

WE ARE STILL HERE: INDIGENOUS PERSPECTIVES OF RESISTANCE

A Dissertation

by

SHARI LYDEANA VALENTINE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,
Committee Members,

Joe Feagin
Stjepan Mestrovic
Robert Mackin
William McIntosh
Jane Sell

Head of Department,

August 2019

Major Subject: Sociology

Copyright 2019

ABSTRACT

In this qualitative study, I endeavor to tell the story of Indigenous resistance, particularly in North America. This story is told through interviews with more than 130 Indigenous activists from 29 Native nations who demonstrate the enduring and coherent nature of Indigenous resistance. I contend that the cultural matrix of Indigenous peoples serves as an abeyance organization to produce recurring activism that conforms to a coherent Indigenous worldview. This worldview produces movements which consistently prioritize protecting the land, centering spiritual principles, fostering community and featuring vital participation by women.

From the Ghost Dance ceremonies of the 1800s to the Water Protectors at Standing Rock, Indigenous peoples have resisted the dominant western paradigms. They have fought for a worldview that is not compatible with the white patriarchal domination of people and nature. This research illuminates an Indigenous worldview. What appears as an Indigenous “rhetoric of survivance” is actually deeply linked to a cultural, political and social epistemology with foundational and organic concepts like time, kinship structures and reciprocity – with concomitant “sacred civics” of “blood and responsibility” and a unique cosmology held in memory and trafficked orally.

Through annals and volumes of academic research across disciplines and cultures not only American Indians, but Indigenous peoples in general, remain marginalized. This marginalization takes place in a variety of ways. Often, it occurs as invisibility: there is simply no mention of Indigenous peoples. At other times, when Indigenous peoples appear, scholars caricature or romanticize them as an extinct species. This marginalization is expected inside mainstream discourses; it is more puzzling in discourses that fight oppression such as feminist

theory or race theory. Frequently, Indigenous peoples are appropriated for discursive purposes and overlooked in the discussion of material realities and solutions. Examples from social movement theory, critical race theory and feminist theory serve to illustrate this pattern.

This research highlights the voices and ideas of Indigenous peoples to tell their own story in response to the marginalization and misrepresentation of usual academic discourse.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated with awe and gratitude to the seven generations who have gone before and the seven who will come after. To all the Indigenous peoples who have resisted annihilation physically and spiritually for so many centuries. Mitakuye Oyacin.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking the many, many Native people who patiently listened and responded to my endless questions for decades, long before and during the official dissertation process. Thank you to all of the Native people who resisted and taught me the value and power of resistance and the beauty of spirit.

Thanks especially to my dearly departed grandmothers—the Irish one who led me to believe I could do anything and the Lakota one who taught me how to do so many things. To Ate, Charles Chipps, who believed in me and told me so, always.

Christi Barrera, you were so very kind when I was such an insecure first generation college student totally out of her depth. And you were still so very kind on the final defense day when you made it all seem so simple and normal. Thank you.

I want to express my heartfelt thanks to my committee. Dr. Mestrovic, your insight always spurred me in uncharted directions and you always agreed to write one more recommendation letter. Dr. McIntosh, your kindness and support was a comfort from the time I first met you. You saved me with your agreement to serve on my committee when I lost my outside member. Dr. Rob Mackin, your confidence in me as a new graduate student gave me a boost I am not sure you ever realized. I am so glad you were there from beginning to end.

Dr. Jane Sell, thank you. Thank you for all of the kindness, for every conversation in the hall and every recommendation letter and every time you made me believe in myself and my ideas.

Dr. Joe Feagin is the reason I became a sociologist, the reason I came to A&M and the reason this dissertation got written. Joe, your patience, insight and guidance meant everything.

Without your steady support and faith, I would not have finished, or probably even started.

Thank you for the insight, the encouragement and the time you spent helping me. And bless you for those many, many recommendation letters.

Finally, I thank my husband, Bear, who supported me steadfastly from beginning to end in too many ways to count. And, my gratitude to my daughter, Erin, who always inspires me and whose support was so cheerfully and invaluable present particularly in the final grueling steps of this marathon.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Professor Joe Feagin, Professor Stjepan Mestrovic and Professor Robert Mackin of the Department of Sociology and Professor William McIntosh of the Department of Nutrition and Food Science.

All work conducted for the dissertation was completed by the student independently.

Funding Sources

There are no outside funding contributions to acknowledge related to the research and compilation of this document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Relevant Literature.....	6
Legal Histories.....	7
Rhetorics of Resistance, Spirituality and Community.....	11
Accounts of Events.....	14
Social Movement Literature and Theory.....	16
II METHODS.....	23
Sources of Information.....	23
Indigenous Methods.....	25
Pitfalls in the Process.....	28
III AN INDIGENOUS WORLDVIEW.....	34
Social Movement Theory.....	36
Feminist Theory Appropriation.....	37
Criticism of Critical Race Theory.....	42
Indigenous Theory.....	43
Tenets of Indigenous Worldview.....	48
Reciprocity and Giving.....	49
Sacred Civics.....	54
Memory and History.....	57
Survival is Essential.....	59
We Are All Related.....	64

Chapter	Page
IV LAND IS IDENTITY	68
Indian Wars	71
V SPIRITUALITY AND COMMUNITY AS CENTRAL TO RESISTANCE	79
Spirituality in AIM and Standing Rock	82
The Trail of Broken Treaties	95
Wounded Knee	98
Standing Rock: A Resistance Community	99
VI WOMEN AS A DRIVING FORCE	101
Women in AIM	103
Women as Water Protectors	111
VII CONCLUSION: SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORIES AND ANALYSIS	116
Framing	117
Framing Constraints	120
Cycles of Protest	124
Multi-Institutional Politics Approach	132
Abeyance	145
Outcomes	150
REFERENCES	162
APPENDIX	178

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

“For us, history is always personal. (I remember the Trail of Tears and Sequoyah’s efforts as if I had been there.) History is directly involved with our families and our generations; tied with sacred white cotton string to the sweet and intense memories of our brother or sister is the desperate and intense hope of each generation to change this history” Jimmie Durham, Wolf Clan Cherokee (Durham 1987:159).

“Don’t ever, ever tell them you are Indian.” These are the oft repeated words of my Cherokee grandfather whose brother lived on a reservation in Oklahoma and whose mother had a living altar in her back yard. He was a successful businessman in Houston, Texas. He told people he was “seven parts Irish and one part Indian.” In actuality, the only Irish thing about him was the Irish woman he married. My other grandfather, who was Choctaw, countered this denial by teaching the language and telling stories of the Choctaw people. Yet he, too, never told anyone outside of the family that he was Indian, even though his sister lived on original Choctaw land in Mississippi. He traded horses and lived his life in white worlds, but he had his own perspectives and his own process within those worlds.

They both denied their white-seeming lives by the way they experienced the world and taught it. I learned to watch ant hills to tell what weather was going to do, to talk with horses and dogs and listen for their answers, to hear wisdom in the voices of the trees and the water and to see the messages in the lightning. These ways of learning and others were a staple of my life, existing contemporaneously with the usual urban education of a major Southern city. The disconnect between what I saw with my grandfathers and what I heard through all other sources

of information, continued through my high school and early college years. As an avid follower of the Wounded Knee events in the 1970s, I finally saw people who talked like us and thought like us. It changed my life forever.

Neither of my grandfathers nor my mixed blood grandmother was involved in any cultural or spiritual Indigenous activities. My great grandmothers were clandestine in their practices. It was not considered smart to admit to being Indian. It was potentially dangerous and certainly unwise. As I became older, I sought out these cultural and spiritual Indigenous practices elsewhere on my own. This journey led me to South Dakota where I was adopted by a Lakota family and spent the next decades deeply embedded in spiritual and cultural practice. I did not move to the reservation, though I spent long months there. I continued to live, work and be educated in dominant white society. It was always apparent that the way I and my family, both biological and adopted, viewed the world was not in sync with the people around us. Looking like a white person and thinking like a white person just were not the same things. This became even more apparent as I returned to graduate school decades later.

This dissertation, while officially 10 years in the making, is decades old. It is born of the experiences of being a white appearing Native person living in urban cities far from Native exposure. And, of the experience of thinking like a Native while attempting to succeed in a white framed education system. Early in my graduate career, I encountered the virtual invisibility of Native voices even in classes about race.

I sat in my social movements course and read about the “success” of the Zapatistas as being that they energized a generation of protests against neoliberal policies and gave a voice to dissidents in a time of despair. I could not wrap my mind around that as the successful outcome of Zapatista sacrifice and resistance. There were many more social movements discussions of

Indigenous movements with white frame imposed determinants of goals and successes. It was clear to me that the success of the Zapatista resistance was that they were then able to live in their own communities, governed by their own councils, in keeping with their own historical and cultural ideals and world views. This, to me, was an easy conclusion. It was entirely absent from discussion of Zapatista resistance.

As I went on to read accounts of Indigenous people written and viewed through white framed research agendas, I became convinced there was a need to inject the voices of Native people into this discussion. By this time, I had been doing ceremony for decades with those American Indian Movement (AIM) leaders of my teen years. I had listened to their stories and the stories of the community about them and the movement. This dissertation began as the means to tell their stories about the things they had been a part of. It must exist inside of the constraints of academic restrictions, but in the end, it still seeks to illuminate a consistent world view of people who rarely get heard in this venue. It is my hope that their voices dominate this discussion even as the form and structure are dictated by academic structures and conventions. With that being said, we proceed to the academic structures and conventions.

Whenever it is possible to use a Native viewpoint to describe events or structure discussion in this dissertation, I will do so. I will explain it when necessary. As a point of clarity, I will use the terms Native, Indigenous and Indian interchangeably because the people described by these terms use them interchangeably. There is no agreement on the most accepted term among them. And, there is no need to agree from their standpoint. That need for agreement on the term is an imposed structure seen in many academic writings. It is identity imposed by a white racial frame which begins colonization by the imposition of names on peoples who have their own names already. Native identity is first to the nation of their birth, Dine or Lakota or

Creek. The colonizers made no distinction between these unique and varied nations. All were Indians. More than 500 years later, as the result of resistance efforts and forced termination policies, Native peoples became not only Dine or Creek, but also American Indian, this time by choosing the name themselves.

Indigenous peoples have participated in centuries of resistance to white western mainstream concepts and world views. These resistance efforts have been remarkably coherent across time frames and geographies. Indigenous resistance frames from early contact through the most recent resistance of Water Protectors at Standing Rock and elsewhere have included several consistent elements:

1. First, resistance is always framed around the importance of land as a responsibility rather than a property.
2. Second, resistance is always centered on spiritual principles and activities.
3. Finally, resistance has always included a focus on community and the critical participation of women.

These frames create challenges to social movement theories of “cycles of protest” and “repertoires of contention” while conforming to theories of abeyance and spillover effects. This dissertation will shine the light on these three elements as well as the voices of Indigenous women and will compare those voices to social movement theories which attempt to analyze and explain them.

This dissertation research project examines the emergence of “Red Power” in the guise of the American Indian Movement (AIM) and the Water-Protectors Standing Rock movement, from *within* the historical and ideological frameworks of American Indians themselves. To understand the emergence, the demands and the outcomes, one must understand the perspective of those making the demands and the history of relations with those reacting to the demands. AIM’s emergence, organizational structure, frames, protest forms, contexts and locations are all deeply

rooted in the historical framework of Indian relations with the dominant white society's legal, religious and state structures. The Standing Rock protests and others springing from them continue to evolve and operate in these same forms.

In this research, I contend that Indigenous people's coherence in framing is the result of a movement in abeyance similar to Verta Taylor's (1989) contentions for the women's movement. Taylor's (1989) work challenges the traditional social movement concept that the women's movement in the United States died after the victory on suffrage in 1920 and was reborn in the 1960s. "This case delineates a process in social movements that allows challenging groups to continue in nonreceptive political climates through social movement abeyance structures." (Taylor 1989:761) Abeyance in this context is the process by which movements are nurtured in organizations (in my examples communities) that are not seen as movement vehicles by the general population or academic gaze. Taylor identifies five abeyance structures that "provide organizational and ideological bridges between different upsurges of activism by the same challenging group" (1989:761). Abeyance structures emerge when society lacks sufficient status vacancies to integrate surpluses of marginal and dissident people. The structures that absorb marginal groups are abeyance organizations (Taylor 1989:762). Abeyance organizations contribute to social change. The abeyance process occurs when there is a strong but small support base and an unsupportive political and social environment.

In this dissertation, I contend the following things:

- The cultural matrix of Indigenous peoples serves as an abeyance organization to produce recurring activism that conforms to a coherent Indigenous worldview.
- This worldview produces movements which consistently prioritize:
 - Protecting the land.
 - Centering spiritual principles
 - Fostering community
 - Featuring vital participation by women.

My research contains three parts. First, there is archival information I have gathered chronicling both the initial resistance to colonization and the continued formation and activities of the Red Power movement, in particular its flagship organization, the American Indian Movement (AIM). Second, my research includes many long interviews with Indigenous activists who were and are participants in AIM, as well as people who were community witnesses and beneficiaries of AIM actions. Included in this is extensive participant observation. Finally, my research includes numerous interviews with, and contemporary public information on, the activists and actions of the Water Protectors at Standing Rock, North Dakota—and subsequent actions deriving from that long series of events. I found, too, that a number of my interview respondents were involved both in earlier AIM actions at Wounded Knee and in the recent resistance at Standing Rock.

From my extensive research, I will show that Indigenous resistance in North America is a continuous movement which conforms to Taylor's (1989) framework for abeyance in a movement. My research also explores the unique contexts and frames of Indigenous resistance which set that resistance apart from other progressive U.S. movements and their social justice paradigms. Sovereignty, land and nonwestern worldviews create different and specific paradigms in Indigenous resistance which are not duplicated in other U.S. movements. Often these Indigenous movements *defy* the usual conclusions of much social movement research, such as those in regard to repertoires of contention and cycles of protest.

Relevant Literature

Literature relevant to this work falls into five categories: the legal history of land claims, sovereignty and treaty rights; relevant government legislation in the years preceding the rise of AIM; American Indian rhetorics of resistance, spirituality and community; texts on AIM and

other Indian organizations before and during the height of protest and accounts of the events from both government and resistance sources; social movement literature relevant to the study of movements. Much of what is most relevant to this work are the oral histories and traditions of Native peoples. These are not reviewed in a literature review; however, they vitally inform this research and are discussed throughout.

Legal Histories

Conquest by Law: How the Discovery of America Dispossessed Indigenous People of Their Land (Robertson 2005) affords an invaluable foundation for understanding both the demands and the form of the demands made by AIM, Water Protectors at Standing Rock and other Indian activists and leaders. It focuses on the religious and legal formation of the “doctrine of discovery” and describes “a staggering array of insider deals, bribes, self –dealing, and other corrupt practices by politicians, lawyers, judges, and other major figures whose interests converged on dispossession of Indigenous peoples” (Robertson 2005:4). These same deals and corrupt political practices that lay the groundwork for colonization continue in force with modern updates in use against AIM and Water Protectors. The ability to reroute an oil pipeline from Bismarck, North Dakota, because white residents fear its effect on their lives to a reservation route without so much as a discussion with Native populations, is initially inscribed in the Marshall rulings and continually reaffirmed in later Court opinions. The Marshall Doctrine utilizes a Papal Bull, which stipulates that whichever Christian nation first lays claim to a discovered area is recognized as legitimate. Chief Justice Marshall enshrines this into law and in the process entirely disregards the prior land claim and legitimacy of Indigenous nations. The ongoing ability to ignore and override Native concerns, health and safety is the hallmark of U.S. Indian policy undergirded by the Marshall Doctrine.

Like a Loaded Weapon (Williams 2005) details the continued use of the Marshall Doctrine by the modern courts. The description of Native peoples as savages and incapable of protecting their own interests or even knowing them continues in graphic and lurid detail in the rulings of the modern courts. These rulings allow the muddy situations wherein the very people who will profit from exploitation of Native resources are those assigned to oversee and protect those resources. Native resources are so often used as nuclear testing grounds, mining grounds or pipeline routes because one branch of government, the Corps of Engineers for example, only has to seek cooperation and approval from another branch of government – The Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs itself, as well as numerous other legislative and court decisions directly created the conditions in Indian country that led to the resistance activities.

In *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties* (1974), Vine DeLoria Jr. gives an excellent and extensive chronology and explanation of the history of land rights, sovereignty and assimilation and termination policies and their corresponding impact on American Indian resistance, tactics and survival. My interviews with activists and witnesses confirm Deloria's (1974) contentions of salience for land, community and spirituality. "The modern Indian movement for national recognition thus had its roots in the tireless resistance of generations of unknown Indians who have refused to melt into the homogeneity of American life and accept American citizenship" (DeLoria 1974:20). The Reorganization Act of 1934, the Dawes Allotment Act, the Indian Claims Commission, the Relocation Act, House Resolution 108 (the policy for termination of tribes and reservation lands), the Bureau of Indian Affairs itself as well as numerous other legislative and court decisions directly created the conditions in Indian country that led to the resistance activities.

These histories provide the framing that continues from colonization through AIM resistance to the current Water Protector resistance frames and challenges and support my contentions of abeyance, land themes and spiritual underpinnings. While these legislative works are virtually unknown in general U. S. populations, they are common knowledge among Native people. Teenagers on the reservation quickly explained to me that the Dawes Allotment Act is the reason why the government can let white people use reservation lands even though the people in the community are against it. My grandfather refused to get a Dawes number (the designation that allows for tribal registry and benefits). He explained that it was ridiculous to obtain a number named after the man who destroyed Indian ways of life in order to prove that one was an Indian. Dawes is a name infamous in Indian country and virtually unknown in mainstream U.S. history.

In *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*, Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz (2014) chronicles the explicit early oppressions both legal and cultural that elicit resistance strategies and opposition frames in Indians. These frames and strategies are held in abeyance and restructured from colonization to AIM resistance to the Water Protectors at Standing Rock. The early oppressions are updated and become the repression strategies of current corporate and government interests. My interviews include references by respondents to many of the events she chronicles. These occurrences, virtually unknown and certainly unmentioned in mainstream discourse and social science, are again common knowledge in Indian country. They are substantive elements of collective memory and form the seeds of coherent discourse framed in resistance strategies from generation to generation in a movement in abeyance.

Joanne Nagel (1995) discusses the importance of the Relocation Act in providing the basis for “ethnic renewal” among American Indians. Many of my older participants discuss this

explicitly in interviews. Nagle's work particularly addresses the involvement of women in Indian resistance as I contend in my work. "From 1952 to 1972, federal programs relocated more than 100,000 American Indians to a number of targeted cities, including Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Los Angeles, Oakland, Oklahoma City, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, San Jose, Seattle, and Tulsa" (Nagel 1995:954). Moving Indians from tribal reservations to urban areas where they mixed with Indians from many other tribes allowed them to become in Nagel's words "supratribally" identified. This relocation that allowed for the creation of an intertribal Indian identity is a crucial element in the development of the organizations, conditions and networks that spawned the protests.

AIM took specific advantage of a pan Indian identity formed out of these relocations. Many of the AIM leaders themselves trace their activist roots to the urban Native communities that developed in the wake of these relocations. The continued expression of this pan Indian identity sees Native peoples from more than 300 nations represented in protests at Standing Rock even though the land in question is Lakota and Dakota treaty land. Because, as I explore more fully in this document, all land is sacred and all Native people perceive a responsibility to preserve and protect it. There is not an Indigenous sense that Standing Rock is Lakota and Dakota land so it is not our problem. Mother Earth is complete and a collectively held responsibility for Indigenous peoples.

The rhetoric of resistance, choices of locations and lists of demands are the direct product of the legal history in the decades after World War II and the treaties that ushered in the reservations as well as the court decisions and legislation that gutted them. These termination policies and their relocation efforts literally created the conditions for the rise of AIM.

Current resistance at Standing Rock builds on these events and elements and is further impacted by the 2007 passage of the United Nations Resolution on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Indian Law 2016). When Water Protectors at Standing Rock talk about the Black Snake and protecting their Mother, they are echoing the terms and positions of the early resisters to colonization and the AIM protests. Women have been the chair of the Indigenous Peoples Council for more than half of its existence.

The United Nations' recognition of Indigenous rights creates a codification of Indigenous themes and frames which is then utilized by the Water Protectors at Standing Rock. Additionally, it has spawned global Indigenous networks, many of whom provided support and amplification to Standing Rock resistance efforts. Maori from New Zealand, First Nations from Canada, Aboriginals from Australia and Indigenous groups from Bolivia, Brazil and other parts of Latin America were all active and supportive of the Water Protectors both through the Indigenous Peoples Council and independently. This resolution itself is an outcome of earlier Red Power activism. One of the outcomes of AIM resistance efforts is the International Indian Treaty Council—a working council of activists which worked for 20 years to create and pass the U. N. resolution. The U.N. resolution itself is a spillover effect of AIM activism. The U.N. Council of Indigenous Peoples itself can be considered an abeyance organization.

Rhetorics of Resistance, Spirituality and Community

Duane Champagne's (2007) comprehensive work *Social Change and Cultural Continuity among Native Nations* is an excellent social science analysis of the nature and structure of American Indian identity formation, collective memory, community organization, philosophy and cosmology. These identities, collective memories and cosmology which serve as the frames of AIM and subsequently of the Water Protectors, are repeatedly referenced in my interviews.

Champagne (2007) discusses the central structures of land, collective memory and identity which play pivotal roles in the formation, frames and strategies of both AIM and the Water Protectors. The philosophy and cosmology of land as living and sacred is a central tenet of his analysis and of the claims of AIM and Water Protectors. Women as protectors and leaders is discussed in his work and amplified in the actions of AIM and Water Protectors. These elements provide the basis for shared framing and its continuity through generations and periods of abeyance.

And, once again, Vine Deloria (1973) Jr's classic text *God is Red* is an excellent primer on American Indian spirituality and its impact on identity, perspective and resistance. The elements and frames as well as the centrality of spiritual concerns which DeLoria (1973) discusses are apparent in both AIM and at Standing Rock. DeLoria (1973) outlines the complex interrelation of land, spirit and identity for Native people. These principles are apparent in action when we see Water Protectors holding spiritual ceremonies and making claims of life and identity for the land itself. When AIM chooses Mount Rushmore as a site of resistance, the sacred nature of land is preeminent and showcased. These spiritually-driven world views provide the bedrock of resistance ideologies from AIM to Standing Rock.

American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance (Stromberg 2006) collects 14 essays by American Indians spanning a hundred years and provides an important window into the collective and continuous nature of the frames of resistance that appear in early resistance to colonization, AIM speeches and documents and Standing Rock interviews, information and strategies. These frames of land, community and spirituality are articulated in my interviews over a century later. In his rhetorics, Stromberg (2006) showcases several early Native women who served as spokespeople for the resistance in their communities. Sarah Winnemucca eloquently details the place of women in Native worldviews. She concentrates her speeches and public

appeals on women and women's groups because she mistakenly assumes that white women hold the same influence to sway opinion and action in their communities that Native women do in her communities. Women continue to sway opinions and serve as spokespeople in Water Protector actions and camps.

The spiritual and deeply cultural nature of the protests is articulated by AIM leaders Dennis Banks (Banks and Erdoes 2004), Russell Means (Means and Wolf 1995) and Adam Fortunate Eagle (1992) in their autobiographical texts. These activist leaders provide the outline and explicit discussion of frames, identities, collective memories and expected outcomes of the AIM resistance. Their words are echoed in my interviews with participants and witnesses. Occasionally, direct quotes are cited in interviews.

In his Black Hills Speech of 1980, Means offers a perspective that links spiritual perception to personal action, "The European materialist tradition of despiritualizing the universe is very similar to the mental process which goes into dehumanizing another person." In a personal interview, Leonard CrowDog (2007) is more direct, "You ask what part [of the motivation and message for AIM activism] is spiritual? All of it. We are spiritual, you are spiritual. All things we do are spiritual. There is no separation into this is and that is not a spiritual thing."

In public speeches, writings and personal interviews, Means continues to highlight that Lakota is a matriarchal society. He stresses that women are the thought leaders and moral compass of Native people and that no collective action could or would happen without the involvement of women. Banks (Erdoes 2004) discusses that they choose Mount Rushmore without thinking because the Black Hills are sacred land and the speeches they give are not rehearsed or discussed because they are common knowledge. Being at Mount Rushmore and

discussing the history of land seizure and massacre and broken treaties was a series of events that did not require planning or script writing. It was present in the collective memories and resistance of Native peoples.

The perspectives of these AIM leaders in their writing and interviews explicitly track the earlier resistance paradigms of colonization and the same sentiments, frames and worldviews are evidenced at Standing Rock. The Water Protectors specifically incorporate ceremony into their resistance efforts and frames. They base their resistance on the concept that the land is sacred and should not be violated by pumping oil. Women run many of the camps and serve as spokespeople for much of the discussion.

Accounts of Events

As noted earlier, the voices of Native people are not often represented in social science literature. These voices inform vital elements of the process in this dissertation. So, accounts of events from individual participants in Indigenous resistance movements are an important inclusion to the literature review. Many AIM activists and witnesses are not published. The foot soldiers in the resistance and the communities impacted by the resistance are represented in my interviews. Multiple Water Protectors from various camps are also represented through live feed transcripts and follow-up personal interviews.

In addition to the autobiographical texts of movement leaders mentioned above, a number of other accounts of the events have been written by parties involved in or witness to the events such as Alvin Josephy (1971). Josephy was a rare high-level Department of the Interior employee with Indian sympathies and sensitivity. Josephy's (1971) accounts lend credence to movement claims of the intransigence and bad faith of the government both historically and in its negotiations and promises to the movement. His work specifically discusses the incubator in

which Indian resistance rises up and the continuing generational issues it addresses. He is explicit in detailing the continuity of Indian claims to the Department of Interior over generations. As I contend, the movement maintains coherent frames and rhetoric over generations. As an Interior Department employee, he explicitly details the Native concerns and sacred consideration of the land. He also notes the involvement of women in pleading the cause and furthering the resistance.

As a prelude to his discussion of the atrocities of government dealings with Indians, Josephy says,

Red Power today reflects a determined and patriotic Indian fight for freedom—freedom from injustice and bondage, freedom from patronization and oppression, freedom from what the white man cannot and will not solve. For almost five hundred years Indians have been fighting defensively for their right to exist—for their freedom, their lands, their means of livelihood, their organizations and societies, their beliefs, their ways of life, their personal security, their very lives. Those who still remain after so many generations of physical and cultural genocide continue to be oppressed by shattering problems, most of them created by the intruder, conqueror, and dispossessor—the white man (1971:3).

Josephy's sympathetic voice in government is more than drowned out.

In addition to the legal and economic repressions detailed in the literature mentioned above, a much more direct and brutal police action was undertaken to silence Indian resistance and movements. The efforts of the FBI, state, local and tribal police are chronicled by Rex Weyler (1982), Ward Churchill and Jim Vander Wall (2002) and Steve Hendricks (2006). My interviews often give first hand confirmation of these brutal repressions. These repressive campaigns by the FBI and their impact on movement activists and activities form a central theme in the examination of AIM in this dissertation.

(Note: This section regarding FBI actions against specific people and groups is one of the sections where a great deal of material was cut because the activists involved were unwilling, even decades later, to show up in print accusing the FBI of the actions that occurred. While most

of them are no longer concerned about their own health and safety, they sincerely believe that this information could make their families targets of the FBI. These interview portions are free for discussion but not for print.)

These actions are a continuation of colonization tactics and are mirrored in contemporary actions against Water Protectors. The over the top military presence against Water Protectors is a direct mirror of tactics used against AIM at Wounded Knee and elsewhere. The resistance strategies from Sara Winnemucca to AIM to Standing Rock continue to focus on land, spirituality and community action with women's vital involvement.

Social Movement Literature and Theory

While AIM is the best known and most publicized historical American Indian social movement organization, as mentioned above, it essentially serves as the flagship of a fleet of local and national organizations. In this regard, it must be viewed through a similar lens as that applied by Douglas McAdam (1999) in studying the civil rights movement and Ferree (2005), Meyer and Whittier (1994), Taylor (1989), in discussing the women's movement by combining the efforts and actions of multiple organizations into the overall designation of a movement. For example, what we see as singular resistance at Standing Rock was actually multiple camps with different leaders and structures cooperating with and through various organizations.

Many of the current references to AIM in the literature place it in a listing of movements spawned by the opened political opportunity structure of the civil rights movement and even reference it in support of Tarrow's (1998) Cycles of Protest theories. However, this placement may be inaccurate regarding AIM and certainly Standing Rock. The texts mentioned above indicate that during the decades in which legal opportunity structures were opening for Blacks

(see McAdam 1999), American Indians were facing ever more repressive legal and social policies such as termination. The emergence of American Indian movements have followed a trajectory more like the abeyance Taylor (1989) describes than conforming to Tarrow's (1998) "cycles of protest."

These theories also seem dissonant when applied to current Water Protector resistance. Standing Rock resistance emerged at a time when there was another major protest movement active, the Black Lives Matter movement. However, the Water Protectors raise issues and concerns very different in theme, tactical framing and action. Their themes are articulated often by women, focused on land and spiritually centered. Tarrow's (1998) "repertoires of contention" concept indicates that movements draw on common frames. Both AIM and the Water Protectors diverge in their frames from other contemporary non-Indian movements. My research indicates this mostly white-generated theory of "cycles of protest" with "repertoires of contention" is inadequate when applied to American Indian resistance.

David Snow and Robert Benford's (1988) framing theory appears to be both applicable and contradictory when preliminarily applied to AIM and Standing Rock. Certainly, these resistance movements do well on the three core framing tasks of diagnosis, solutions and motivational reasons. They were quite successful in mobilizing adherents, gaining bystander support and demobilizing their antagonists in the direct confrontations. However, Snow and Benford's (1988) concept of infrastructure, phenomenological and protest cycle constraints on framing are less clearly applicable to either of these American Indian protest movements. The protest cycles that are around Indian resistance do not generally address or even touch on the concerns of Native people. Their repertoires are not adequate to address the communal, land driven and spiritually centered resistance efforts of Native peoples. The infrastructure

requirements of Snow and Benford's (1988) theory are replaced in Native resistance with a sort of community or spiritual infrastructure that holds in abeyance between periods of active or public protest. But it is a structure that governs life and thought in Native communities, not simply the organization of protest actions. It resonates with the closely held tenets of Indigenous worldviews with regard to protecting the land, centering spirituality and preserving community.

On the issue of centrality and salience for the population, AIM and Standing Rock are difficult to analyze in that the salience for the dominant culture was virtually nonexistent at the onset, however, as noted above, these resisters speak to a completely different culture and from a completely different cultural matrix. Within that matrix, the frames were salient and resonant. My further discussion and research will clarify and extend these concepts. The concept of empirical credibility is easily surmounted by simple education on the history of American Indians and was accomplished quite effectively. The experiential commensurability portion of phenomenological constraints again swims in the murky waters of the dual cultural matrix discussed above.

Joe Feagin's (2013) discussion of home-culture counter framing in *The White Racial Frame* captures the sense of Indigenous resistance most accurately. He notes that Indigenous groups have the "longest tradition of countering white oppression" (Feagin 2013:188). He goes on to discuss the egalitarian gender relations and spiritual underpinnings of Indigenous resistance frames. And provides support for my abeyance contention when he says, "Indeed, there is an unbroken line of transmission from early home-culture frames predating European invasions to such home-culture frames today" (Feagin 2013:189). My research examines this concept in depth and expands it in Native contexts from Native perspectives.

The most important potential problem area with regard to framing is the concept that cycles of protest constrain available framing. According to this theory, AIM would be a later arriving movement and would be constrained to the frames already in play within the cycle. AIM frames were not in fact limited to the contexts described by the other rising movements. Standing Rock has no particular relation to the Black Lives Matter Movement or other rising movements in this cycle except the very general shared oppression from a white racial frame. AIM and Standing Rock demands center as noted above on treaty rights, sovereignty and assimilation issues that were not a part of the dominant protest frames in the cycle or currently.

The explanation explored in this work is that American Indian resistance actually conforms to Taylor's (1989) theory of abeyance. As noted earlier, AIM itself considers the movement and the issues to be hundreds of years old. The Water Protectors at Standing Rock echo this belief. This dissertation research looks at Taylor's (1989) abeyance structures and determines that American Indian resistance, like the women's movement, constitutes a resurgence of a movement in abeyance. This concept of resurgence of a movement in abeyance expands the possibilities for factors that influence the ability to maintain abeyance.

The location choices of AIM in their protest actions are telling on this point. Alcatraz, where so many natives had been imprisoned for "aboriginal sin", including 14 Hopis who refused to send their children to mission schools, was an available site in the collective memory of a movement in abeyance. Wounded Knee, the site of the century old massacre that is common shared memory in Indian Country, was the natural choice for the gathering which led to the second armed standoff. The generational hatred of the Bureau of Indian Affairs made it the logical choice in Washington to express resistance to being brushed off and lied to by government. They are all important points examined in light of the theory of abeyance. And, in

fact, the current Water Protectors at Standing Rock return to the themes and often harken to the historical locations of prior resistances as well as AIM.

An additional consideration as a tool for analysis is the “spillover effects” detailed by Meyer and Whittier (1994). It is not readily apparent that there are any spillover effects that produced AIM’s rise other than, perhaps, the general spillover of the protest cycle. Though, that link is tenuous. However, my research overwhelmingly indicates that AIM produced a crescendo of spillover effects in terms of organizations that sprang up in its wake, the impact on the entire framework of Indian affairs and their future move from marginalized termination to self-determination and most certainly in the impact on mobilizing lifelong and instrumental future activists. For example, Wilma Mankiller was a 23-year-old Cherokee housewife in San Francisco when the occupation of Alcatraz occurred. She went on to become the tribal chief of the Cherokee nation and attributes the transformation of her life to her involvement with AIM and Alcatraz. The Water Protectors are producing similar spillover effects in the form of pipeline protests in Louisiana and elsewhere.

Repression is both a historical and current overarching theme in American Indian resistance. The important spiritual and cultural frame directed at American Indians themselves rather than the public at large along with the changing of larger culture views of them may be more compatible with social movement literature on the women’s movement than that currently applied to Indigenous movements or even other groups of color. Ferree (2005) notes, “Women’s movements addressed changes in values and norms directly in the institutions of religion, medicine, family and economy. Women’s movements worked in, on and through civil society as much as or more than on the state as such” (140). We see in the AIM archives and statements their focus on changing the consciousness of Indians as much as changing the external

conditions. The Standing Rock resistance also spends great energy in enlisting civil society and changing minds as well as conditions.

In general, but also in specific with regard to Native women's activism, I will apply Armstrong and Bernstein's (2008) Multi-Institutional Politics (MIP) approach. This approach seeks to link the theoretical critiques and insights of a body of social theorists who have eschewed the dominant Political Process Theory (PPT) and provided insight into social movement theory from a cultural perspective. Glenn Bracey (2016) insightfully critiques PPT with regard to its treatment, or more accurately, its failure to treat with race. Bracey argues, "...that a racially white interpretive lens led early political process theorists to tacitly employ an assimilation-based model of race. Despite it not being marked as such, a theory of race has always implicitly guided political process theory. Unfortunately, that implicit theory has been assimilationist and white-centered in orientation" (2016:12). With their centuries old counter frames and very alternative worldview, Indigenous peoples are a very bad fit for a theory that relies on assimilation to white cultural frames. Given the deeply embedded cultural matrix of Indigenous resistance frames, MIP analysis seems the most promising avenue for connecting social movement theories to Indigenous resistance movements.

In the area of outcomes, social movement literature has a distressing tendency to conceive outcomes that are products of the scholar's frame as much or more than the movement's. This work looks at outcomes as measured against the movement's goals and from within the cultural matrix of the American Indian. How do AIM leaders and community witnesses judge the outcomes of the resistance? What changes do we see as a result of the movement in Indian Country? Further, the nature of the American Indian Movement lends itself

to studying outcomes in the manner that Andrews (2004) applies to the civil rights movement over the long rather than the short haul and in multiple relevant arenas of concern.

The Water Protectors resistance at Standing Rock is itself an outcome of AIM. Meyer and Whittier (1994) have outlined a concept of outcomes as measured in policy, culture and participants that considers both short-term and long-term effects as well as individual and collective impact. This model appears to be the most suitable to measure outcomes in American Indian contexts. These short-term and long-term trajectories are often evident in witness accounts, public press and interviews.

My interviews with more than 100 activists and witnesses confirm the salience of specific Indigenous frames of land, community and spirituality as well as the prominence of women in resistance efforts. Indigenous peoples, with their centuries of culturally derived resistance, are likely the only group with frames and worldviews that are not reactions too and overshadowed by the hegemonic dominance of elite white males and their theories of reality. This dominance, engineered and sustained by European imperialism and colonization and buttressed by resource driven capitalist economics has governed the thought of all resistance movements since colonization began in the 1600s. Only the frames and land base of Indigenous peoples are established prior to this framing model. Other models, by virtue of when they arise are in reaction to and influenced by this hegemonic elite white male colonization of both land and thought. My participant observations, spanning years, highlight the spillover effects and generational nature of resistance.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

Sources of Information

My project necessarily employs multiple methods of analysis and data collection. Preliminarily, extensive historical research into the legal underpinnings of Indian policy that creates the foundational resistance frame and salience was necessary. Pertinent legislation and court cases were read as well as commentary and texts regarding their impact. Much of the strategies of Indian resistance from colonization to current Water Protectors take place in legal strategies and cases based on these historical treaties and legal precedents.

Secondly, I have reviewed and coded newspaper reports from both national sources such as the *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times* and *Washington Post* as well as local papers in the areas where protest events occurred such as San Francisco, Minneapolis and Standing Rock. I reviewed coverage by Native news outlets such as *Indian Country Today* and the *Akwesasne News* and coded them for Indigenous perspectives. In the case of Wounded Knee, international press was very involved so some tracking of coverage in these outlets was undertaken. International coverage of the Water Protectors is also present. These contemporaneous newspaper reports give us insight into the strategies, frames and desired outcomes of the various resistance actions. They also help to track the abeyance structures in action over time.

Perusal of current American Indian subject websites for mentions of AIM or Standing Rock events past or present are useful in answering both spillover and abeyance questions as well as outcome issues. The Minnesota Historical Society Library maintains not only back copies of *Akwesasne News* but also the archives of the AIM newsletter which have been reviewed. The

Bay Area Indian Center in San Francisco houses archival information on the Alcatraz occupation which have been reviewed and coded. I reviewed government documents on both the protests themselves and the government legislative and commission responses to it which are available online. The government documents relating to the FBI's counter intelligence war against AIM have been released under the Freedom of Information Act and have been reviewed. Native websites reflect the community response to resistance and track the impact and outcomes of efforts to change minds within the community. Government documents provide insight into the repression and counter mobilizations of the opposition.

The biographies of activist leaders are a valuable source of names of other participants. While many leaders have published books such as Means, Banks, CrowDog, Peltier and Fortunate Eagle, many other prominent leaders such as Carter Camp, Hank Adams and John Trudell have not. My interviews with many of these activists have confirmed and expanded the published information. Cross referencing activist names with leadership lists in Indian organizations and government testimony on legislation yielded important information on spillover effects. Examining the lists of tribal leadership positions past and present offers more information on outcomes and spillovers.

The records of the Wounded Knee Defense Committee are also housed at the Minnesota Historical Society. Since the committee conducted more than 900 defensive trials and 300 offensive legal actions, I have gleaned a great deal of information on activists, repression and outcomes from review and coding of these documents. For information on Standing Rock, multiple daily live feeds from activists at the camps were monitored. I conducted interviews with participants in the Water Protector camps. Particular priority was given to activists who were involved in both AIM actions and current Water Protector efforts.

Indigenous Methods

As stated earlier, this dissertation was born of a desire to foreground the voices of Native people when discussing Native concerns. My initial inspiration and investigation were driven by the idea that academic discourse made Indigenous voices silent or secondary. This intention meant that my research would need to look and sound different from the research I had read. How to do this became a research project all on its own. Several excellent methods books have informed both my research and my presentation of this research. In her ground-breaking work, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012), an Indigenous Maori researcher, outlines six principles that should guide research with Indigenous peoples. These are the following imperatives: 1) to situate and conceptualize research within its wider genealogy of Western imperialist and colonialist processes; 2) to contextualize the formation of knowledge in relation to power dynamics; 3) to connect the power dynamics of the interfacing processes of political, economic, cultural, and social change (and bureaucratic and corporate entrenchment); 4) to critically deconstruct the notion of decolonization; 5) to understand not only the survival necessity, but the power processes involved in Indigenous renaming, reclaiming, and redefining of concepts of research; and 6) to devise and articulate research agendas from Indigenous perspectives. These imperatives served as my guiding principles in conducting the research and in writing about the research.

While these principles were excellent overarching imperatives, that was a theory text. The actual step by step implementation came from other sources. I was inspired by the ongoing engagement and participant oversight in Mitchell Duneier's (2000) *Sidewalk*. I committed to take my findings and writing back to the people who had contributed to them. Conducting my research as an insider, it was incumbent upon me to make sure that my recitation and

presentation of the discussion was true to the intent of the people involved. This simple commitment became much more problematic than I had ever anticipated and will be discussed further. I decided to return to graduate school and study sociology because I found a copy of Feagin and Vera's *Liberation Sociology* in a used book bin. I was captured by the concept of reflective sociology, though I certainly would not have known to label it as such. Feagin and Vera note, "Moreover, reflectivity, broadly conceived, is at the heart of what it means to be human; it is integral to the ability to understand, and to empathize with, the social other" (2014:268). It is a primary motivation of this research to produce that reflective empathy in those who read this. I sincerely hope that by allowing Native voices to tell Native stories, a measure of understanding and insight will be made available.

In deciding how to present the information, I relied on the excellent work of Gregory Younging (2018), a Cree nation member who owns the only Indigenous publishing house in existence. Younging's (2018) work, *Elements of Indigenous Style*, helped me check my own inclinations with regard to how to present the work itself. *Aboriginal Oral Traditions* (Hulan and Eigenbrod, 2008), helped me to develop good habits and skills in faithfully collecting the oral traditions and oral history which were naturally a part of the participant observation and interview process.

Perhaps the most valuable resource in any part of this research was *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (Wilson 2008). This text captured the dilemmas of being an insider in the community and using as a field site, the lives, lived and spiritual, of your Indigenous community. Wilson (2008) lays out the research process as a ceremony. He holds that if it is approached as such, it will be inherently both truthful and respectful. Following his tenets and applying them to my initial research process as well as the many iterations of

complications involved with the changing minds and literal death of respondents allowed me to maintain equilibrium and approach the process in ways that would benefit both the research product and the community.

One of the principles that Wilson (2008) centers his discussion on is “relational accountability.” This is the accountability that Indigenous researchers owe to their past and future generations, the past and future generations of other Indigenous peoples, the people and communities they are researching and their own relationships with the other relatives, the 404 other “nations” as the Lakota would term it—plants, animals, elementals. This concept is entirely complementary to an Indigenous world view and a ceremonial practice. It served as a stabilizing center for me in my conduct of the research and decision making on how to discuss and present it. As a structure and principle, it is the pitch perfect Indigenous counterpoint to the materialist, colonizing influence of research conceived in elite white male power centers. When research is ceremony, it is approaching the world as an Indigenous person does and that perspective brings a different tenor and different choices to the entire research process. It begins to strip the whitewashing from academic research.

As a part of this ceremony approach to research, copies of my notes and recordings when done have been given to the respondents or their relatives if they indicated that desire. As a part of this effort, more than 650 hours of recordings have been digitized, copied and distributed to individuals who were a part of the interview process or who requested that their oral discussions be made available to their relatives on their death. These recordings contain histories of family, community and movement, songs, stories and teachings.

As a part of this project, an entirely independent oral history preservation was spawned. In addition to the interviews and recordings from the dissertation research, I had several decades

of recordings from teachings and talks and song lessons with various elders and community leaders which were added to the digital records and copied for participants and relatives as they chose. Some of these recordings included the voices of those long gone and served to remind and revive particular Native versions of “repertoires of contention” and survivance.

Pitfalls in the Process

One of the unique aspects of both Native worldviews and my insider research status meant that I was privy to conversations where there was an assumed common history and understanding. As Valerie Lambert (2007) noted in her Choctaw research, “aspects of my methodology-including how to ask particular questions- were informed by my status as a citizen of the tribe and by my background of having been reared in Oklahoma” (286). My research was similarly methodologically informed. This common understanding required translation in order to meet the terms of academic discourse and comprehension by people without that shared history. In that process, much time was consumed.

A secondary pitfall I did not anticipate was the community reaction to the information. Often, AIM leaders or community participants in reflective space responding to my inquiries would discuss things they had not previously aired publicly. Ideas that might not be readily integrated in larger groups were discussed one on one with me. When I took the writings and conclusions back to them and others, they were less willing to see them in print. Native people are inherently suspicious of long official written documents. This suspicion is reasonable and logical when viewed from inside the Native experience with 370 broken treaties and countless court battles resulting in legally stolen land or resources. This should not have surprised me as much as it did. I kept returning with new writings hoping to find the proper written words. Actually, it was the fact that it was written at all that was at issue. If I spoke the information, in

phone calls or in person, there were head nods and agreements. If I presented it in written form, there was suspicion and reservation. Joy Harjo and Gloria Bird (1998) discuss this phenomenon:

To write is often still suspect in our tribal communities, and understandably so. It is through writing in the colonizers' languages that our lands have been stolen, children taken away. We have often been betrayed by those who first learned to write and to speak the language of the occupier of our lands. Yet to speak well in our communities in whatever form is still respected (20).

When I met and interviewed Harjo herself in 2015, she commiserated with me on the merry go round of approvals and rejections. Her advice helped facilitate future negotiations on written information as well.

A few of my respondents are illiterate, so others would read the work to them. Several heated discussions ensued from that process. The reader would take issue with either my framing of the conversation or the actual discussion on the part of the participant. Discussions, explanations, teachings and narratives emerged from the ensuing exchange. Often they were very enlightening to the project. Sometimes, the manuscript had to be entirely deleted or changed. Sometimes, the respondent gave permission for me to write the information if it was not directly attributed to them. So, you will see comments from movement leaders both as themselves and as unnamed participants. Sometimes, the leaders would ask me to edit the material and I would. When it was returned, with a different audience, reader or reflective mood upon them, they would return to the earlier perspective and discussion.

Several dozens of pages built around the recollections of five vitally involved AIM leaders went through rewrite after rewrite in the attempt to find a version that all were good with at the same time. That version was formulated, but then writing it down became the issue. The actual writing of the ideas, as it turned out, was a major crux of the problem. This issue of writing itself as a problem repeated many times over the course of the research. If I would

verbally discuss the perspectives and quotes and my conclusions and insights, I would get hearty agreement from multiple sources. When I committed it to writing, the agreement evaporated.

Russell Means says in the preface to his famous Black Hills speech of 1980:

The only possible opening for a statement of this kind is that I detest writing. The process itself epitomizes the European concept of 'legitimate' thinking. My culture, the Lakota culture, has an oral tradition, so I ordinarily reject writing. It is one of the white world's ways of destroying the cultures of non-European peoples, the imposing of an abstraction over the spoken relationship of a people.

I remembered these words many times as I attempted to negotiate my way through the land mines of writing an oral tradition or transcribing and writing response to spoken conversations. This rejection he references returned again and again.

Literal years were lost in this process. And, it was not entirely resolved. There is a great deal of information, insight, support and dialogue available to me. I have enthusiastic permission and support to share it verbally. I can say volumes. I can write much less. This too, was a perfectly reasonable field limitation to expect from a culture which sees writing as taking the life and truth from all interactions. The process of using these many hours and hundreds of discarded pages to inform the process without directly printing them in the process became another tenet of Indigenous research as ceremony. And, they were clear, in oral discussion/defense or any other presentation or conversation; I am free to tell the story as I experienced it and as I remember it. Many repetitions to shore up my memory were involved prior to this carte blanche permission.

My decades of participation in these communities and with these respondents meant that often I was asking questions in very familiar situations of people I knew very well, who might have already answered those questions years ago. So, sometimes the interview started with statements like, "Remember when we talked at the Sundance about...." Interviews were often informal and more unstructured conversations than semi-structured interviews. Also, that lengthy

participation meant that I did not have to spend a lot of time asking for context, I knew the contexts.

I interviewed 137 people for this dissertation. They ranged in age from 18 to 89. They were representatives of 29 different native nations. Fifteen of them decided after seeing their words in print that they were not interested in being a part of the reported results. Of the remaining 122, 43 have died since I interviewed them. This created critical problems for my research. Six died before I could review their interviews with them. I had to then decide how to proceed with including them. In four cases, they had close family members who had been a part of the interview process and were willing to sign off on the information. The other two interviews were simply given to the families as recordings and deleted from the research reports.

The remaining 36 deceased respondents were a mixed bag of research nightmares. In some cases, they had fully approved of the writing and that writing had become an integral part of my report. However, they had relatives who had been opposed to their comments to begin with and were now exerting influence to have the information removed and returned to them. (In many cases, the things they wanted disregarded were not even a part of my writing. But, that was not an important distinction to them.) Negotiations with families, often many factions of families with different concepts, consumed years.

A researcher who was not a part of the community could well have taken the approval from the respondent and ignored the relative's objections. As an Indigenous community member and an academic committed to a different paradigm in Indigenous research practices, my concerns were more nuanced. I had to consider future relationships with the people involved and the integrity of the research itself. Additionally, in a few cases, I had to be faithful to the wishes of the original person interviewed. In some cases, they specifically knew they were saying things

that relatives would not like, and they felt they were important things to say. Again, some decisions were to just include the information and anonymize the leader in question. This decision has met with mixed responses from the relatives involved.

A final methodological sticking point occurred as I tried to decide how to anonymize people who were going to be anonymous. In a usual research structure, I might just choose random names such as Sally or Ethan. However, in Indigenous worldviews, names are powerful descriptors and are not something you would just make up and assign to someone. So, if people needed to be kept anonymous, and I could not just randomly assign them names, what would I do? This is a case where research as ceremony came in handy as well as the historical and collective memory of Indigenous people.

One event that is very present for Native people is Abraham Lincoln's hanging of 38 Dakota people. Most people outside of Indian Country have never even heard of it even though it is the largest official mass execution in U.S. history. Inside of Indian Country, you are aware of it whether you are Dakota or Choctaw. There are many accounts of this event, but I will quote from the published account in *Native News Online*:

In the fall of 1862, after the United States failed to meet its treaty obligations with the Dakota people, several Dakota warriors raided an American settlement, killed 5 settlers and stole some food. After more than a month, several hundred of the Dakota warriors surrendered and the rest fled north to what is now Canada. Those who surrendered were quickly tried in military tribunals, and 303 of them were condemned to death (Charles 2017).

There is much discussion of the patent unfairness of the trials. Lincoln was loath to execute 303 people so he continued to change the requirements of the death penalty until he arrived at a number designed to pacify white settlers. He never ordered a retrial despite the problems with the original trials.

“On December 26, 1862, by order of President Lincoln, and with nearly 4,000 white American settlers looking on, the mass execution of 38 Dakota men occurred” (Charles 2017). Each year there is a long trail ride on horseback in the dead of winter that traverses the path the Dakota had traveled and ends up in their ultimate execution spot to commemorate the event. The names of those 38 Dakota are the pseudonyms chosen when an anonymous naming is required in this research.

As a final methodological note, the data from these interviews is stored electronically on an encrypted password protected hard drive kept in a locked file cabinet. The notes and other hard copy materials are stored in the same filed cabinet in my university office. This research was conducted with the initial approval of the Institutional Review Board at Texas A & M University and subsequent approvals from Hollins University IRB and Henderson State University IRB.

CHAPTER III

AN INDIGENOUS WORLDVIEW

Native American resistance exhibits coherent frames of resistance across centuries. From early colonization to current Water Protectors' efforts, consistent themes and frames of resistance are evident. Three particular frame consistencies are evident:

- The central importance of land as a trusted responsibility rather than a commodity property.
- Resistance centered on spiritual principles and activities.
- The focus on community.
- The critical participation of women.

These frames are not born of social movement activism and resistance. They are not formulated as tropes in a resistance effort. They are the natural expression of a comprehensive and coherent Indigenous worldview crafted over many centuries. This chapter will discuss that overarching world view before exploring specific ways it is expressed and deployed in resistance efforts over generations.

This chapter explores the essential common tenets of Indigenous world views and how these commonly held tenets frame Indigenous responses to dominant cultural practices and discourses. This dialogue begins the process of describing an Indigenous theory which contrasts historically with imperialist Western paradigms in virtually all areas of discourse. The chapter will examine Indigenous resistance to modern development and hegemonic Western practices drawing upon its contrasts and conflicts with social movement theory, critical race theory and feminist theory while utilizing the unique terminology of Indigenous language and concepts.

Within all of these academic fields, Indigenous peoples present problems for scholars. As UCLA sociologist and Chippewa Indian Duane Champagne (2007) points out, "The story of

American Indian self-determination has not been a primary focus of social scientists. The theories and conceptualizations that have been used to account for the place of American Indians in American society have been largely based on ethnic marginalization and racial conceptualizations that are recognized as not good fits” (2).

Social movement theory, which focuses most explicitly on the role that Indigenous peoples’ movements play in contemporary global society, often inadvertently relegates the logic, structure, and goals of these movements to Western democratic or even revolutionary values. However, I contend there is a shared standpoint, an “organic” *raison d’être* that comprises the basis for Indigenous positions and struggles. I will proceed by challenging social movements’ frameworks and then move to providing both an empirical and descriptive basis for an Indigenous peoples’ theory.

I will conclude by discussing the appearance of essentialist framework through which this standpoint resonates by looking briefly at the discussion of essentialism (and constructivism) within epistemological theoretical debates. What appears as an Indigenous “rhetoric of survivance” is actually deeply linked to a cultural, political, social epistemology with foundational and organic concepts like time, kinship structures and reciprocity – with concomitant “sacred civics” of “blood and responsibility,” and a unique cosmology held in memory and trafficked orally.

Through annals and volumes of academic research across disciplines and cultures not only American Indians, but Indigenous peoples in general, remain marginalized. This marginalization takes place in a variety of ways. Often, it occurs as invisibility: there is simply no mention of Indigenous peoples. At other times, when Indigenous peoples appear, scholars caricature or romanticize them as an extinct species. This marginalization is expected inside

mainstream discourses; it is more puzzling in discourses that fight oppression such as feminist theory or race theory. Frequently, Indigenous peoples are appropriated for discursive purposes and overlooked in the discussion of material realities and solutions. Examples from social movement theory, critical race theory and feminist theory will serve to illustrate this pattern.

Social Movement Theory

Contemporary social movement theory draws on examples of Indigenous movements to illustrate various theoretical positions of social movements developed by academics in the global North. Rarely do they explore the frames of Indigenous resistance except through the lens of pre-existing Western academic jargon. As noted earlier, this jargon and its encompassing theories are assimilationist and whitewashed (Bracey 2016). In assessing the outcomes or success of movements, the lens of Western academic outcomes is employed rather than the frames or a goal of the Indigenous peoples themselves.

In a case study of the Zapatistas, Oleson (2005) credits them with “reinvigorating the frames of opposition to neoliberalism” (189). He deems their successful outcomes to be the reinvigoration of opposition to neoliberalism and the expansion of the internet as a movement tool. Anyone unfamiliar with the Zapatistas would be hard pressed to discern that these are Indigenous people whose stated goals are to live in a traditional manner and whose frames come from centuries of Indigenous oral tradition and practice. Their success is in actually achieving self-determination, not reigniting global opposition or revolutionizing internet communications.

Their frames, like their goals, are born of an Indigenous worldview. Their presentation by conventional academics is as a *subject* of the Western worldview and analytical discourse. They are marginalized even as their ideas are repackaged and appropriated. Scholars translate Indigenous frames and theory into Western theoretical and conceptual categories. In this way,

scholars reify the perception that Indigenous peoples and frames of resistance are only comprehensible through Western frames. In reality, they become ever more incomprehensible when subjected to these artificial externally imposed concepts. This colonization of the process asserts as normal the imperialist domination of Western ways of thinking and being. As Charles Chipps (2010) says,

Colonization, that's a thistle with many thorns. They take the land, they take away the ceremonies. They thought they could take the spirit, but that can't be colonized. Our hearts cannot be colonized. They want us to think it is normal for these things to be as they are. That's colonization. But, we know better. It is normal to live with our relatives in harmony with the sacred and the earth. This (he waves his hand around a street corner in a reservation edge town) this is not normal. This is colonization. These ideas that create this. That is colonizing thought.

Feminist Theory Appropriation

This theme of repackaging and appropriation runs rampant in feminist theorizing most particularly, but not exclusively, in the arena of ecofeminism. Ecofeminists take as a central tenet that ecological disasters affect women more than men. To justify action, ecofeminists emphasize the degradation of Indigenous lands and the “plight” of Indigenous peoples. Yet, for all of its inclusion and critique of Western paradigms of exploitation and exclusion, ecofeminism, with its origins in colonizing Western academic thought, is often guilty of some of the same patterns of exploitation, appropriation and exclusion against which it struggles. The struggles of the Chipko movement in India and the efforts of American Indian women are cited liberally in many articles and every anthology.

However, articles by or interviews with Indigenous peoples are rarely included. These movements like Oleson's (2005) characterization of the Zapatistas are recast in feminist languages that strive to divorce women and nature to overcome the Western paradigm which oppresses women based on this presumed association. This language ignores the fact that Indigenous women do not divorce themselves from nature. In actuality, this association and

reverence for nature serves as a primary motivation for their resistance. There is a privileging of language and truths as well as the methods for divining those truths.

Through application of feminist academic jargon and their privileged positions, they appropriate and ignore the voices of Indigenous peoples. They normalize the colonizing rhetoric and ideas. Ecofeminist theory, like social movement theory reproduces the intellectual subjugation of Indigenous people in three ways: exclusion of Indigenous voices and frames; cloaking Indigenous women's concerns in ecofeminist jargon; and, reproducing ethnocentrism by assuming that Indigenous women are victims of local patriarchy.

Donna Haraway (1989) alludes to this when she makes it clear that constructions of nature in the study of primatology as well as constructions of gender are deeply implicated in the politics of race and colonialism. She notes that scientific narratives depend on their authors' historical "positioning in particular cognitive and political structures of science, race, and gender" (303). It is indisputable that the cognitive and political structures of science, race and gender for Western feminist academics are significantly separated from those positions in Indigenous cultures. Not only is the study of science and primatology, but Western feminism as well implicated in structures of colonialism in several important ways.

Evelyn Fox Keller (2001) perhaps sums it up best when she says in her critique of science, "Unexamined myths, wherever they survive, have a subterranean potency; they affect our thinking in ways we are not aware of, and to the extent that we lack awareness, our capacity to resist their influence is undermined" (81). There are relatively unexamined myths within the discourse of ecofeminism and they do exert "subterranean potency" both on the course of ecofeminism and the relationships with Indigenous peoples. In later chapters, we will examine

the “subterranean potency” of Indigenous myths. These myths tell a very different story and exert influences in opposition to mainstream Western imperialist ideology.

Ironically, perhaps the textbook example of exploitation comes from Haraway herself. In further developing a kinship structure for her cyborg, Haraway (2003) draws upon the coyote, a powerful symbol in many Indigenous cultures. She acknowledges her appropriation, “My use of coyote is marked by the middle class, white feminist appropriation of Native American symbols, about which one must be very suspicious. There is a particular way in which feminist spirituality has operated in a rather colonial way to Native American practices” (Haraway 2003:327).

Having acknowledged both the suspicious nature of her appropriation and the historical practice it joins in colonizing Native Americans, one might expect Haraway (2003) to dispense with her capture of the coyote. She does not; in fact she does not even apologize for the appropriation. She goes on to say, “However, in saying that I do not mean to dismiss or to forbid what I and others have been doing in terms of using Native American symbols” (Haraway 2003:327). Haraway goes on to insist that “...certain figures like the raven and the coyote do work in Anglo culture, as well as in Native culture. So I think there is a way in which this cross-talk between figurations is politically interesting, although certainly not innocent” (2003:328).

It is not difficult to imagine the reaction of feminists from all sections of the feminist spectrum raining acid critique down upon a male writer (or female for that matter) who made such comments with regard to women or gender issues. We do not even have to imagine it; there are volumes of feminist writings doing just that. While Haraway is the most frank and unapologetic in her appropriation and exploitation, she is not alone. Rather, she is joined by the vast majority of mainstream western academic voices. Her comments beg several observations.

While coyote may “work” in Anglo culture, it works for Anglo means and ends. Coyote is exiled in Anglo culture. In forcing coyote into a kinship relationship with her cyborg, Haraway (2003) has kidnapped coyote from the kinship structures within which it flourishes and forced upon it a language which is not its own. In a metaphorical sense Haraway (2003) has kidnapped coyote and taken him to a circus in much the same way bears were caught and trained to dance or whales are forced to live in pools and perform tricks for the entertainment of that “white middle class” referenced by Haraway (2003). Coyote’s two legged Indigenous kin are without voice or recourse in this crime against their relative.

These sorts of overt and covert appropriations and exploitations are precisely the foundation on which ecofeminist criticism of patriarchal domination and destruction is premised. When Haraway (2003) opines that the “cross-talk” is “politically interesting” two distinct questions arise. First, there is the implication by use of the word crosstalk that there are two speakers, in reality, there are only multiple white middle class feminists speaking. She does not provide in her works the voice that would speak for coyote’s original kin. They are silent, marginalized, and invisible.

Secondly, the cavalier assertion that this mythical crosstalk is politically interesting begs the question of interesting to whom? The answer, of course, is those same white middle class feminists Haraway (2003) has already admitted have appropriated Native American symbols. Are these symbols appropriated in the cause of Native American liberation? No. They are kidnapped from their sacred contexts and used for the politically interesting conversational stimulation of Western feminist academics. In what way does this differ from the patriarchal appropriation, exploitation, marginalization and colonization of women and Indigenous peoples

practiced by men and decried by these same feminists? It does not differ; rather it indicts feminists as co-conspirators in the hegemonic Western imperialist frame of domination.

This is particularly egregious in light of the fact Buffy Saint-Marie (2017), Cree songwriter and activist noted in her lyrics several decades ago, “Reservations are the nuclear frontline.” In *Ecofeminism Through an Anticolonial Framework*, Andrea Smith (1997) recites a dizzying litany of ecological destruction of Indian lands. Quoting various studies, she notes, “60 percent of the energy resources (i.e., coal, oil, uranium) in this country are on Indian land” (1997:23). She further notes that “100% of uranium production takes place on or near Indian land” (Ibid). Over fifty reservations have been targeted for toxic waste dumps (Conger 1991). “There have been at least 650 nuclear explosions on Shoshone land at the Nevada test site. Fifty percent of the underground tests have leaked radiation into the atmosphere” (Tallman 1991).

Smith cites dozens of additional examples of environmental issues among Native Americans including miscarriage rates around uranium mining enterprises that are “six times higher than the national average” (1997:23). She sums up her comments in this section by saying, “The inability to fully embrace an anticolonialist ideology is the major stumbling block in developing alliances between Native people and members of the mainstream environmental movement and feminist movement” (25). Not only have most feminists failed to embrace anticolonialism, they have a long and checkered history of embracing colonialism itself and using those very principles to advance their own ends through subjugation and domination of Indigenous peoples. This history will be further explored in the following chapters. I will also chronicle the persistent, coherent and passionate defense of the principles of Indigenous worldviews on sacred land, spiritual principles and community strength as well as the egalitarian roles of women in these communities and causes.

Criticism of Critical Race Theory

Race theorists become unlikely conspirators in the marginalization of Indigenous peoples. In *The World is a Ghetto*, Howard Winant's (2002) self-identified historical sociology, the first half of the book discusses the effects of colonization and liberally utilizes the long history of genocidal practices against Indigenous peoples to make his point. In Part II, the analysis and solutions part, he discusses the conditions necessary for successfully resisting hegemony. He calls for a "rearticulation of racial formation" and stresses the need to develop resistances that operate as "counter hegemonic blocs" (240) to challenge racial hierarchy, mobilize masses and utilize "transnational resources, ideas and political leverage" (144). He postulates a "subalternity dynamic" (241) wherein there is a disconnect between the emergence of an insurgent elite and the ability to mobilize the masses. He contends that "political success often involves education, access to international circuits of ideas and funding" (Winant 2002:241).

Yet, in his global tour of resistances, Winant (2002) fails to mention a single Indigenous movement. His analysis of Brazil, while giving credit for Brazilian racial formation, shifts to various local and global black movements which were unsuccessful. He never mentions the regional movements of Indigenous peoples in other parts of Latin America, many successful, which surely exercised influence on Brazilian consciousness and activism. In Brazil, he fails to mention the Indigenous Yanomami movement for land rights or the rubber tappers' movement incorporating indigenes and successfully mobilizing the "counter hegemonic bloc" Winant proposes as the answer to Brazilian "racial democracy" (2002:240).

The Zapatistas, perhaps the poster child for his theory, are nowhere to be found. He also fails to include the hugely successful umbrella group of CONAIE (see Johnson and Almeida

2006) or the more than a dozen other successful Indigenous uprisings in Latin America. Having utilized Indigenous people to drive his point home in Part I, Winant (2002) disappears Indigenous resistances in his modern racial formation theory. This demonstrates, once again, that attempted colonization of Indigenous minds and thoughts and movement activism. It is used, by White Western academics, as an example to make a point of Western imperial academic theorizing. And then, we are supposed to forget whose ideas and whose resistance this actually is and focus instead on the normalizing colonization of Western academic theory and jargon.

Indigenous Theory

As Duane Champagne points out, Indigenous resistance is not a good fit for the prominent discourses of academicians, resulting in marginalization (2007). In *Prison Writings*, Leonard Peltier (1999) predictably phrases the subject somewhat differently, “To many white people the government especially, Indians who resist assimilation must be guilty of something. We are guilty. Guilty of Aboriginal Sin” (15). Aboriginal sin is the transgression of refusing to accept the obvious superiority of Western ways. Indigenous refusal to embrace the “obviously superior” ways and world views of their European conquerors has been a thorn in the side of political, social, economic and religious leaders for more than five hundred years. This resistance, spiritually born and communally sustained on sacred land bases, is not replicated by any other resistance force.

Extensive theoretical and philosophical concepts backed by tomes of writing have created a framework of “manifest destiny” further bolstered by even more volumes of intricate legal machinations, numerous crusades and endeavors by humanitarians, philanthropists and missionaries. In the United States, an entire subcabinet level national government agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, exists solely to manage Indians and their resources. Canada, Australia

and New Zealand have similar governmental bodies. Despite centuries of armed bloody annihilation tactics and another two hundred years of legal, cultural, and economic warfare, Indigenous peoples are still resisting assimilation, as Peltier (1999) says, embracing “aboriginal sin.” This resistance is fueled by the foundational tenets of Indigenous worldviews and practiced in the sacred civics of Indigenous resistance.

Indigenous peoples from Latin America to New Zealand have embraced this aboriginal sin, or in other words adhered to this theoretical worldview. In his historical sociology, Winant states, “Hegemony works by incorporating opposition” (2002:35). Yet on a global scale, hegemony has been unable to incorporate these Indigenous resistances. Scholars have been equally unable to meaningfully incorporate Indigenous resistances into their theoretical frameworks. As noted above, Western scholars randomly examine Indigenous resistances to serve their immediate needs, and in doing so they fail to grapple with the uncanny similarities of these resistances across cultures, geographies and timelines.

Indigenous peoples on a global scale have been remarkably effective in resisting assimilation. As noted above, assimilation is a racialized tool of colonization. By definition, it requires annihilation of that which is not of the dominant white racial frame. Despite the best efforts of the most hegemonic forces the world has known, Indigenous peoples say, “We are still here!” And they are still very recognizable in their worldview and activist frames. My research suggests this resistance is the product of a shared alternative worldview, what Westerners might call a theoretical perspective, among Indigenous peoples. The remainder of this chapter will introduce the existence and tenets of this alternative frame or theory and its inherent opposition to dominant Western structures of thought.

This opposition and its concomitant theoretical underpinnings can be identified and traced in global scale interactions. In her article on the impact of the global Indigenous movement on International Law, Rhiannon Morgan (2007) notes, “The history of the emergence of global ‘indigenism’ is relatively well documented (for example, Brysk 2001; Sanders 1980; Wilmer 1993). These studies make clear that strong transnational networks and shared claims already existed between differently situated Indigenous peoples prior to U.N. interest in Indigenous issues, as did an emerging collective Indigenous identity” (277). The U.N. documents chronicling the development of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples show how compatible Indigenous world views are across cultures.

At the first planning meeting for the world conference attended by numerous Indigenous representatives from 11 nation-states the document notes, “The meeting faced the ‘problem’ of virtual instant agreement by the delegates to proceed with the proposal of the National Indian Brotherhood to hold the international conference. But the full four days of the conference were spent usefully and enjoyably. A definition of ‘Indigenous people’ was developed for the purpose of delegate status at the proposed conference” (Sanders 1980). In a matter of hours, Indigenous peoples separated by oceans, languages and culture who had never met before reached agreement on the tenets of a global conference. By the next day the requirements of membership were formulated and agreed upon. Imagine the implausibility of this sort of speedy agreement between the governmental representatives of these same nation-states.

Accounts of the international conference itself are even more indicative of common Indigenous framing and philosophy. Two hundred and sixty people participated in the conference, including 52 delegates, one hundred and 35 observers, 25 members of the press and fifty-four staff members. The conference originally scheduled three days of workshop sessions as

a way to get acquainted and develop rapport. “After two days of workshops it was decided to go directly back into plenary sessions on Thursday. The sense of direction in the conference was so clear that further preliminary workshops were unnecessary. All delegates realized they shared common experiences of oppression, though they varied from ‘mild’ racial discrimination to ethnocide and genocide. On the final two days the Charter of the new organization was debated, amended and approved” (Sanders, 1980). Anyone who has ever attended a professional conference or a meeting of disparate activists must take a moment to marvel at the similarity of thought and goals producing agreement on such complex and vital issues in this compressed timeframe.

The resolution adopted by the assembly, the Solemn Declaration, illustrates the unified and collective theoretical framework underpinning Indigenous resistance. Judith Butler (2002), in her exploration of kinship norms and how they structure the unthinkable, wonders if we “have accepted an epistemological field structured by a fundamental loss, one which we can no longer name enough even to grieve...we find our way politically in the wake of the ungrievable” (40). It is interesting to note in the excerpt below the “unthinkable” kinship claims and the obvious grief in the face of their desecration. The resolution adopted by the assembly gives great insight into the unified and collective Indigenous frame of reference and resistance—and grief for the ungrievable.

The following is a partial excerpt of the Solemn Declaration, a liberation manifesto:

We the Indigenous Peoples of the world, united in this corner of our Mother the Earth in a great assembly of men of wisdom, declare to all nations:

We glory in our proud past:
when the earth was our nurturing mother,
when the night sky formed our common roof,
when Sun and Moon were our parents,

when all were brothers and sisters,
when our great civilizations grew under the sun,
when our chiefs and elders were great leaders,
when justice ruled the Law and its execution.

Then other peoples arrived:

thirsting for blood, for gold, for land and all its wealth,
carrying the cross and the sword, one in each hand,
without knowing or waiting to learn the ways of our worlds,
they considered us to be lower than the animals,
they stole our lands from us and took us from our lands,
they made slaves of the Sons of the sun.

However, they have never been able to eliminate us,
nor to erase our memories of what we were,
because we are the culture of the earth and the sky,
we are of ancient descent and we are millions,
and although our whole universe may be ravaged,
our people will live on
for longer than even the kingdom of death (Sanders 1980).

It is clear from the history of swift agreement and organizing on a global scale that Indigenous people around the globe share an essential frame of resistance predicated on a stable theoretical framework that draws on different “repertoires of contention” and relies on framing from entirely different theoretical grounding than other resistance movements. Indigenous resistance strategies and rhetorics of survivance do not draw their sustenance from Western philosophical, mythological, intellectual, or scientific traditions or theories. The collective memories of Indigenous peoples do not contain Mount Olympus or Mount Sinai.

Though Indigenous peoples spread across the globe and have different presentations of the frame, there remains a consistent theoretical framework for Indigenous cultures regardless of geography and uniquely situated experiences with Western imperialism. While imperialists spoke different names, worshiped their gods in different ways and pursued their goals with various strategies, the hegemonic frame of oppression and racialization remains both visible and

consistent across continents and centuries. Distinct elements transport freely across languages, centuries, theologies and economic systems.

Tenets of Indigenous Worldview

What are the essential tenets of existence enabling Indigenous peoples to consider themselves a collective in spite of cultural, linguistic, ethnic and historical variations and in the face of unremitting centuries long efforts from a global hegemonic colonizer? The discussions, traditions and actions of numerous Indigenous people and groups over time suggest three inherent worldview components, an Indigenous theoretical frame, common to Indigenous peoples and in direct contradiction to Western ideology: time, reciprocity, and kinship. The first of these tenets is the concept of time. Time is not linear. Time in fact is not. Or at least not in any way that can be understood in Western thought forms. Whatever has been is. In the Indigenous cyclical concept of time, history is not separated from current reality.

Indigenous peoples think in a cyclical manner rather than the linear fashion of Western thought. Lines, and hence linear thought, exclude all points which do not lie upon the line. Contrast this with Indigenous concepts of returning cycles and the inclusive circle as the primary geometric element. Circles include while lines exclude. In a cyclical concept of time, there is no “end of history.” History doesn’t go unerringly forward never to look back. History like the earth has cycles that return. Time and space are not fixed points on this line. They are more akin to points on a moving spiral.

The Hegelian concept of an “end of history” simply has no point of contact with Indigenous thinking on time. Winona LaDuke (1992), an Anishinabek (Ojibwe) activist, suggests that there are two principle elements of indigeneity vital to understanding “Indigenous thinking.” “*Pimaatisiwin* or the ‘good life’ is the basic objective of the Anishinabek and Cree people. An

alternative interpretation of the word is continuous birth. This is how we traditionally understand the world. Two tenets are essential to this concept: cyclical thinking and reciprocal relations and responsibilities to the Earth and creation” (52). Cyclical thinking and continuous birth is an insurmountable obstacle to accepting an end of history or the inevitable march of modernity and progress so inherent to the Western world view. In contrast to the series of endings in Western thought, Indigenous people have continuous beginnings. This concept of time as cyclical contributes to the abeyance nature of Indigenous resistance explored in future chapters.

Reciprocity and Giving

LaDuke’s (1992) concept of reciprocal relations and responsibilities is the second basic hallmark of indigeneity. Western theoretical thought and discourse developed in a schema that entrenched hierarchy and survival of the fittest with man’s undeniable position at the top of the chain of being. Indigenous peoples recognize an inextricably interwoven existence which does not elevate any part over another. It is horizontal rather than vertical. Reciprocity, not competition, is the governing principle of living and thought. These differences in critical thinking create a bond among Indigenous peoples in the same way the Western thought system creates a hegemonic approach across culture and language.

The discourses of Indigenous peoples effectively constitute an alternative theory of reality derived from a radically divergent frame of origin. While hierarchy has some place in some Indigenous groups, it does not overturn the reciprocity principle. Even those who are honored with leadership positions, in fact, especially those who are honored with positions of leadership to protect the whole community, are even more bound by this concept of reciprocity and giving. A person who has great honors and great material wealth without sharing it is seen as out of balance and harmony. They do not long last in favor with the community.

Giving, rather than taking, is the driving force of relationships. In *Indigenous Traditions and Ecology*, Gonzales and Nelson (2001) discuss this concept of giving, its centrality to Native lifeways and the antithetical nature of Western concepts of taking:

Natural law, as outlined in the creation stories and original instructions of most Native nations, states that one should never take more than one needs when harvesting or collecting something from the earth. A related Indigenous natural law is the law of reciprocity: if one receives a gift, whether a fish from a river, a deer from a forest, or dinner from a friend, one should return that gift with another gift-another food item, physical objects like clothes, or a gift of nature (shell, stone, feather) as appreciation, an honoring gesture, or a song. This practice of giving and being given (as opposed to taking) is a central tenet of Indigenous religious traditions. Western capitalism, on the other hand, which thoroughly dominates the world through economic globalization, is based on the belief that one should provide the least amount of input (investment) for the maximum amount of output (profit). Put another way, one takes as much as possible while investing the least amount of resources (natural, human, financial). It is clear that Western capitalism is out of balance with natural law” (529).

Finally, Indigenous peoples have a kinship structure which includes all living things. The Lakota concept of this is *mitakuye oyacin*. *Mitakuye oyacin* translates roughly into English as everything is related. The conceptual underpinnings of this concept encompass all animate life on earth including the earth herself. The concept of what is animate is also radically different. Kinship relations are extended to all living things from trees to whales and these kindred are recognized and honored as unique and valued in interdependent relationship with humans. There are similar descriptions in the languages of other Indigenous peoples, however, this research will most often utilize Lakota concepts and terminology, not because they are better or different, but because they are the ones most familiar to me in their nuanced meanings and practice.

The kinship structure of Indigenous life is not fictive as academic anthropologists suggest. In fact, this construct of fictive kin is another example of the manner in which Western academic discourse maps its own structural understandings and views onto the explanations of Indigenous ways. Fictive, being a derivative of fiction already prejudices the kinship as less than

real. Judith Butler (2002) wonders if kinship is “always already heterosexual?” (17). In an Indigenous framework it is not even already or always Homo sapiens. In the search for subversive disruptions, Butler (2019) would find no more staunch allies than Indigenous peoples. Curiously enough, most Indigenous peoples have cultural allowances for same sex couplings and even honor them as particular messengers with unique perspectives in ways similar to those Butler (2019) theorizes in *Gender Trouble*.

For an Indigenous thinker, kinship extends not only across bloodlines but across species lines. Indigenous peoples are related to animals and plants as well as people. Mother Earth is not a fictive kinship. Note in the declaration above that this parental relationship is acknowledged by an international gathering of multiple Indigenous peoples. Buechel (1970) highlights this in his dictionary of the Lakota language. As an example of *maka* – the word for Mother Earth- he says: “As they would say touching the ground and taking an oath, if one should lie he would surely stumble upon the earth” (Buechel 1970:328). A Western thinker might swear on his bible or his “mother’s grave.” An Indigenous thinker would literally take an oath on his mother. Kinship engenders reciprocity. For Indigenous peoples this reciprocity is present towards all things. This fundamental reciprocity towards all things stands in direct counterpoint to the Western religious and Enlightenment philosophies of domination and colonization. In his 1980, Black Hills Speech, American Indian leader Russell Means contrasts the Indigenous reverence for earth to the development of Western civilization:

Newton, for example, "revolutionized" physics and the so-called natural sciences by reducing the physical universe to a linear mathematical equation. Descartes did the same thing with culture. John Locke did it with politics, and Adam Smith did it with economics. Each one of these "thinkers" took a piece of the spirituality of human existence and converted it into code, an abstraction. They picked up where Christianity ended: they "secularized" Christian religion, as the "scholars" like to say- and in doing so they made Europe more able and ready to act as an expansionist culture.

There is no equivalent to the “Great Chain of Being” in Indigenous thinking. This concept is defined on the City University of New York (CUNY) English website.

Its major premise was that every existing thing in the universe had its "place" in a divinely planned hierarchical order, which was pictured as a chain vertically extended. ("Hierarchical" refers to an order based on a series of higher and lower, strictly ranked gradations.) An object's "place" depended on the relative proportion of "spirit" and "matter" it contained—the less "spirit" and the more "matter," the lower down it stood. At the bottom, for example, stood various types of inanimate objects, such as metals, stones, and the four elements (earth, water, air, fire) (City University of New York Brooklyn College Department of 2009).

The idea that there would be a hierarchy wherein sacred stones and the spirits of earth, water, air and fire would be considered inferior to humans would be one that could not find purchase in an Indigenous paradigm. All things have spirit and purpose and those purposes are not ranked in order. They are all seen as vital. And humans would certainly never be at the top of the great chain in an Indigenous worldview.

Reciprocity and universal kinship precludes hierarchy. Without hierarchy, there exists no driving sanctified inspiration to denigrate other peoples or beings in order to improve one's own status and worth. LaDuke (1992) discusses the ramifications of reciprocity in conflict with Western paradigms:

I believe that is a state of mind, so let me talk about it in terms of what I call industrial thinking. Instead of viewing natural law as pre-eminent, we are taught in this society of man's dominion over nature. Does a tree have standing is an unusual argument in this society, because we are taught that man has superior rights to all around him. What has happened is that over time, all that is alive, has spirit, has standing on its own in an Indigenous worldview, now is viewed only in terms of its utilitarian benefit to man (56).

In an Indigenous paradigm, humans do not have dominion over the earth or anything on it. The Lakota explain human speech as a compensatory attribute. Humans are so weak in survivability without natural fangs or claws that they needed rationality to be able to plead for their existence from relatives such as bears and buffalo on whom they rely for survival. The

extensive kinship concept precludes the “othering” necessary for racialization and oppression. Reciprocity stands as a direct counterpoint to the culture of competition and its supporting theories and institutions are inherent in dominant hegemonic culture.

The elements of traditional Western thought justifying Western hegemonic domination conflict with Indigenous thinking. First, the concept of an end to history makes progress in a linear fashion a driving goal and provides unquestioned adherence to such concepts as modernization. Second, the philosophical and religious concept that man has dominion and responsibility over Nature and all other inhabitants of the planet provides ample justification for all manner of oppression. This Great Chain of Being concept gives rise to the important processes of hierarchies of power. Finally, these hierarchies necessitate competition for a preferred place in the Great Chain which demands the othering and oppression of some for the advancement of others. Means (1980) again discusses the differences in Indigenous thought:

Being is a spiritual proposition. Gaining is a material act. Traditionally, American Indians have always attempted to be the best people they could. Part of that spiritual process was and is to give away wealth, to discard wealth in order not to gain. Material gain is an indicator of false status among traditional people, while it is "proof that the system works" to Europeans.

Distance becomes an important component of action for Western conquerors. Man must distance himself from Nature, from other species and in fact from other humans in order to achieve and maintain a preferred position in the hierarchy. In *Systemic Racism*, Feagin (2006) suggests this is a form of cultural alexythemia which enables the sustained immoral and immutable tenets of the white racial frame. Alexythemia is a term coined by psychotherapist Peter Sifneos. It literally means without words for emotions (Bar-On and Parker 2000). He used the concept to describe people who have a deficiency in processing, describing or even understanding emotions. Certainly, Westerners have been incapable of processing, understanding

and describing the emotions of Indigenous peoples on subjects from sacred land to sacred language for half a millennium. Means (1980) suggests this failure to relate is a calculated and pervasive component of Western domination and colonization strategies. As Means points out:

The European materialist tradition of despiritualizing the universe is very similar to the mental process which goes into dehumanizing another person. And who seems most expert at dehumanizing other people? And why? Soldiers who have seen a lot of combat learn to do this to the enemy before going back into combat. Murderers do it before going out to commit murder. Nazi SS guards did it to concentration camp inmates. Cops do it. Corporation leaders do it to the workers they send into uranium mines and steel mills. Politicians do it to everyone in sight. And what the process has in common for each group doing the dehumanizing is that it makes it all right to kill and otherwise destroy other people.

This distancing from other beings and the process of nature is effectively impossible inside an Indigenous world view. Efforts to assimilate and adopt Western ideas create core level dissonance for an Indigenous person. It is not a matter of simply adopting a few ideas here and there; it requires a complete restructuring of thought itself. In light of these fundamental paradigm differences, it becomes clearer how Indigenous peoples resist being co-opted by the hegemonic discourse. They continue to hold to sacred principles of time, reciprocity and kinship while practicing a sacred civics that protects the land, centers spirit and promotes community harmony.

Sacred Civics

The voices of Indigenous resistance, born of these common frames centers around three principles, a sort of “sacred civics”: blood, land and memory. Note that all three figure prominently in the resolution adopted by the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (Sanders 1980). This sacred civics manifests in long term resistance efforts and strategies focused on land, centered on spiritual principles and exhibiting prominence of community and women. In *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts*,

Chadwyck Allen (2002) analyzed the intersections of culture, identity and politics in Native Literature, focusing in particular on the way writers use traditions and the shared history of colonization to construct Indigenous identities aimed at attaining self-determination. Indigenous writers in both the U. S. and New Zealand utilize similar rhetoric to formulate discussion of problems of colonialism such as invisibility, dominant frames insisting assimilation is inevitable and legal strategies perpetrating political disempowerment. This centuries-long resistance by Indigenous peoples is the product of the Indigenous worldview and sacred principles, and, their refusal to be colonized with assimilation.

Allen outlines strategies he calls the “blood/land/memory complex” and the “discourse of treaties” (14). According to Allen, “these three terms provide powerful tropes for figuring Indigenous identities, in part because blood and memory create a sense of continuity between Indigenous life in the past and in the present, while territorial dispossession suggests the necessity of repatriating land to Indigenous communities” (15). I suggest that these elements of Indigenous action are the “sacred civics” or praxis of Indigenous theory. It should be noted here that the Indigenous view of blood and land is in no way connected to the white supremacist tenets of blood and soil. Blood is a kinship bind, not necessarily needing to be shared through inheritance. Native peoples see all creatures as relatives and as sacred in their own right. There is no concept that men have dominion over other creatures or the land itself. Land is a sacred trust, not soil to own and exploit.

Much of Indigenous discourse centers on the concept of blood rights and responsibilities. This is both a civil and spiritual discourse. While particulars differ among nations (just as Western nations and religions differ) the intrinsic importance of blood is consistent. The blood of ancestors, the blood of birthing, the blood of dying people, the blood that makes one Indigenous

are all aspects of the blood discourse. Indigenous people, unlike the Western concept of family, extend kinship to all with an Indigenous blood claim. Blood is binding in similar ways that Westerners conceive of “blood being thicker than water.” An important caveat here is that blood does not have to be hereditarily obtained to be thicker than water. While the Western statement implicitly favors a genetic interpretation and faculty of blood, Indigenous concepts of blood are not tied to genetics. Exchanges of blood and sacrifices of blood create kinship as concretely as the blood of birthing. For Indigenous peoples, there is a great deal of blood binding them reinforced by a core theoretical concept of expanded kinship.

Land, living and sacred, is central to all Indigenous discourses. Western discussions of rights and property give both concepts a portable character. Indigenous dialogue always identifies the specific importance of certain land. It is not the amount of land, but the living character of specific lands that is at issue. Land is not a commodity that can be traded or for that matter owned— it is a sacred trust. In this regard, Indigenous discourse on land shares some components with the historic and contemporary discourses of many Western peoples around the city of Jerusalem. While important for different reasons to different groups, it is vitally important. The state cannot trade twice as much land somewhere else for the plot of land that is Jerusalem. No other land is *that* land, and hence, no other land can serve the purpose of that land. If we imagine the outrage of Western peoples from all arenas to a suggestion of mining uranium in Jerusalem, testing nuclear weapons, or drilling for oil, we begin to conceive the Indigenous perspective on land misused by colonizers for centuries.

You cannot provide compensation with money, other land or civil rights for the loss of the sacred trust embodied in particular land. Only the Paha Sapa (Black Hills) can serve the physical, emotional and spiritual needs that are manifest in them. Think of trying to buy, trade,

move or compensate for the Wailing Wall. Western, and for that matter many Eastern, civilizations endow a few specific plots of land with special properties and significance. These limited places have life and essence and value outside of their material use. An Indigenous world view extends this special essence and value to all of the earth, not just isolated plots of it. Land has intrinsic value, is held in collective memory and exerts kinship claims on Indigenous peoples.

Memory and History

Memory is collective and that collectivity is expansive. Memory is a history. The differences between orality and literacy play a pivotal role in the difference of framing goals, strategies and outcomes between Indigenous people and Westerners. Among these mechanisms frequently mentioned in discourse is a discussion of “collective memory.” In *Systemic Racism*, Feagin (2006) points out that these interconnected memories impact the actions and ideas of the oppressors as well as those of the oppressed. Walter Ong (2002), in his work *Orality and Literacy*, explores extensively the relatively greater impact of the processes of collective memory on oral cultures. Ong discusses the nature of thought and action in oral versus literate societies. The very nature of thought processes and information storage in an oral society insures that the “collective memory” of oral societies will be more vivid and accessible than that of a literate society.

Ong begins his work by noting that the structure of oral cultures enhances memory retention of necessity. Feagin (2006) points out the psychological and emotional wages of the white racial frame on the oppressed. Ong’s (2002) work would suggest that these wages are far greater than any Western literate scholar can imagine. Oral cultures intrinsically embed experience in ways designed to evoke emotion and action. This stands in vivid contrast to the

absence of emotion in the cultural alexythemia discussed earlier. Tragically for the recipients of the oppression of white racist framing, they also embed them in more permanent and intrinsic ways than literate discourse. And, these embedded memories of colonization are available frames that resonate with all Indigenous peoples allowing the oral culture and tradition itself to form an abeyance structure that nurtures and sustains resistance.

Memory is history. Indigenous histories are not written in judicial precedents and changing legislation, they are transmitted parent to child in story, song and teaching. They are lived in the cyclical manner inherent to Indigenous minds and thinking about time. These histories do not include Aristotle, Aquinas, Jesus or Julius Caesar. These histories include agreements made by colonial powers which are now remembered in legislation differently by those colonial inheritors. They are remembered the same by the Indigenous descendants.

All Indigenous peoples share this common approach to memory as history. They also share similar experiences with the faulty written memory of colonizers. They share the common cultural validation of memory as history and identity and the common invalidation of reality by the changing nature of linear legal and rational thought in the Western paradigm. Westerners change history regularly and, to an Indigenous thinker, whimsically.

The entire legal structure of Western society is in a constant state of flux. What was true yesterday is not true today. Laws change and when they do, history changes. Collective memory intrinsically resists the constant changes inherent in legal rational thinking. The changeable, convenient and flighty nature of Western thought is often remarked upon by Indigenous peoples. Lakota elder Charles Chipps (2010) says, as he shakes his head: “Yum lives in the minds of white people. That must be where he went.” Yum is the whirlwind, always moving and always carrying chaos and destruction in his pouch.

Survival is Essential

Given the previous discussions of common indelible elements of Indigenous worldview, philosophy and lifeways, the question of essentialism may arise. At this juncture, since the readers are well versed in the academic discourses surrounding essentialism and identity politics, it seems prudent to briefly discuss those concepts in light of the foregoing observations of Indigenous peoples. In her comprehensive theoretical treatise, *Essentially Speaking*, Diana Fuss (1989) contends that the constructionist/essentialist binary is artificial. Constructionists require some element of essentialism in order for their various theories and standpoints to work.

She carefully delineates the essentialist notions inherent in Derrida, Lacan, and feminist and African American constructionist theory. In analyzing Afro-American literary theory, she examines Fanon, Gates, Baker and Joyce. On Joyce Fuss notes, “Joyce holds the opinion that for Gates, Baker, or any other Afro-American critic to deconstruct race as a dominant conceptual category amounts to turning their backs on Afro-American culture, denying not merely their literary tradition but their very identity as black. The charge, then, is clear: to deconstruct race is to abdicate, negate or destroy black identity” (1989:27).

Acknowledging the risk of hegemonic appropriation, Fuss nevertheless deems it worth the risk:

I cannot help but think that the determining factor in deciding essentialism’s political or strategic value is dependent upon who practices it: in the hands of a hegemonic group, essentialism can be employed as a powerful tool of ideological domination. The question of the permissibility, if you will, of engaging in essentialism is therefore framed and determined by the subject-position from which one speaks (1989:32).

Most feminist theorists and virtually all social scientists in race theory react with particular vehemence to essentialist paradigms with good reason. The essentialist intellectual traditions, beginning with Aristotle and continuing through Enlightenment misogynists such as

Bacon, have been skillfully employed hand in hand with religious essentialism to justify and perpetuate the oppression of women (see Carol Christ for a detail of this process) and Indigenous peoples as noted above by Means. These essentialist conceptions became the tenets of a white racial frame and the structure of a systemic racism described in depth by critical race theorists such as Feagin (2006) in *Systemic Racism* and other works. Indigenous peoples certainly qualify in the categories Fuss (1989) sets aside for deploying essentialism. While I agree with her argument and its commentary on race and hegemonic dominance, I would like to extend the argument and speak specifically from the worldview of an Indigenous thinker.

I suggest that the discussions of essentialism with regard to Indigenous peoples fall into the category I outlined earlier of people who try to map Western jargon and concepts onto Indigenous thoughts and processes. Essentialism, as it pertains to Indigenous peoples, has two forms. The first is the imposed essentialism of white oppression which makes all Native peoples the same. It erases all that is unique and positive in the effort to erase identity, dignity and memory. This essentialist framing is the variety most often rebutted by race scholars and other social scientists.

Noted Anishinabek writer and scholar Gerald Vizenor (1989) points out that “Social science theories constrain tribal landscapes to institutional values, representationalism and the politics of academic determination” (5). As noted, the patriarchal roots of Western thought found essentialism necessary to the furtherance of Western dominance. The idea that time is divided and linear, for example, is an essentialist tenet which is not examined by Western thinkers. Essentialism which serves the dominance of Western thought is considered science or fact. Essential tenets making up the paradigms of other groups are denigrated as shallow or strategic rather than meaningful philosophy and theory. Again, colonization hegemonies dictate that

Western thought is preeminent and correct and all should be subsumed and assimilated into the essential tenets of that worldview.

Native peoples do not cooperate in that essentialist paradigm. They have their own worldview which predates Western colonization and survives to resist. It approaches essentialism as unique attributes that all beings possess. Each living thing has an essential essence that should be valued and honored. This uniqueness of all things and the dignity accorded all life is a fundamental tenet of Indigenous resistance.

In feminist circles, Luce Irigaray's (1977) writings are frequently heralded as essentialist. Irigaray's writing coincidentally is exceptionally applicable to the conditions and positions of Indigenous peoples. In *This Sex Which Is Not One*, Irigaray's (1977) description of woman could easily apply to Indigenous framing and philosophy:

How can I say it? That we are women from the start. That we don't have to be turned into women by them, labeled by them, made holy and profane by them. That has always already happened, without their efforts...their fatherland, family, home, discourse, imprison us in enclosed spaces where we cannot keep on moving, living, as ourselves. Their properties are our exile (212).

This passage is eerily reminiscent of the quotes from early Indigenous leaders confronted with colonization, the writings of modern Indigenous people and the statements of Indigenous people in interviews throughout this dissertation.

I would suggest in the case of Indigenous peoples that identity has not been developed in reaction. Rather it appears as reaction due to the overwhelming essentialist paradigm of Western thought and dominance. Indigenous identities, unlike the identities of other interest groups normally discussed in these essentialist discourses, precede the dominant and essentialist in their own right, Western identity tropes against which they are being compared. In order to consider Indigenous identities essentialist, in the negative sense of Western academia, you must first

subscribe to the theory that Western civilization with its end of history and devotion to linear modern progression is the natural order of things. It is rather a constructed and carefully buttressed identity cultivated over centuries. There is nothing natural about it.

On a level playing field not dominated by this construction masquerading as fact, it would be relatively easy to argue that Indigenous thinkers have a more valid claim to being in the natural order of things. Indigenous peoples would seem to qualify under the exemptions to or legitimization of essentialism made by Spivak (1987), Fuss (1989) and Irigaray (1977). Of course that only matters inside of an academic discourse; an Indigenous frame would be blithely unconcerned about where it falls on the artificial constructionist/essentialist continuum of Western theoretical discourse.

More importantly, Indigenous theories of being and behaving seem “essentialist” when cast inside an ongoing Western academic discourse. Viewed from the vantage point inside Indigenous culture and theory, there is no conflict regarding essential natures. These perspectives are not adopted for strategic value as suggested in feminist and African American resistance framing. They are not “adopted” at all; they are intrinsic to an Indigenous way of being. The essentialism criticized in academic works is not the essence of Indigenous resistance and theory. Critics may see essentialism, but they do so without an understanding of the relationality that makes objects, people and ideas unique and essential to the whole. Essentialism functions differently when placed in an Indigenous theoretical framework. The diversity of different creatures contributes to the internal coherence of Indigenous worlds. Each essential element makes the entirety possible, makes it whole.

While Indigenous people would not bother with the argument, they have many insights to proffer to the discourse. An Indigenous perspective sees essentialism as inherent without

problematizing the concept. Within the extended kinship to all living things is the understanding of the unique and special place held by each living being. A hawk is essentially itself and cannot be duplicated by any other creature. The hawk's ability to spot a rabbit from a half a mile in the air and plummet to capture it is the special gift of the hawk. To deny the essential nature of a hawk would be folly to an Indigenous thinker. The key here is that the hawk is a relative not an oppressed "other".

It is diversity rather than homogeneity which is prized by Indigenous thought. In his Black Hills Speech in 1980, Russell Means quotes an old Lakota maxim, "Honor your brother's vision." Fuss (1989) points out that "identity is inherently unstable" (104). Certainly within Western theoretical traditions this is a truism. However, Indigenous thinking, the product of centuries of oral tradition and collective memory would find this statement ridiculous. Identity is such a stable construct in Indigenous culture that 52 Indigenous delegates in a matter of days could craft a sweeping international program based on identity complete with a stirring resolution defining that identity. Identity is not unstable in an Indigenous world view. It is buttressed by core theoretical concepts and reinforcing lifeways practiced for millennia. This stable identity structure and with its oral traditions and collective memories serves as the blueprint for Indigenous movements in abeyance.

In an Indigenous thought world, essence is a foundational concept, not a strategic position. In much the same manner that time and history have no comparable meaning within Indigenous worldviews, essentialism and its ancillary identity debates has no commensurate translation. *Taku skanskan* is a Lakota phrase with a meaning close to essence. However, the Lakota concept of essence is as far from the theory debates in Western academia as are Indigenous concepts of time, history and kinship. *Skanskan* is a concept whose complexities and

nuances include the spirit of essence. Basically, it is a term denoting the force that exists and moves continuously through all things. Its etymological root *skan* is defined as dissolving as in the melting of snow. *Skanskan* indicates continuous, connected movement of life force energy. This energy serves to reinforce the Indigenous concept of boundaryless existence including the boundaries imposed by linear time and thought. Coupled with *taku* (meaning to speak with conviction), *skanskan* becomes a special designation of continuous moving energy expressed, usually vocally.

Taku Skanskan is essential to life, it is life. It does not inhabit only humans, nor do humans have a special form of it not enjoyed by others. It flows, continuously through and around all living things. *Skanskan* is essence. It is this essence that unites, not divides, all living things. When this essence is noticed or felt, the voicing of it is sacred; *taku skanskan* is giving voice to that which is the essence of life. In other words, the concepts Western thought would dismiss as essentialism, are inherent to the connectedness and collectivity of Indigenous peoples. As noted above, land itself has this essential character.

We Are All Related

This emphasis on communal relations and survival permeates Indigenous frames from literature to political action and manifests in the resistance efforts over generations. Cornell and Kalt (1988) note:

As one looks back on the increasingly activist Indian politics of the post-War years, what is striking is the persistent salience of goals which have little to do directly with the common American vision of success. Again and again three intimately related concerns emerge: tribal sovereignty, treaty rights, land. All have to do fundamentally with the maintenance and protection of peoplehood, of community... It has been a politics of national survival (4).

In his sensitive work *American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance*, Stromberg (2006) notes that American Indian rhetoric is “communitist.” He explains his use of the term survivance by

discussing it in contrast to survival, “While survival conjures images of a stark minimalist clinging to the edge of existence, survivance goes beyond mere survival to acknowledge the dynamic and creative nature of Indigenous rhetoric” (1). He quotes Kennedy’s *Comparative Rhetoric* “Rhetoric among the Indians, as in other traditional societies, was largely a conservative defensive force in transmitting and preserving the independence, way of life, and values of the culture” (7). And further notes in analysis, “This narrative, rehearsed in numerous representational texts from government policies to cinematic Westerns, has produced in the American social imagination an image of Indians as elements of our past – tragic, noble even, but no longer around” (7).

For centuries, Indigenous peoples have relied upon these “rhetorics of survivance.” In effect, survival is what is essential. Within these common theoretical frame components discussed in this research, Indigenous peoples also share the “repertoire of contention” that unequivocally places them in a condition of daily fight for survival. These frames are not simply efforts to collect adherents to a movement or a cause. They are the elements of survival. Indigenous people around the globe are not fighting for more rights or better living conditions or more respect and opportunity. They are in a desperate fight for survival that has been going on for hundreds of years. From this protracted struggle, joined with collective memory going back thousands of years and land that is consecrated with generations of blood, emerges the “identity” and sacred civics of Indigenous peoples and the collective alternative frame of the past, present and future. This frame emerges in resistance that is coherent over time and focuses on land, centers spirituality and features community and women in its organizing.

This alternative frame continues as Champagne (2007) notes to present a “not good fit” within Western discourse. It does, however, begin to explain the American Indian Movement’s

ability to introduce completely new “repertoires of contention” at the end of a “cycle of protest” in defiance of established social movement theory. It sheds light on the thorny position of Indigenous women who embrace an association with nature that presents such an untenable position for Western feminism to incorporate. It reveals why Indigenous discourse is so easily omitted from comparative racial discussions since it does not access the same lineages of civil rights and demands for admission to the hallowed spheres of Western hegemony. As Means (1980) says:

It is the role of American Indian peoples, the role of all natural beings, to survive. A part of our survival is to resist. We resist not to overthrow a government or to take political power, but because it is natural to resist extermination, to survive. We don't want power over white institutions; we want white institutions to disappear. That's revolution.

In observing, studying and writing about Indigenous peoples for centuries, Westerners have been hampered by the application of theories and concepts which find no connective tissue in Indigenous theory and practice. To understand and interact with Indigenous people, there must develop a consciousness of Indigenous theoretical discourse and its underpinnings to replace the current themes of dismissing the existence of Indigenous theory or imposing inapplicable theoretical constructs developed inside of Western traditions and values.

The following chapters will further elaborate the theoretical discourse and foundations of Indigenous thought and demonstrate how Indigenous people apply those paradigms consistently over time in the resistance to Western domination in its myriad forms. To the Western mind, these choices more often than not appear ill conceived or divorced from reality. As the interviews, archives and documents in the following chapters will illustrate, they are soundly conceived from an alternative world reality comprised of fundamentally divergent values, thought forms and traditions.

The initial chapters will allow Native voices to speak for themselves, with minimal analysis and comparison prior to focusing on the ways in which Indian resistance can be analyzed with Western academic theories of social movement discourse. The chapters will explore Indigenous land and identity, the role of spirituality in resistance, the focus on community in the resistance and the central roles of women in Native resistance efforts. Then, I will analyze that information using social movement concepts of framing, abeyance and spillover effects as well as some discussion of outcomes and how to measure them in a way that is commensurate with Indigenous worldviews.

CHAPTER IV

LAND IS IDENTITY

When we read non-Indigenous discussions of Indigenous relationship to the land it is clear that the relationship has been observed and noted as important. Sometimes the observers are awed, sometimes they ridicule. They sometimes speak in admiring terms and sometimes are dismissive. But, from initial contact to the present, it is accepted dogma that Indigenous people are connected to their lands in special ways. The contact literature is filled with discussion of this connection by Spanish, English and French early colonizers. What is never truly understood, then or now is the depth and strength of that connection. Nonnatives are not really equipped with the worldview or perspective to truly grasp the Native relationship to the land. In the previous chapter, I discussed the centrality of the land to Native people. In this chapter, I will allow them to speak of this and discuss the consistent trajectory of land as a primary theme in Indian resistance. Land and identity are synonymous in Indian Country.

A Dine activist I interviewed had this to say about land and identity. (Dine are called Navajo by colonizers but Dine is the name the people give themselves.)

When you ask me how the land influences my identity, I really don't know what you are asking. The land doesn't influence my identity, the land is my identity. For us, we are the land, the land is us. There's no separation. When the Mother is drilled and mined, we feel it in our souls (2010).

We will call this Dine activist and spiritual leader Aichaga. (It should be noted that this is a pseudonym from the executed Dakota 38 (Charles 2017) discussed in the Methods section, and is not a name that would ever be given to an actual Dine.)

Interviewee Cetan hunka (2009) (pseudonym) is a Lakota, but her sentiments echo the ones expressed by Aichaga (2010). "For us, fighting for the land is the same as fighting for the

people. Without the land, there are no *oyate* (Lakota word for the people). We must fight for the land or die with it” (Cetan hunka 2009).

When I interviewed Hopi farmer Oyate tonwan (pseudonym), he was expansive in discussing the concept of land and identity and the intense relationship between the two:

We belong to the Earth. She is our Mother, but she is also our blood and our bones. She is us, we are her. There is no thing that divides the Hopi from the earth. We are of the earth. This earth. No other earth is our earth, is us. If we were to be moved from this earth, it would be as if our blood were drained away and our will to live would flow out too. We would be no more. (2010)

In my field work, I spent a great deal of time trying to compare Indigenous identity and identification with the land to the identity themes of other marginalized groups. My search was futile. There are no true comparisons in other marginalized groups, at least in this country, for the way in which Native people identify with and relate to their homelands. A few of my younger activist participants made some comparison to the Palestinian situation as the closest thing to the circumstances of Indigenous peoples. Some even discuss Palestinians as Indigenous.

However, the AIM era activists do not draw these comparisons. For them, Jews are the most treasured allies. Jewish people stood with AIM from the start. The American Indian Movement was involved in more than 2,400 court cases as part of the FBI effort to divert resources and destroy the movement. The Minnesota Historical Society records indicate that the Wounded Knee Legal Defense Committee handled the majority of these cases and won 92.4% of them (Hennessey 1996). The Defense committee had 17 lawyers across the country. AIM activists recall that all of the lawyers who defended them were Jewish. I have not been able to verify that all were, but at least 13 of the 17 were. As a result, older Indian activists are staunch defenders of Jewish people and Jewish homelands. Their younger counterparts are more globalized in their view and look more favorably on Palestinian claims to land rights. This is one

of the few divergences in support between younger and older activists. It has not created any serious rifts across the generations, however.

Cetan hunka (2009), quoted above, is not a reservation Indian. She has lived in the city for over a decade. Yet, she returns to her reservation homeland multiple times a year. She teaches school and spends the entire summer and winter break at home on the reservation. She has not given up her land claim on the reservation. Doing that, according to her, would be like giving your lungs away. “I could not breathe if I gave away my place. I would smother from the city and the people and the lies. The land breathes for me. It gives me the breath of life to carry on” (2009).

When you listen to her talk, it is clear that this description is not metaphorical in the way that mainstream writers might create a metaphor to describe deep feeling. She is very clear that this is literally true for her. The land is her lungs. It breathes in the true world which allows her to exist and survive in the false world of the colonizers. Later in this chapter, we will hear accounts from over a century ago of Native peoples similarly equating illness and death with separation from the land.

Cetan hunka is the daughter of one of the AIM leaders from the 1970's. Her dream is to form and teach in an immersion school someday. She has participated in numerous resistance efforts over her life. Her current work is with the National Indigenous Women's Resource Center to try to track missing Native women and protect others from becoming statistics. Native women are assaulted and murdered at a rate five times the national average. Cetan hunka (2009) says, “These women are missing and gone because they are weakened by the things done to our land. When the Mother is bruised and battered and trampled, our bodies are also. These people crush the earth by day and the daughters of our nation by night. It is one and the same.” She refers to

the pipeline workers and other white groups who are responsible for 91% of the reported assaults on Native land.

These people cannot be prosecuted by tribal courts. The original jurisdiction is the FBI and they are not interested in prosecuting assaults on Native lands. The white workers are fully aware of these loopholes and often brag about it and sneer at their victims as they dump them in ditches or parking lots after assaults. “Woman after woman, they tell me of being mocked as they are assaulted. That is the ones who survive to tell, others are never heard from again. Sometimes the bodies are found. Often not. They are the visible reminder of how our Mother is being destroyed. They are the wound. White people destroy all that is life sustaining. The Mother, the mothers of the people, it’s the same destruction” (Cetan hunka 2009).

It is clear that the Indigenous connection to land is real and vital in ways that are not replicated for other groups. So, it is easy to see why land is a foundational principle in resistance efforts across time. I will track three resistance efforts to illustrate this connection: the Indian Wars and Ghost Dance resistance of the 1800s; AIM and the Red Power resistances of the 1960s and onward; the Water Protectors at Standing Rock in 2016 and onward.

Indian Wars

In a November 2007 personal interview, AIM leader Russell Means made it clear that there is no end period to the Indian Wars. “There was no ‘last battle’ of the Indian Wars. There will never be a last battle of the Indian Wars. There will be Indian Wars as long as there are Indians left to stand and say, I am an Indian and I have no need to become anything else. Until every Indian can say that freely and act upon it in the ways that are natural for us, until white people allow that truth to stand, there will be Indian Wars” (Means 2007)

Indian removal and the subsequent and concurrent Indian Wars actually encompass literal centuries, but this dissertation will largely examine the period in the 1800s up to the Ghost Dance movement in the late 1880s. The discussion of the early resistance will have two components: the statements and discussions of many different Native speakers during the encroachment, resistance and removal from their homelands and the information and statements concerning the Ghost Dance Movement.

The stories of removal and resistance, land theft and genocide are each unique and important. And, they are woven together by common threads. The story is repeated with different names on the graves and different leaders in the discussion. Always there are deaths, broken treaties, lies and manipulations, dislocation, more death and removal. Many of the Native voices predict that removal will result in death and many discuss the separation from the land as the disease which kills the people. They try to return to be healed and are killed or captured. In rare cases, some manage to stay or return in secret. The voices are often somewhat assimilated. Some use exclusively Native logic and analogy. Others use the logic and stated beliefs of the colonizer to make their point. Elizabeth Rich (2004) argues that this use of the colonizers language to make the case is a hallmark of AIM as well.

The distance between colonizers and Natives on beliefs surrounding land could not be greater. Discussing the history of relations between colonizers and Natives, Peter Nabokov (1978) elaborates on the gulf between the white view of land and the Indian relationship to land:

A major stumbling block between Indians and whites was their opposite attitudes toward the land. In the New World, whites cleared the forests and cultivated the ground, slaughtered wild game in massive quantities, mined the earth's gold and silver as if they would never end, and began peopling villages and towns blocked out after those in their homelands. Yet the Indians generally viewed themselves as the earth's occupiers and custodians, not as its surveyors and engineers. The colonists, whose society was founded on private ownership and consolidation of personal riches, looked disapprovingly at the Indian custom of sharing land in common (70).

Chippewa Alec Paul explains more specifically the Indian perspective in this regard. “So these families of hunters would never think of damaging the abundance or the source of supply of the game, because this had come to them from their father and grandfather and those behind them” (Speck 1915).

Nabokov (1978) further notes, “The Native American talent for accurate recollection of the wording of ancient treaties sometimes, however, stymied white negotiators who wished to reinterpret their content” (120). These treaties had perpetuity clauses that were themselves expressed in terms of the land itself. “For as long as the grass shall grow and the rivers run” (Nabokov 1978). The land is permanent and preeminent in Native consciousness. It is the source of life, the tablet of history, the site of creation and spiritual practice. Over and over Indian people reiterated the words of Osceola, the Seminole leader, who fought so hard and hid so effectively that he was able to die of old age in his homeland. He claimed that no man owned any part of the earth and a man could not sell what he did not own (Nabokov 1978).

Chief Joseph of the Nez Perce stated it eloquently:

I did not want to come to this council but I came hoping that we could save blood. The white man has no right to come here and take our country. We have never accepted any presents from the Government. Neither Lawyer nor any other chief had authority to sell this land. It has always belonged to my people. It came unclouded to them from our fathers, and we will defend this land as long as a drop of Indian blood warms the hearts of our men (Joseph 1876).

When told he must move to the reservation, he further elaborated:

I will not. I do not need your help; we have plenty and we are contented and happy if the white man will let us alone. The reservation is too small for so many people with all their stock. We are free now; we can go where we please. Our fathers were born here. Here they lived, here they died, here are their graves. We will never leave them (Joseph 1876).

While Chief Joseph and Osceola were able to live and die on their lands, most were not so fortunate. The Cherokee nation, unlike the Nez Perce, took the colonizer at his word and set

up white like systems, structures, schools and communities. They were the original “model minority.” Their efforts were rewarded with betrayal.

As the colonizers in Georgia continued to encroach on Cherokee lands in the early 1800s, the nation called upon the federal government to honor its treaties and prevent the encroachments. These entreaties were ignored and later much worse. The Cherokee Nation had a regular newspaper, *Cherokee Phoenix*. In September 1929, the editor, Elias Boudinot, took the government to task for violating its own laws and failing to protect the land. “We were in hopes the executive of the United States would respect the laws entrusted to their administration, although they may be inclined to question many of our rights. One right, however, the United States cannot possibly deny us—the right of calling on her to execute her own laws” (Hudson 2006). However, they did indeed deny that right and in 1830 passed the Removal Act at the urging of President Andrew Jackson. Boudinot had more to say then. “They have decided that they will not be governed by these solemn instruments, made and ratified by their advice and consent. They have followed the heels of the President, and deliberately laid aside their treaties. When it comes to this we have indeed fallen upon evil times” (Hudson 2006:117-118).

Even though the Cherokee successfully appealed this law in the Supreme Court, which struck down the law in total on the basis of the treaty language, they were removed. *Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia* (1831) prohibited removal and encroachment. *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832) further confirmed the Cherokee rights to their land in defiance of Georgia state claims and encroachments and enjoined the federal government to act to assure these rights. President Jackson then made his famous declaration: “Well: John Marshall has made his decision: now let him enforce it!” (Greeley 2006). This case remains the only Supreme Court ruling to be annulled by the Executive Branch.

Removal of the Cherokee from their lands, which had been granted in perpetuity by ratified treaty, commenced. On the Trail of Tears, the Cherokee lost between 25 percent and two thirds of their people, depending on whose numbers are given credence. Hudson (2006) points out what the Water Protectors at Standing Rock would rediscover almost 200 years later. “The desire for Cherokee land outweighed both the promises of the treaties and the solemn honor of the Constitution. The Removal Act epitomizes the conflict of national interest with national honor” (58). In a conflict between national interest and national honor, Native nations are living witness that national honor loses every time.

Before the Cherokee were removed in 1836, the Choctaw had preceded them in 1831. But they only left after the white man tried more than 40 times between 1800 and 1831 to force the Choctaw to sell their land. My grandfather told the story of Choctaw removal from the ancient homeland in Laurel, Mississippi. I was surprised to see a version of it repeated in academic sources such as Nabokov (1978:151).

This is a summary of the story as my grandfather told it: The people were all packed and gathered to leave on the hundreds of miles of forced march. They were under provisioned and with many barefoot. Many, many of them would never see the final destination. The women broke away with tears in their eyes and pain in their hearts. The women walked in procession, all together with the grandmothers leading them through their beloved forest. They dropped their tears on the roots of the elm and petted the leaves of the oak in mournful farewell. They said farewell to the friends of their lives and the spaces of their ancestors. Gently, they entreated each tree relative to remember them and to care for their dead. And then they walked to death themselves on the long march.

In 1834, the Chickasaw followed the Choctaw on the Trail of Tears. But prior to that, Chickasaw spokesman Levi Colbert (1826) discussed the Chickasaw love of their land and its importance to their health. Like prior Indian speakers, Colbert echoes the idea that they had no ownership to exercise in exchanging land for other land west of the Mississippi:

We never had a thought of exchanging our land for any other. If we should exchange our lands for any other, fearing the consequences may be similar to transplanting an old tree, which would wither and die away, and we are fearful we would do the same... We have no lands to exchange for any other... If we should consent, [to move west] we should be likened unto young corn growing and met with a drought that would kill it (American State Papers, Indian Affairs 1826).

Oglala Lakota writer Luther Standing Bear (1928) discusses the individual relationship to the land and its importance to health. “The old people came literally to love the soil. They sat on the ground with the feeling of being close to a mothering power. It was good for the skin to touch the earth, and the old people liked to remove their moccasins and walk with their bare feet on the sacred earth. The soil was soothing, strengthening, cleansing and healing” (26).

In 1877, the Ponca were driven from their homes and forced on a 500 mile march. More than one third of them died on the way and many others were permanently disabled. Standing Bear (1928) defied edict against leaving the reservation to take his dead son’s bones back to be buried in traditional Ponca burial grounds in Nebraska. While there, he told his story to the newspaper and to the church group in Omaha and gained a national audience for their plight. A Senate investigating committee confirmed the truth of his story and the Ponca were given some compensation for their confiscated property and allowed to return to Nebraska (Nabokov 1978)

Standing Bear echoes the sentiments expressed in the paragraphs above by the Five Civilized Tribes 40 years earlier. He finishes his long story of negotiation and dismissal by government sources by telling of the forced removal:

They took our reapers, mowers, hay rakes, spades, ploughs, bedsteads, stoves, cupboards everything we had on our farms, and put them in one large building. Then they put into wagons such things as they could carry. We told them we would rather die than leave our lands; but we could not help ourselves. They took us down. Many died on the road. Two of my children died. After we reached the new land, all my horses died. The water was very bad. All our cattle died; not one was left. I stayed till one hundred and fifty-eight of my people had died. Then I ran away with thirty of my people, men and women and children. Some of the children were orphans. We were three months on the road. We were weak and sick and starved. When we reached the Omaha Reserve, the Omahas gave us a piece of land. While we were working, the soldiers came and arrested us. Half of us were sick and would rather have died than been carried back; but we could not help ourselves (Jackson 1893:24).

The Hopi are an Indigenous group which has never actually had a treaty with the United States. The surrounding pueblos had 17th century land grant agreements with the Spanish. But, the Hopi, having never been conquered, have no agreement. When Pueblo land was acquired by the United States, those land grant agreements were supposed to be honored. They were no more honored than the more than 370 negotiated treaties which were abrogated repeatedly by the United States. Many Pueblo nations had reservations with the general outline of their prior grants. The Hopi see themselves as caring for the earth so that it will survive. They take their responsibility and relationship with the land very much to heart. Hopi elder Dan Katchongva (1957) testified before Congress in 1955 when he was well in his 80s. Katchongva (1957) recounted the Hopi prophecy regarding land and the White man.

We knew that this land beneath us was composed of many things that we might want to use later such as mineral resources. We knew that this is the wealthiest part of this continent, because it is here the Great Spirit lives. We knew that the White Man will search for the things that look good to him, that he will use many good ideas in order to obtain his heart's desire, and we knew that if he had strayed from the Great Spirit he would use any means to get what he wants. These things we were warned to watch, and we today know that those prophecies were true because we can see how many new and selfish ideas and plans are being put before us. We know that if we accept these things we will lose our land and give up our very lives (10).

Notice that Katchongva continues the reverence for the land and also equates the loss of the land as tantamount to giving up life. He echoes the sentiments in my interview above with current Hopi farmer Oyate tonwan.

CHAPTER V

SPIRITUALITY AND COMMUNITY AS CENTRAL TO RESISTANCE

As the West was stolen and the nations were incarcerated on reservations, hope was a priceless thing. In February 1890, in an effort to further disturb community loyalties and ties as well as satisfy white greed for land, the Great Sioux reservation that covered most of South Dakota was broken up into five smaller reserves. Much of the land was allocated to white colonizers and the Indians were given plots of land to farm. Schools taught English, Lakota speaking was punished. Ceremonies and cultural practices were discouraged. Rations were cut to one-third. The drought, inhospitable farm land and lack of farming knowledge doomed the Indians to failure and near starvation. In this atmosphere of death, deprivation and despair, the Ghost Dance Movement found fertile ground.

The Ghost Dance Movement began with Northern Paiute prophet Wovoka in Nevada, but it spread across Native peoples all through the West from Oklahoma to California and all points in between. The Dance and its practices were adapted by various Indian nations to incorporate their beliefs and practices as well as their current resistance efforts. The Ghost Dance, properly performed, would unite Native peoples in harmony, bring back the ancestral spirits to fight with them, drive the white colonizers from the land and bring peace (Kehoe 1989).

Some incarnations of the Ghost Dance movement, the Plains groups of Lakota, Cheyenne and Arapahoe in particular, saw it as a military prophecy and movement. It included special spiritually enhanced clothing, which made the wearer bullet proof and strong. These Ghost Dance shirts have been handed down from generation to generation and form a part of the sacred bundle of many medicine families. Several of my respondents allowed me to view or participate

in ceremony with their sacred shirts. More than one AIM leader referenced that these ceremonies with Ghost Dance shirts were performed to guide and support resistance activities.

On the Standing Rock reserve, the dance was particularly popular as was its leader Kicking Bear. “The people turned to the Ghost Dance ritual, which frightened the supervising agents of the BIA. Those who had been in the area for a long time figured out that the ritual was often held shortly before battle was to occur. Kicking Bear was forced to leave Standing Rock, but when the dances continued unabated, the Indian agent James McLoughlin asked for more troops” (Kehoe 1989:15). Thousands of additional army troops were deployed to the reservations. The agency came to believe it was actually Sitting Bull who was the leader and moved to have him arrested on December 15, 1890. During the arrest, Sitting Bull was killed. This had the effect of driving other related Indians to flee the reservation and seek solace in ceremony, including the Ghost Dance.

The Ghost Dance movement incorporated the critical elements of life for Native Peoples: return of the land and harmonious living, spiritual reunion with their dead ancestors, vision ceremony to escape the misery of daily existence and, for some, the power to drive the white man away. In Nabokov (1978) an anonymous Pine Ridge Dakota describes the ceremony:

The leaders beat time and sang as the people danced, going round to the left and sidewise in step. They danced without rest, on and on, and they got out of breath but still they kept going as long as possible. Occasionally someone fell unconscious and lay there in vision.... The visions varied at the start, but they ended the same way, like a chorus describing a great encampment of all the Dakotas who had ever died, where all were related and therefore understood each other, where the buffalo came eagerly to feed them, and there was no sorrow but only joy, where relatives thronged out with happy laughter to greet the newcomer. Waking to the drab and wretched present after such a glowing vision, it was little wonder that they wailed as if their poor hearts break in two with disillusionment. The people went on and on and could not stop. They preferred that to rest or sleep or food. And so I suppose the authorities did think they were crazy—but they weren't. They were only terribly unhappy (255).

Lakota John Fire/Lame Deer (Erdoes 1972) elaborates on the expected outcomes for the Plains participants.

They told the people they could dance a new world into being. There would be landslides, earthquakes, and big winds. Hills would pile up on each other. The earth would roll up like a carpet with all the white man's ugly things – the stinking new animals, sheep and pigs, the fences, the telegraph poles, the mines and factories. Underneath would be the wonderful old-new world as it had been before the white fat-takers came. ...The white men will be rolled up, disappear, go back to their own continent (Fire and Erdoes 1972:228).

As noted above, the white response both officially and throughout the populace was fear and violent repression efforts. Reaction to this movement was the catalyst that brought about the slaughter of 300 unarmed men, women and children by the seventh Cavalry at Wounded Knee, South Dakota on December 29, 1890. Bigfoot and his followers had left the reservation after the murder of Sitting Bull. Even after being captured and held at Wounded Knee, they were attempting to perform a Ghost Dance ceremony. Chiefs and medicine people across the reservations in Indian Country were rounded up and incarcerated to keep them from inspiring or inflaming their followers with the Ghost Dance. A hundred years later, the FBI would reprise this incarceration strategy to divide AIM leadership from the followers and the movement. The FBI made the decision to prosecute every possible case in court regardless of its chances for success. This lock up strategy to remove the leaders from the people and divert the attention from organizing to defense of life and limb was an exact replica of the response to the Ghost Dance a hundred years before (Stern 1994).

While ceremonies and cultural practices had been discouraged previously, in 1892, Congress moved decisively to crush Indian culture and religion. Under the new law, Indians who practiced or sanctioned Indian beliefs, performed religious dances or participated in any Indian religious ceremonies were to be imprisoned. Over time, the interpretation of this law became

more and more barbaric and far reaching. Men were forced to cut their hair, feasts were outlawed, feathers, sacred pipes and other ceremonial and cultural items were confiscated and desecrated. In Indian Country, the public practice of the Ghost Dance was discontinued in fear of death as meted out at Wounded Knee. But, the ceremony as well as others continued in secret. And, the Caddo still practice it today. This movement and its goals are echoed faithfully in future resistance efforts.

For a century, the ceremonies were practiced in relative secret but they were practiced. By driving the sacred underground, the government had actually assured the survival of resistance as a central cultural tenet. If you must resist to pray, then resistance is vital. These Ghost Dance principles of community, harmony and protection of the sacred and the land are nurtured in the cultural practices of Indian Country and then, like the first leaves on the choke cherry in South Dakota, they come back to life and sight in the American Indian movement a century later.

Spirituality in AIM and Standing Rock

The Ghost Dance as a spiritual ceremony, which heals the land, combines the most vital pieces of any Indian resistance frame. It is not surprising that it was so popular or that it has survived the intervening time. I contend, as do most of my research participants that the AIM resistance and the Water Protectors efforts are a continuous resistance movement formulated through the same cultural lens and structures. Mary CrowDog (1990) writes in *Lakota Woman* of the Ghost Dance being done during the occupation of Wounded Knee in 1973 to honor the ancestors killed on that spot and to seek guidance from both them and the spirits of the land.

The Ghost Dance and its message and lessons were very present for the AIM members I interviewed. According to Ponca Indian Carter Camp (2007), the Sergeant at Arms for AIM at

the Wounded Knee occupation, “The Ghost Dance is remembered. Now as then, it reminds us that our spirits are never far from us, they are a part of us, guiding us in our struggle. They are in the land and in us. The Ghost Dance was just a way of saying what we had already known. What we already were and are. Warriors and healers for our ancestors and our children. Before and after death.”

Leonard CrowDog (2011), spiritual leader of the AIM movement, still performs the Ghost Dance ceremony at CrowDog’s Paradise on the Rosebud Reserve in South Dakota. He has authorized it to be done at the Sundance land of my spiritual community in Texas. He suggested to me during our discussions of the Ghost Dance that this is the ceremony needed to bring peace to the Middle East.

Wakinyan na (2010) (pseudonym) also speaks of the Ghost Dance:

When we went back to Wounded Knee, the Ghost Dance came alive again. We knew it would. We knew our ancestors would come to guide us, counsel us and fight with us. Just as they did before. They are never far from us. Ceremony lets them help us and help the land which helps us be whole.

She is an AIM activist who was present at Wounded Knee and the occupation of the BIA offices in Washington as well as many other AIM actions. She is Cheyenne. She tells me that her Grandmother talked of her mother being a part of the Ghost Dance as a young girl.

In an oral tradition, the old stories are much present, as are the knowledge of the treaties and the atrocities committed to abrogate them. When we talked about Alcatraz and the Trail of Broken Treaties action that ended with occupation of the BIA, she makes note that these old history lessons are teachings all Indians know.

White people are funny, they just wipe out history. Like it never was. They don’t know it. How do you know who you are if you don’t know your history? They don’t know themselves. We know ourselves. We know them too. We know what they said even when they choose forgetting. We know. That’s what we used in the AIM movement. We used our history and theirs to talk about today. Today is today because of what yesterday was.

We know how we got here. The spirits remember and they remind us when we forget (Wakinyan na 2010).

The collective memory of Indian Country and the parallel oral tradition that keeps memory tied to feelings and actions, make the frames of resistance – land, spirituality and community—readily available as tools for mobilization.

Just as the Ghost Dance movement grew from a vision and spiritual principle and practice, AIM resistance also was spiritually focused as was the action of Water Protectors in Standing Rock. Bridgett Kills Straight (Oglala Lakota) points out, “AIM is first, a spiritual movement, a religious re-birth, and then the rebirth of dignity and pride in a people. The American Indian Movement is attempting to connect the realities of the past with the promise of tomorrow” (American Indian Movement Interpretive Center 2015).

On one of the official AIM websites is the following History of AIM:

The movement was founded to turn the attention of Indian people toward a renewal of spirituality which would impart the strength of resolve needed to reverse the ruinous policies of the United States, Canada, and other colonialist governments of Central and South America. At the heart of AIM are deep spirituality and a belief in the connectedness of all Indian people. AIM policies have consistently been made in consultation with spiritual leaders and elders (Wittstock and Salinas 2015).

On the opening page of the site, which is one of the official sites for the Water Protectors, this is written, “In honor of our future generations, we fight this pipeline to protect our water, our sacred places, and all living beings” (Standing Rock Sioux Tribe 2016). Dallas Goldtooth, organizer Indigenous Environmental Network and Standing Rock Water Protector, puts it simply, “This land is everything to us” (Elbein 2017). Brule Lakota activist Lewis Grassrope brings out the interconnectedness of the resistance to spirituality and the land. “Grassrope saw the camps at Standing Rock as the seed of a new Native American nation built on neo-traditional lines and fueled by spiritual revival. ‘What needs to be accomplished hasn't been,’ he said. ‘We

need to stop the pipeline completely, and we need to rebuild our nation and re-establish our ancestral ways” (Elbein 2017).

Ladonna Brave Bull Allard (2016) is one of the founders of the Water Protectors at Standing Rock. Her land is the home of the Sacred Stone Camp, one of the several campsites of Water Protectors resisting the pipeline. Brave Bull Allard’s (2016) discussion of the pipeline begins in the past and ends in the spiritual:

On this day, 153 years ago, my great-great-grandmother Nape Hote Win (Mary Big Moccasin) survived the bloodiest conflict between the Sioux Nations and the U.S. Army ever on North Dakota soil. An estimated 300 to 400 of our people were killed in the Inyan Ska (Whitestone) Massacre, far more than at Wounded Knee. But very few know the story. As we struggle for our lives today against the Dakota Access pipeline, I remember her. We cannot forget our stories of survival... We must remember we are part of a larger story. We are still here. We are still fighting for our lives, 153 years after my great-great-grandmother Mary watched as our people were senselessly murdered... We are the river, and the river is us. We have no choice but to stand up.

Once again, we are reminded that for Native people, the past is present, always. The nature of oral tradition and collective memory keep the long history of massacre, murder and genocide fresh on the minds of each successive generation.

As noted in the previous quotes from early Native peoples, spirituality is intrinsically tied to attitudes about the natural world for Indian people. In modern Western constructs, religion exists separate from family, community and politics. In an Indigenous worldview, religion and religious practice are not simply components of life; they comprise the central theme of life from which everything else follows and to which everything in life is connected. It is virtually impossible to speak of Indigenous culture as separate from Indigenous religious expression. Religious expression is the cloth from which culture is woven for Indigenous peoples. It is also the wheel upon which resistance is spun into cloth.

Furthermore, Indigenous peoples enjoy a constant personal awareness of their relationship with the divine and the presence of the divine in all things. The body specifically represents a manifestation of divinity in a way much more concrete and immediate than Western cultural ideologies propose. As AIM activist and current Water Protector Arapahoe Maka te najin (2017) (pseudonym) says:

My body is my spiritual space. It is all that is mine, everything else is already belonging to Creator. All that's mine is the body I walk in. My walk is my spiritual practice, my resistance is my spiritual practice, my body is my sacrifice to spirit and to the movement. It's all the same. Life is ceremony. Resistance is ceremony.

The Sundance, perhaps the most revered of Plains Indian ceremonies, has this principle of the body as a sacred sacrifice. The interwoven nature of life and ceremony and the physical embodiment in ceremony is captured in the title of the book by AIM political prisoner Leonard Peltier (1999) who has served almost 40 years for a crime even the judge who sentenced him no longer believes he committed. His book is titled *Prison Writings: My Life is My Sundance*. This concept of life as ceremony and resistance as spiritual is endemic to all of the people I interviewed and further to the Native peoples I have spent my life around.

Just as Indian resistance is fundamentally about the land, it is intrinsically centered in the spiritual. While the Ghost Dance was overtly a spiritual ceremony, the spiritual underpinnings of all early resistance efforts are obvious in the comments of the Natives who were there. One of the reasons land is so precious is that it is sacred in very personal and specific ways. When you walk in the Native homelands with an Indian, the casual conversation is of the spiritual in the world around.

As I walked with Charles Chipps (2010), descendant of Woptura who was the Medicine Man of Crazy Horse, he pointed to the large white stone across the field:

That stone was the stone that Woptura had his vision for the medicine to give Crazy Horse. It [the stone] came from the Butte [nearby Eagle Nest Butte, a sacred place of ceremony] on a bolt of lightning. It is from this stone that he fashioned the invisibility medicine stone for Crazy Horse. The stone showed him the way and the wind sang the song.

He then began to sing the song that the wind sang to create the medicine for Crazy Horse to win his battles long ago. This is the immediate presence of nature, spirituality and lived history in Indian Country.

This scene was repeated over and over as I traveled through reservations from New Mexico to New York. The spiritual is the essence of the forces of resistance. This was true for Crazy Horse and it is still true for Ladonna Brave Bull Allard (2016). This interwoven and resistance ready nature of Native spirituality is a fundamental reason for the white war on Native religion. Indians must be Christianized lest they continue to find strength in the spiritual all around them and turn that strength into further resistance. As John Trudell says, “With religion, we disappear into their heavens and hells” (Ratcliffe 2016).

Early in the contact with whites, Iroquois leader Red Jacket expressed dismay at the nature of white religious worship since it was so different from Native experience. In almost all Native nations there is some version of the Lakota idea to “Honor your brother’s vision.” This means that you grant validity and respect for the power and belief of another in their vision even if it is incomprehensible to you. But Red Jacket (1845) was confused by the constant quarrels among white religious leaders

Brother! You say there is but one way to worship and serve the Great Spirit. If there is but one religion, why do you white people differ so much about it? Why do not all agree, as you can all read the book?...Our way teaches us to be thankful for all the favors we receive, to love each other, and to be united (58).

This principle of honoring your brother's vision and not quarreling about spiritual vision, enables the spiritual to be a unifying force for Indian resistance without being a source of contention.

The resistance movements of early contact, the (early) Indian Wars and Removal, were all conceived and carried out with spiritual principles. The Medicine People were often the leaders. The war parties were given spiritual tokens and special ceremonies for success. All resistance was spiritual resistance. AIM continues this tradition of placing spiritual principles at the center of the resistance. The original AIM leaders made a special pilgrimage to Pine Ridge to meet with a group of elderly Medicine Men before joining the Alcatraz resistance. Ceremonies were done daily and often multiple times daily during the occupation of both Alcatraz and Wounded Knee. The rally and takeover of Mount Rushmore was conceived in ceremony. AIM leaders stopped at CrowDog's Paradise to see Medicine Man CrowDog before going on to take over Rushmore and demand it be returned based on the Fort Laramie Treaty provisions.

The Black Hills were illegally seized. The Supreme Court has ruled that to be a fact. The United States government has offered a sum which has now escalated to hundreds of millions of dollars as payment with interest from the time of confiscation. But, the Lakota have refused. They want the return of the sacred Paha Sapa, Black Hills. There is no amount of money to compensate for sacred land. Russell Means writes in his book of the special altar that CrowDog gave them and credits it with keeping them from dying when the National Guard showed up to arrest them. And also credits spirit with ensuring that the trials never actually happen through a series of unlikely events.

AIM activists remain convinced that their resistance was and is a spiritual journey, a guided life vision. Wakinyan Na (2010) says:

We should have all died at Wounded Knee just like Bigfoot and his people. The FBI's had so much firepower, so much. We had a few old rifles. But, we had Spirit. We had our ancestors, we had the ceremony. Ceremony saved us. CrowDog was the most important man at Wounded Knee. He kept us right with Spirit.

CrowDog (2011) is more humble in his recitation:

We stayed with Spirit always. We filled the cannupa, we prayed in the lodges, we made prayer ties. We prayed. And, we listened. We listened carefully to the voices in the wind. To our ancestors. To the Spirit. Carter told me he could see the bullets like shining lights because the lightning spirits lit them up for him. He would warn the others. The spirit showed us what we needed.

One of the Indigenous foot soldiers, Comes With Thunder (2011) (pseudonym), verifies that Carter Camp could see the bullets as shining lights. He says it saved his life. When I ask Carter Camp (2011), he demurs. All he will say is, "I did my best to hear and see the spirit messages wherever they came. I am a soldier not a medicine man. CrowDog talks to the Spirits. I just listen to them. And listening to them has saved my skin more than once."

In their studies of social movements, scholars Nepstad and Smith (2001) connect identities conjoined with spiritual values and beliefs with moral outrage and deep commitments to sustained, and risky, collective behavior. This theory is certainly evident in observing the actions of both AIM and the Water Protectors, and certainly the thousands of early Indians who died with colonization. A young Shawnee Ho tan inku (2017) (pseudonym), that I interviewed who was pepper sprayed and shot at in Standing Rock claimed to be quoting the great early Shawnee leader Tecumseh when he said, "So live your life that the fear of death can never enter your heart. Seek to make your life long in service to your people." Comes With Thunder (2011) says much the same as Tecumseh, "Dying is inevitable. Live for something and you will die for something. We all thought we would die in Alcatraz, in Wounded Knee, we lived. As long as we live we will pray and we will resist." "If I die, I will die with a prayer for my people in my heart and a song of the Spirit in my ear" (CrowDog 2012). Wakinyan Na (2010) says, "We were

prepared to die. We have been dying since we were born. If we die, we die. If the land dies, so does the future. We live to make the future and remember the past.”

The Lakota have a saying that was voiced by warriors preparing to fight, “Hoka He!” It means it is a good day to die. But as explained by Oglala Charles Chipps (2010), it is a deeper statement. “If it is a good day to die, it is most definitely a good day to live. We live before we die. Every day is Hoke He. And we live. We live as we do because we are knowing that we will die.” Hoka He could be heard all around AIM actions and is heard repeatedly at Standing Rock. A good day to die is a good day to live. The reasons for that are likely in the spiritual worldview of Native people.

Victoria Chipps (2009), an Oglala elder, was trained by the great Medicine Man Hornchips in ceremony. Hornchips was the son of Woptura who was the Medicine Man to Crazy Horse. Chipps (2009) describes this spiritual nature and lack of fear in dying,

So, if we die when we were praying, or in the Sundance or in our walks to pick medicine, what will happen to us? Where will we go? [She pauses as if she expects me to know the answer. I do not supply one though I suspect what she will say next.] We go nowhere. Nowhere. We are here. Ellis [her dead husband] was in my dream last night. Hornchips reminded me where to get the choke cherries this morning. The spirits of the land stay with the land. They are here just like we are here. And, when we do ceremony we can talk to them, like we talk to each other. So, we die. So. We change. So, no, dying does not stop living.

For Native people, the sure and certain knowledge of becoming a spirit and the helpful and interactive nature of the spirit world makes dying less fearsome, at least in theoretical terms. The connected nature of land, spirit and community makes the sacrifice of life for the greater good a common tenet of personal life.

In writing this research, there has been a consistent challenge to balance giving enough history to make the meaning comprehensible without giving so much history that the meaning is buried. In that challenge, I came to understand the difficulty of AIM leaders and Native elders in

answering what seemed to me to be straightforward inquiries. Often I would ask a question such as, do you think that the way you look at spirituality influences the way you practice your activism? Or, I might ask, tell me how spiritual principles influenced the activists in the AIM resistance? These questions were frequently met with puzzled looks. Perhaps, like asking an academic how research impacted their writing. Sometimes, I would get lengthy lessons in history and spirituality and being Indian. I have dozens of hours of such lessons from the Chipps family and CrowDog. Choosing which part actually answers the question is always a challenge and I am never sure it is a challenge well-met.

The following is a much abbreviated and abridged discussion with CrowDog and another AIM leader, which covered several days during a ceremony in 2016. It picked up and left off as if no time had passed. And, it assumed a great deal of familiarity with the people and events in question so it is annotated with many brackets. CD is used to indicate CrowDog and FS (for foot soldier because that is how he wished to be designated. He was in fact a fairly well placed and influential leader in the movement and has continued his activism at Standing Rock.)

CD: So you ask how much the things that happened to our ancestors were important for us in the AIM movement before [before is his way of referring to the past which most scholars think of as the time of AIM. For CrowDog and other activists, AIM is not the past, it is still present.] How do I say this...what happened to them happened to us. We know it. It is in us.

FS: You could call it a knowing in our DNA.

Me: John Trudell talks about the knowledge and connection to earth and sky in our DNA. Is that what you mean?

FS: Trudell was always good with words. He was our voice at Alcatraz. Every night on the radio. Telling our story. Telling about what you call the past and making it present for people across the country. Radio Free Alcatraz. His is a powerful voice. It came at a cost: his wife and child. [The night after Trudell participated in a well-publicized protest outside the FBI building in February, 1979. His pregnant wife and three children were burned alive in a very suspicious fire. AIM leaders all believe and have amassed some credible evidence that this was an FBI action.] The FBI murdered his kids and Tina. They thought they would silence him. They did, for a while. But they can't silence us. The

spirit asks us to speak and to sacrifice so that the people and the earth will live. We do this the same way our ancestors did this. Crazy Horse, Sitting Bull, Tecumseh. [Note, each of these names was accompanied by a lengthy discussion of what each did and said and how they resisted and were treated by white people and institutions.] They listened to the same spirits we listen to. They said what we say because we're all saying what the earth needs saying. Now, at Standing Rock, the spirit speaks again. With new voices, and some old voices. But the same words. The message does not change. It is the same. It is the spirit.

CD: These ceremonies we do here, now, today. They are the same ceremonies that were done by Woptura before the Battle of Greasy Grass [Indian term for what whites call the Battle of Little Big Horn]. They are the same ceremonies we did at Wounded Knee, the same altar at Rushmore. This is the altar we have used for generations. The same as all our efforts before. They are the same ceremonies that are happening at Standing Rock.

FS: The spirits don't change. The message doesn't change. The altar doesn't change. We say today what Crazy Horse did then. We listen to CrowDog, he listened to Woptura. They did a Ghost Dance and the Sundance, we do a Sundance, and, sometimes a Ghost Dance. We did the Ghost Dance at Wounded Knee. And, at Alcatraz. We smoked the cannupa and prayed. Today they do this at Standing Rock. Many dancers are there. Many AIM peoples are there. Many new peoples have come. But they all still have the same voice. Because it is the voice of spirit.

CD: The treaties haven't changed either. They still say the same thing. The only thing that changes in any of this is the white man and his writing and his talking. He changes. We don't. It is easy for us to remember what we say, because we say the same truth. He has to keep checking his notes to make sure he's telling today's lie. Because today the lie is different than the lie before. But the purpose is the same, to steal our land and make us disappear. But we are still here. And now we are at Standing Rock again. Sitting Bull died at the Standing Rock reserve because they were afraid of him and the Ghost Dance. The FBI's killed Frank Clearwater at Wounded Knee, just like they had killed Bigfoot before. But Pedro [his son] was born at Wounded Knee too. The spirit sends what we need, who we need. There are new voices, but the message is the same. And the enemy is the same. The greed and spiritual nothingness of white people is the same. It was gold and the Black Hills then. It's oil and Standing Rock now. It's the same to us and to them. But, we remember while they pretend to forget (Foot Soldier 2016).

There is so much going on in this exchange. It is embedded in a cultural matrix that takes for granted an understanding of things like Greasy Grass and the importance of the legendary medicine that Woptura made for Crazy Horse. It was said to be what made him invisible to bullets and protected him. They talk about the words and deeds and frames of Indians a hundred years or more in the past. And they are clear that the same message, same spirit, same enemy,

same struggle is happening today. They see themselves as the inheritors of these struggles and these responsibilities to protect the land, keep the sacred and build the community. They speak of the Ghost Dance as if it happened a few months ago, not a century ago. This discussion is a clear road map of a consistently framed movement in abeyance.

As a part of this conversation, CrowDog talked about going to Standing Rock. He prayed in lodges about it. To a person, the 50 plus people at this ceremony urged him not to go. It was cold, the weather was bad, and he was very ill and in a wheel chair. He continued to insist that he was being told to go. We were all concerned that he would get hurt. At the same time, though we did not know it because we were in ceremony, military veterans across the country were mobilizing to go support at Standing Rock. CrowDog left us and as he said he would- in wheel chair, failing health and all- he went to Standing Rock. On December 5, 2016, about 500 of those veterans, led by the son of General Wesley Clark, came to CrowDog, Arvol Looking Horse and elder Phyllis Young to offer an apology for the damage done by the United States military in Indian Country. Wesley Clark, Jr. spoke for the group:

Many of us, me particularly, are from the units that have hurt you over the many years. We came. We fought you. We took your land. We signed treaties that we broke. We stole minerals from your sacred hills. We blasted the faces of our presidents onto your sacred mountain. When we took still more land and then we took your children and then we tried to eliminate your language that God gave you, and the Creator gave you. We didn't respect you, we polluted your Earth, we've hurt you in so many ways but we've come to say that we are sorry. We are at your service and we beg for your forgiveness (May 2016).

The veterans got into formation by rank and knelt before the elders asking for forgiveness. As we watched live-feeds, those of us who had been in Texas with him, shook our heads in awe. That YouTube video serves as a continuing inspiration to many. Spirit sent CrowDog there to participate in an unplanned, unimaginable ceremony of generational healing. He was doing just as he had said in my discussion with him. He was listening to the voice, the

same voice, spirit, that he has listened to his entire life. He offered forgiveness. He laid his hand on their heads in blessing. He blessed hundreds of them, even though we knew he was so weak and ill, we could not believe he found the strength. He told us later, spirit gave it to him, like always. His response—that too came from the voice of spirit. It said the same thing Osceola and Chief Joseph and a thousand Native voices before him had said. “We do not own the land, the land owns us” (May 2016).

The people who were there to witness the ceremony of forgiveness talked about it being put together in days. “Less than 48 hours” said Cherokee Ha hin hda (2017), (pseudonym). “CrowDog was not even a part of the discussion. We did not know he would be there. And then, there he was, just an hour or so before the gathering. Like magic. It was amazing.” When I asked him about it later, CrowDog (2017) would not elaborate much. He simply said, “Spirit. We are still here. And we still listen. And we still follow spirit.” For me, this whole process of ceremony in Texas, unplanned and ill-advised trip to Standing Rock, culminating in forgiveness ceremony with veterans was a dilemma. How could I really relay the way it occurred for Indigenous people? In the end, I cannot. It was the absolute nutshell of that strand of spirit that connects Native resistance from Crazy Horse to AIM to Standing Rock.

As I pointed early in this document, Indigenous peoples see their world and themselves from inside of communities. Community advancement, survival and harmony are the governing concepts for personal action as opposed to Western worldview tenets which individualize achievement and motivation. Given that community is at the center of individual actions, it is no surprise that it forms a central tenet of collective action and motivation.

The Trail of Broken Treaties

“Our obligations and our loyalty have to be to the earth, and they have to be to our sense of community and to our people and our relations” (Trudell 2001). Trudell echoes the statements about community embedded in the prior discussions from early Native spokespeople. Native peoples are community driven. AIM is a community movement. A primary purpose repeatedly discussed by the leaders both then and now was to bring back dignity and purpose to Native people. The Trail of Broken Treaties was perhaps the best example of how successful they were contemporaneously. We will discuss the longer lasting effects later. The Trail of Broken Treaties, like so many resistance efforts before it, was mobilized by the death of a leader.

Richard Oakes was the charismatic young Mohawk who led the Alcatraz occupation and was instrumental in many early actions by AIM and other resistance groups. In one of these actions aimed at confronting a racist YMCA camp about its treatment of young Native children, he was shot and killed. He was unarmed and his murderer was known as a white supremacist. He was acquitted of the charges. AIM leaders believed this acquittal was aided and abetted by white supremacist groups who funded his defense and spread publicity against Oakes. They also contend that the district attorney was an ally to the white supremacists. The jury contained no people of color and no women. This was a fact that AIM attorneys found both conspicuous and suspicious. At the August Sundance in CrowDog’s Paradise, done clandestinely, because it was still illegal, the AIM leaders had discussed a caravan that would draw attention to treaty issues as it wound its way to Washington to confront the government about them (CrowDog 2011).

Oakes was shot in September, 1972. Reaction spread through Indian Country like wildfire. The organizers decided this was an opportune time to move so 50 people from several activist groups met in Denver to plan what would become the Trail of Broken Treaties. There

were actually eight Native organizations involved in the planning and execution of the caravan: AIM, the National Indian Brotherhood (a Canadian organization), the Native American Rights Fund, the National Indian Youth Council, The National American Indian Council, the National Council on Indian Work, The National Indian Leadership Training and the American Indian Committee on Alcohol and Drug Abuse. The caravan was planned in two days in the Denver hotel.

The caravans would originate from Seattle, San Francisco and Los Angeles and travel to Washington, D.C. to present a 20 point action plan that was developed by AIM leaders at the Minneapolis headquarters. Less than a week after the Denver meeting the caravans set out. The ability to agree in two days and mobilize in a week is the product of the community focus and support discussed in this work. The caravan started in October and stopped at reservations along the way. Noted Standing Rock Lakota writer and activist Vine DeLoria, Jr. (1974) explicitly details this resistance in *Behind The Trail of Broken Treaties* “The B.I.A. did its best to hamper the caravan. Nevertheless, as the caravan arrived at the reservations, it was generally greeted by large crowds and joined by many participants who also wished to present their grievances to the government” (47).

DeLoria notes, and a review of newspaper coverage from the time confirms, that the government and press interpreted the Trail of Broken Treaties as a primarily urban movement. However, DeLoria points out, and my AIM interviews confirm, that “its members represented nearly every tribe, age group, political persuasion and ideology in Indian country. Over 80 percent of the group were residents of reservations, and old people were well-represented” (1974:47). He further notes the extensive participation of Eastern nations even though they had largely been denied federal recognition and the benefit of federal services. He points out that this

will remake Indian relations with the government. The 20 point action plan is included in total with extensive descriptions and details in Appendix A of this document. These are the 20 points in brief:

1. Restoration of constitutional treaty making authority.
2. Establishment of treaty commission to make new treaties.
3. An address to the American people and joint sessions of Congress.
4. Commission to review treaty commitments and violations.
5. Resubmissions of unratified treaties to the Senate.
6. All Indians to be governed by treaty relations.
7. Mandatory relief against treaty rights violations.
8. Judicial recognition of Indian right to interpret treaties.
9. Creation of Congressional joint committee on Reconstruction of Indian Relations.
10. Land reform and restoration of a 110 million acre native land base.
 - A. Priorities in restoration of the Native American line base.
 - B. Consolidation of Indians land, water, natural and economic resources.
 - C. Termination of losses and condemnation of non-Indian land title.
 - D. Repeal of the Menominee, Klamath and other termination acts.
11. Revision of 25 U.S. C. 163; Restoration of rights to Indians terminated by enrollment and revocation of prohibitions against “dual benefits”.
12. Repeal of state laws enacted under Public Law 280.
13. Resume Federal protective jurisdiction for offenses against Indians.
 - A. Establishment of a national Federal Indian Grand Jury.
 - B. Jurisdiction over non-Indians within Indian reservations.
 - C. Accelerated rehabilitation and release program for state and federal Indian prisoners.
14. Abolition of the Bureau of Indian Affairs by 1976.
15. Creation of an office of Federal Indian Relations and Community Reconstruction
16. Priorities and purpose of the proposed new office.
17. Indian commerce and tax immunities.
18. Protection of Indians religious freedom and cultural integrity.
19. National referendums, local options and forms of Indian organization.
20. Health, housing, employment, economic development and education

These points each contain lengthy and explicit explanations in the full document. But even these bullet points show the now familiar themes of self-determination/sovereignty, community health, land protection and spiritual and cultural integrity. The goals elaborated in the Trail of Broken Treaties were long cherished community ideals. Means (2007) talks about how little disagreement there was over the plan:

“It was harder for us to decide what route to take to Washington than it was for us to figure out what to ask for when we got there. We had been asking for these things since we first started talking to white people. We did spend some time explaining the points carefully because we had experience, all of it bad experience, with white people being deliberately stupid about meanings.”

Wounded Knee

The position of AIM was that it was not a nationally driven organization. It only went to places where the community invited it to come. AIM came to Wounded Knee at the request of three traditional Lakota grandmothers on the Pineridge reservation. For several years, the tribal government at Pineridge had been run by Dick Wilson. He was complicit with the FBI and U.S. Marshalls in targeting traditional Lakota ceremonies and people. As a result, impeachment proceedings were brought against him in February 1973.

Chanka hdo (2010) (pseudonym) is an elderly Lakota female who was on Pineridge Reservation at the time, described the atmosphere:

If you were known to be a traditional, they would watch your house. They would wait for you to do ceremony or they would try to smell sage or sweetgrass burning to know you were doing ceremony. If they did or even if they didn't, they would break in and take your sacreds. Your feathers, your fans, prayer ties, even your cannupa. They broke cannupas and set fire to sacred eagle feathers. And, if you argued, they threatened to bring in the FBI to take you to jail in Rapid City. We knew we would never return. We were scared. So we endured as long as we could. We tried to change things. But they called in the FBIs to intimidate people and break up the process. We did not know how we would survive if we could not pray. So, the grandmothers called AIM to come to help us. We thought we needed warriors if they had FBIs.

AIM responded and the ensuing events led to the Occupation of Wounded Knee in February 1973. Again, the contemporaneous press coverage and even much academic writing reports the action as national activists driving the show. While he notes that Banks and Means deserve some criticism for the press manipulation, DeLoria (1974) is clear about the community involvement at Wounded Knee:

The nature of the Indian force occupying Wounded Knee astounded Indians and whites alike. This was no ordinary protest of young Indians intent on making headlines

(although plenty of headlines were made and eventually accusations were leveled against Banks and Means for manipulating the media). Rather, a strong contingent of Sioux traditional peoples were at Wounded Knee. Revered medicine men and several well-known holy men were taking part in the occupation. Representatives of the Iroquois League were at Wounded Knee, and the Iroquois had always received the utmost respect for their precise knowledge concerning treaties and the sovereignty of Indian nations. The more Indian people saw of the Wounded Knee protest, the more seriously they began to take it (75).

The leader I called Foot Soldier (2016) in the interview above also talked about the community nature of the occupation:

I was at Rosebud when Leonard called me. He said Dennis and Russell would be there that night. They had called him after receiving calls from the Grandmas. They wanted him to talk with the traditionals and medicine people and have them all join up at Wounded Knee to do ceremony and talk about what to do next. We weren't planning an occupation, we were planning a community meeting to pray and talk. Leonard told us all to bring our cannupas and sacreds and come. So we did.

Chanka hdo (2010) elaborates further. "We took our kids. It was the whole community. Families, elderlies. Medicine people with their bundles. We were all going to a community gathering. We finally knew we would be heard and helped." Victoria Chipps (2009) was not at Wounded Knee, but she was on the Pineridge reservation:

Everyone was going to Wounded Knee. AIM was coming to help and the people were so happy. I had ties to make for a ceremony so I didn't go, but my son went and my neighbors. We did not know that the world was about to change. We just hoped that they could find a way to get Wilson's goon squad and the FBIs to let us pray in peace. Then Wilson found out and he called in the Marshalls and the FBIs and what we thought was a prayer meeting and community thing became a war zone. It happened just like that.

Standing Rock: A Resistance Community

From Alcatraz to Wounded Knee, AIM resistance was a community affair. Whole families went to Alcatraz. Richard Oakes and Anne Oakes had their five children there, and many others had families there as well. Elders and youngsters and all in between joined the Trail of Broken Treaties and the community gathered at Wounded Knee. Indian resistance is communally focused and community based, then and now.

At Standing Rock, it was the local community leaders like Ladonna Brave Bull Allard who first took up the resistance. And then it was Indigenous people of all ages from over 300 federally recognized tribes according to NBC News. Water Protectors claim support from over 500 Indigenous nations. Many are not in U.S. such as the Maori and Moskito who had representatives at Standing Rock, or are not federally recognized such as the Chiricahua nation of California.

NBC reports Water Protector numbers reached more than 3,000 at the height of the resistance. The Standing Rock tribal government contends the numbers reached closer to 5,000. Regardless of the actual numbers, the makeup was easily discernible with a scan of the camps or even watching live feeds or news reports. There were reservation Indians, urban intellectual Indians, New Zealand Indigenous peoples, young people, families, elderly, and non-natives of all colors and multiple nationalities. The communal nature of the resistance at Standing Rock was evident in every news report and constant live feeds from the camps. Wakinyan na (2010), who was there and had been at Alcatraz and Wounded Knee, draws the comparison. “It was like Alcatraz multiplied a thousand times. But it was still the same feel. The same community. The same goals that we tried for back then. We are still here. But, now we have lots of friends!”

This consistent community focus underpinned by spiritual practice and in service to the land is also a system that allows equality between genders. There is a consistent female leadership focus in Indian resistance. The fact that my interviews represent as many women as men is a reflection of the fact that resistance in Indian Country represents women as well as men.

CHAPTER VI

WOMEN AS A DRIVING FORCE

“The Lakota are a matriarchal people. Almost all Indigenous peoples on the earth are matriarchal. The earth is our mother. The women are our future. They are our past too. And they are certainly our present. They are on the front lines always and then bringing up the rear as well. They give us life and they are our wisdom on how to live that life” (Means 2009).

Means’ claim of matriarchal prominence in Indigenous nations is backed up by scholars. Guerrero (2003) summarizes this concept:

...Native nationhood, premised as it was on matrilineal lines of kinship and descent for most if not all Native peoples prior to the impact of U. S. colonialism and patriarchy on their Indigenous lifeways. These communal models of Indigenous governance granted women respect and authority; exemplary of the gender egalitarianism practiced by many Native societies is their use of both matrifocal and patrifocal councils to negotiate consensus and make decisions in times of peace and war. Native women...provided matrilineal continuity in their roles as “Clan Mother” who determined role responsibilities among all members through collective cultural practices and reciprocal kinship traditions (for example, among the Iroquois Confederacy in the Eastern Woodlands; among the Southwest Pueblos and Navajo/Dine; and among the Great Plains Tribal Nations in the Dakotas) (63).

In 1894, the Hopi explicitly employed their matriarchal organization in opposition to allotment. They sent a letter to Washington, which was signed by 123 clans. This missive painstakingly explains the inheritance of land through the female line and the further reversion of that land back to women. And, it carefully discusses the idea of the community working together to make sure that none are left wanting. It reads in part:

The family, the dwelling house and the field are inseparable, because the woman is the heart of these, and they rest with her. Among us the family traces its kin from the mother, hence all its possessions are hers. The man builds the house but the woman is the owner, because she repairs and preserves it; the man cultivates the field, but he renders its harvest into the woman’s keeping, because upon her it rests to prepare the food, and the surplus of stores for barter depends on her thrift. A man plants the field of his wife, and

the fields assigned to the children she bears, and informally he calls them his, although in fact they are not. Even of the field which he inherits from his mother, its harvests he may dispose of at will, but the field itself he may not. He may permit his son to occupy it and gather its produce, but at the father's death the son may not own it, for then it passes to the father's sister's son or nearest mother's kin, and thus our fields and houses always remain with our mother's family (Courlander 1978:126).

Earlier, I told the Choctaw story of the women bidding farewell and asking for help from their relatives in nature. But women were also active resisters. In a 1930 history of Indian removal, Samuel Williams marvels at the Choctaw resistance and the fact that women are so much a part of it, "Even James Adair, who had no love for the Choctaws, grudgingly admitted that they both loved their land and would fight for it. Even the women fought bravely, accompanying their husbands to battle, carrying ammunition and supplies and cheering their men on to greater efforts" (305).

In *Women and Power in Native North America*, Klein and Ackerman (1995) conducted exhaustive historical and ethnographic research on more than two dozen Indigenous peoples in all geographic areas of North America and summarized the results as follows:

The third theme is a frequent pattern of gender balance in Native systems of belief. From Holy Woman of the Blackfoot and White Buffalo Calf Woman of the Lakota, both of the northern Plains, to Changing Woman, Spider Woman, and White Shell Woman of the Southwest, Native North American cultures are characterized by mythological images of women that are complementary rather than subordinate to those of men (248).

Obviously, differences existed among Indigenous cultures. However, these differences were in form rather than substance. Gender divisions in Indigenous cultures indicate a division of labor and responsibility for community wellbeing rather than a denotation of intrinsic gender superiority. The Six Nations Confederacy continues to function as an egalitarian social and religious body and even forced the conquering English to deal with women's divine right in Iroquois law.

Sally Wagner (2001) notes, “The treaty discussions with the Six Nations, while held with men as was the European custom, were always delayed in ratification since the Six Nations negotiators must obtain approval from the women whose land was being discussed before granting any rights to travel or settle on it” (37). The Cherokee council of matriarchs continued to govern the lives of the Cherokee from their homelands through the Trail of Tears and into resettlement in Oklahoma. Hopi governing councils, which hold civil, social and religious authority, continue to be comprised equally of men and women elders. Other Indigenous peoples in North America reflect similar patterns of continuity in women’s roles in their communities.

Women in AIM

The popular knowledge of AIM, to the extent that any knowledge of AIM is popular, conceives of it as a movement led by handsome young Indian men: Dennis Banks, Russell Means, John Trudell, etc. However, they and their cohorts tell a different story. The above from Foot Soldier indicate the prominence of the traditional Grandmothers at Pineridge in inspiring the Wounded Knee events. The official archival site for AIM chronicles its co-founding by Mary Jane Wilson (Anishinabek) Clyde Bellecourt (Anishinabek) and Dennis Banks (Anishinabek) in Minneapolis. Pat Ballinger, known as the mother of AIM, chaired the St. Paul chapter. Mary Brave Bird told her story in *Lakota Woman*. And, the involvement of Anna Mae Aquash is much discussed in the wake of her murder.

Women were instrumental in the success of the Trail of Broken Treaties. AIM's national news editor Anita Collins (Paiute Shoshone) served as secretary of the events, and Lavonna Weller (Oklahoma Caddo), first woman president of NIYC, served as treasurer (Mohawk Nation 1974:2). Madonna Thunderhawk and Russell Means collected documents from BIA files (Means

and Wolf 1995:235). They left this occupation with U-Hauls full of 1.5 tons of documents that would reveal the widespread practice of sterilization abuse and other abuses (Price 1998:119).

In addition to his comments above, Means (Means and Wolf 1995) even wrote in his autobiography of the influence of women in the AIM efforts. He points out that the protest at Mount Rushmore, for which he and Dennis Banks get much credit, was actually not their idea or their action.

After he sobered up, Dennis called a meeting and told us that Lizzie Fast Horse, whom I knew from my summer of dancing in South Dakota, and Muriel Waukazo, another elder, were organizing a protest at Mount Rushmore to assert the Lakota claim to the Black Hills under the 1868 treaty. They wanted AIM's help (167).

He goes on to discuss the actions taken and the participation of Trudell and others and how they end up camping on the monument and people from the Indian community in Rapid brought them supplies and food and water. They stayed for a few weeks from September to October of 1970. But he and the other AIM leaders leave after three weeks or so to return to other pursuits. Means (Means and Wolf 1995) points out, "The women proved to be the strongest and most determined of our group. They stayed well into December, when fierce winter storms finally drove them off" (170).

Alcatraz is generally seen as the spark that ignited the AIM resistance. Even though, it was not actually an AIM function. It was put together by Indians of All Tribes, a San Francisco based activist group. Richard Oakes is widely heralded in literature and newspapers as the face of the Alcatraz resistance. And the voice of the resistance was indisputably John Trudell with his Radio Free Alcatraz broadcasts. However, the person who was in the initial landing party and stayed to the final curtain, organizing many of the essential functions of the resistance before during and after was LaNada Boyer/Means (Shoshone Bannock) the head of the Native American Student Organization at the University of California, Berkeley campus. In January of

1968, she was the first Indian student admitted to the University of California, Berkeley (Johnson, Nagel and Champagne 1997:107). She later chaired the Native American Student Organization that led the occupation. She wrote a \$300,000 grant proposal to turn Alcatraz into a cultural education center (Winton 1999:8). Also present and instrumental was Madonna Gilbert/Thunderhawk (Cheyenne River Lakota).

While students were the majority of occupiers, community members such as Grace Thorpe (Sac Fox), daughter of Olympic athlete Jim Thorpe, provided much support that made the occupation possible. Thorpe procured a generator, water barge, and ambulance service, along with coordinating publicity, including visits by Hollywood stars such as Jane Fonda, Marlon Brando, Anthony Quinn, and Candice Bergen. She handled public relations on Alcatraz and at the later Fort Lawton occupation. Later, she helped secure property for the site of Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl (DQ) University, the first university of American Indian and Chicano students, near Davis, California (Johnson 1996:232).

She credits Alcatraz as the birth of her resistance, "Alcatraz made me put my furniture into storage and spend my life savings" (Johnson, Nagel and Champagne 1997:30). Thorpe later worked as a lobbyist with National Council of American Indians and worked to convince factories to locate on reservations so people would be able to have jobs without leaving their lands. In 1980, she returned to her reservation and served as a tribal judge and health commissioner (Malinowski 1995:433). Thorpe remained an activist throughout her life. In her sixties, with only her social security checks, she started a fight against what she called "radioactive racism" in her own tribal government, which was considering storing nuclear waste (Neil 1996, 74). In 1993, she founded the National Environmental Coalition of Native Americans.

Community member, Stella Leach (Colville), a 50-year-old nurse, ran the health clinic and was a leader in the occupation toward the end (Fortunate Eagle 1992:89; Johnson 1996: 124). Dr. Dorothy Lone Wolf Miller (Blackfoot), the Director of Scientific Analysis Corporation, used her office as the headquarters for Indians of All Tribes and received an education grant to start Rock School on the island and to set up the island health clinic. She also printed the newsletter of the occupation (Fortunate Eagle 1992:78). Numerous community members, such as Wilma Mankiller, who was 23 at the time, volunteered support for the occupiers from the mainland and visited the island. Mankiller claims Alcatraz as the catalyst for her political awareness, stating, "It gave me the sense that anything was possible. Who I am and how I governed was influenced by Alcatraz" (Winton 1999:10).

If we look at Wounded Knee again with an eye to the involvement and influence of women, we find a great deal. Russell Means characterized South Dakota, at this time, as being "the Mississippi of the North" (Johnson, Nagel and Champagne 1997:248). Pine Ridge had a murder rate 700 times that of Detroit. Dick Wilson's private army, called "goons," created an atmosphere where arson, beating, and murder were common (Olson 1984:171). The most radical support to remove Dick Wilson came from female elders such as Gladys Bissonette and Ellen Moves Camp. As Gladys Bissonette recalled, "When we marched there were nothing but us women" (Weyler 1982:73). They publicly picketed against Wilson in an atmosphere of an internal civil war (Means and Wolf 1995:251). Older women from Pine Ridge called AIM to their reservation to discuss the situation, and a group led by Dennis Banks and Russell Means arrived in February 1973 (Johnson, Nagel and Champagne 1997:250). Mostly older women, many who had lost children or grandchildren during Wilson's regime, packed the meeting in

Calico. Mary Crow Dog/Brave Bird and Russell Means make it clear that the Wounded Knee Occupation was the idea of older women (Crow Dog 1990: 113,124; Means and Wolf 1995:265).

During the ten-week siege, of the 350 occupiers, fewer than 100 were men (Price 1998:122). Women had spearheaded the dissent at Pine Ridge and performed all tasks, including carrying weapons (Sayer 1997:54). One photo of Anna Mae Aquash (Micmac) shows her digging a bunker with a golf club. Women also ran the medical clinic (Brave Bird 1994:179). Most of the primary negotiators with the government were female elders, including Bissonette and Moves Camp. Carter Camp (2011) chuckled when I asked him about the influence of women at Wounded Knee, “Honestly, there was no part of that action that wasn’t influenced by the women. They called it. They organized it. They built it. They talked us out of it alive. They were everywhere. Doing everything. Just like Indian women always.”

After Wounded Knee, Wilson instituted a reign of terror on the Pineridge reservation. His goons were a death squad. Within the next two years, 250 mostly traditionalists were killed on the reservation, and 69 AIM supporters, a third of them women (Jaimes 1992:328). Gladys Bissonette lost her son, Pedro Bissonette. He was the president of the Oglala Sioux Civil Rights Organization. BIA police killed him in October 1973. Her daughter, Jeanette Bissonette, was murdered on the way home from Pedro's funeral (Matthiessen 1983:132; Olson 1984:172). No indictments were ever issued against the goons for any of these murders.

After Wounded Knee, 85 women were charged with crimes. Two of the major trials after Wounded Knee were of women leaders, Madonna Thunderhawk (Lakota) and Lorilei Decora/Means (Ho Chunk). Madonna, a cousin of Russell Means and thirty-three-year-old mother of three at the time of Wounded Knee, was from the Cheyenne reservation in South Dakota (Brave Bird 1994:200). She had spent nine months at the Alcatraz occupation in 1970 to

1971 and worked as a teacher in survival schools. Survival schools were another project of Red Power groups. After Wounded Knee she co-founded WARN with Janet McCloud and others.

Lorilei Decora/Means was the state director of Iowa AIM at age nineteen (Brave Bird 1994:200). She joined AIM at age sixteen, and joined McCloud and Gilbert in the formation of WARN. Neither of the women was present during their trials—they were too busy organizing on reservations (Sayer 1997:128). They received very little media coverage or organizational support compared to the amount the men got. They tried seeking funds from white feminists, but they came with strings attached. The most notable was that the Indian women should make Indian men more accountable for their actions regarding sexism (Crow Dog 1990:243). Indian women had a unique way of calling men out on sexism that was not available to white women. They argued that acting sexist was a sign of being assimilated. Acting sexist was a way of demonstrating you were ignorant of Indian traditions.

The fish-ins in Washington State are less well known than other Indian resistance efforts of the time. Perhaps it is because they were one of the few efforts with women out front as the leaders. Fish-ins were a response to a Washington State policy that used state laws to restrict Indian fishing rights guaranteed by federal treaty. Even though an 1851 treaty guaranteed the Northwest Indians unrestricted use of the natural resources, state police regularly arrested them for fishing off the reservation. The fish-ins were a decade long resistance that culminated in 1974 with a court decision. *United States v. Washington State* (known as the Boldt decision after Judge George Boldt) upheld the treaty right of the tribes to fish and allocated half of the salmon harvest to them. Fish-ins began as nonviolent protests but white vigilantes, game wardens and state police used tear gas, clubs, beatings and shooting to suppress the Indians. The women fought back.

Women were the ones carrying arms during the fish-ins. Regional newspapers carried photos of older women with rifles, quoting them as saying, "No one is going to touch my son or I'm going to shoot them" (Jaimes 1992:312). Coastal Northwest nations were strongly committed to sovereignty and would regularly escort the IRS staff off their reservations at gunpoint. At Puyallup fish-in camp in 1970, spokesperson Ramona Bennett was quoted as saying, "We are armed and prepared to defend our rights with our lives. If anyone lays a hand on that net, they are going to get shot . . . we're serious. There are no blanks in our guns" (Camp 2007). Both Hank Adams (Anishinabek) from National Indian Youth Council, and Tribal Chair Ramona Bennett, spokesperson for the Puyallup fish-ins, were shot by white vigilantes, Ramona was seven months pregnant at the time (Johnson, Nagel and Champagne 1997:18).

Women were key public figures in the fish-in movement; this was not an unusual role for them in Northwest Coastal nations. Women were the majority of protesters and of those arrested. One of the first protests occurred in 1961: of twenty-seven protesters, only eight were men. When men were arrested, women ran the fishing boats (Katz 1995:279). Janet McCloud (Tulalip) was one of the key leaders in the fish-in movement. McCloud acknowledges that one of her most consistent sources of support was female elders (Payne 1994:6).

In 1964 Janet McCloud and Ramona Bennett founded the Survival of American Indians Association to raise bail funds and moved their regional movement to some national prominence. Hollywood stars like Marlon Brando and Dick Gregory lent their support, including getting arrested themselves at fish-ins (Johnson, Nagel and Champagne 1997:15; Price 1998:90). The fish-ins unified the small fishing tribes in the state: the Makah, Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot, among others. The state avoided confrontations with the larger tribes, but

concentrated on smaller ones that had fewer resources with which to defend themselves (Mohawk Nation 1974:26).

Janet McCloud went on to found the Northwest Indian Women's Circle, which focused on issues such as sterilization abuse and problems with the foster care placement and adoption of Indian children (Payne 1994:7). McCloud was a founding member of WARN, Women of All Red Nations, and more recently, the Indigenous Women's Network, a coalition that covers tribes from Chile to Canada. In 1982, in San Francisco, Dennis Banks put the leaders together to iron out differences and go forward keeping all disagreements within AIM. Means (Means and Wolf 1995) points out that the meeting was good with a notable exception, "One thing we didn't act on was a suggestion from Janet McCloud, a leader from Washington State, that we find ways to get Indian men to lead the fight against the physical abuse of women in their own communities. We never took it up as an issue, and I still regret that we didn't" (432). Mary Brave Bird wraps it up fairly succinctly, "It is to AIM's everlasting credit that it tried to change men's attitudes toward women. In the movement we were all equal" (Crow Dog 1990:206).

From November 22-26, 2010, in San Francisco, AIM held what was billed as the AIM International Conference. On the 22nd, there was a panel discussion, Women of AIM, which featured five women who had been active in AIM. Anne Begay (Dine), Yvonne Swan (Colville), Madonna Thunderhawk (Lakota), Morning Star Gali (Pit River) and Corine Fairbanks (Lakota) talked about being involved in AIM. The conference and this panel were livestreamed. Begay, whose daughter was fathered by Leonard Peltier, talked about being stalked and questioned for years even in the park with her daughter. She says the "man with shiny black shoes" asked her if she knew Peltier and warned her that "what happened to Anna

Mae could happen to her daughter.” She talks about being watched and harassed for over a decade by FBI agents (Norrell 2010).

Swan, who was active in Washington State fish-ins, actions against corporate mining and other AIM actions, discussed the “men in shiny shoes, unmarked cars and suits” who surveilled her from the 70s to the 90s. They even grabbed her son one day, but she had taught him to watch for them and how to get away and he did. “The government is merely a screen for the rich corporations,” Swan said. “But don’t ever underestimate the power of the people.” Speaking of the importance of the American Indian Movement, Swan said “We’re caretakers, we are up against the destroyers” (Norrell 2010). Madonna Thunderhawk said the struggles are intergenerational, the struggles for the “land, water, our people, the children. The work continues, the struggle continues” (Norrell 2010). Thunderhawk was also present at Standing Rock with the Water Protectors six years later as was Morning Star Gali. She was born in the AIM house in Oakland and grew up in the movement. She says, “For me, the movement was always grounded in a place of spirituality and love, that was the movement I was raised in” (Norrell 2010).

Women as Water Protectors

The original camp of the Water Protectors, Sacred Stone Camp, was on the land of Ladonna Brave Bull Allard. It was LaDonna who originally put out the call for support to fight the pipeline. She was instrumental in getting the Standing Rock Tribe on board with the resistance efforts. The tribe provided waste disposal and other services to the Water Protectors. They also allowed the camping on tribal lands when Allard’s call for help exceeded her land’s capacity to support the help. That help came from all around the globe and a great deal of it was from women. Pua Case, a Native Hawaiian woman who traveled to Standing Rock, talks about

the importance of the sacred. “We are not here to be anything but peaceful. But we are here. We will stand here in our tribal names in respect and honor. Standing Rock is a prayer camp. It is where prayers are done” (Jenkins 2016).

Many of the Standing Rock participants credit their activist awakening to the formation of Idle No More. It is an activist environmental organization founded in 2012 by four women, three of them Indigenous, to combat the tar sands and other environmental degradation in Canada. It spread across the globe and found support and sparked activism in places as far flung as Ukraine. According to Jenkins (2016):

Idle No More’s success set off a firestorm of solidarity protests among Indigenous groups in the United States, who in turn used the energy to draw attention to their own local fights—virtually all of which involved some sort of spiritual claim. In Hawaii, protestors instilled the same tactics—and sometimes even the same slogans—into an ongoing effort to halt the construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) atop Mauna Kea, a volcano Native Hawaiians consider sacred. In Arizona, members of the Apache nation began occupying an area known as Oak Flat, vowing to fend off the proposed development of a copper mine on land they call holy.”

Caro Gonzales (Chemehuevi) attributes her activist awakening to Idle No More. “Idle No More raised our consciousness. When people are chaining themselves to bulldozers that is prayer” (Jenkins 2016). Gonzales insisted spirituality isn’t a cursory side-affect but is a crucial, driving force behind the recent surge of Native environmental activism. Virtually all the protest she has attended, she said featured some form of prayer or sacred ritual. “All of us are protesting because we are part of this sacred [connection] to the earth...we are all the mountains, we are all the birds—it sounds corny, but it’s true” (Jenkins 2016).

Long time environmental activist and Anishinaabekwe, Winona LaDuke was at Standing Rock and says, “In a lot of ways, Standing Rock was like a Selma moment for all of us. We were all awake. We were very present. We saw it going down. We were here” (Loew 2017). LaDuke has written six books on Indigenous activism and environmental efforts. In *All Our Relations*,

LaDuke (1999) discusses the interconnected nature of Indigenous rights and environmental protections:

Grassroots and land-based struggles characterize most of Native environmentalism. We are nations of people with distinct land areas, and our leadership and direction emerge from the land up. Our commitment and tenacity spring from our deep connection to the land. This relationship to land and water is continuously reaffirmed through prayer, deed, and our best way of being—*minobimaatisiwin*, the ‘good life.’ It is perhaps best remembered in phrases like ‘*This is where my grandmother’s and children’s umbilical cords are buried...That is where the great giant laydown to sleep...These are the four sacred Mountains between which the Creator instructed us to live...That is the last place our people stopped in our migration here to this village*’ (4).

Kandi Mosset (Hidatsa, Mandan, Arikara), Tribal Campus Climate Change Coordinator for the Indigenous Environmental Network, spent long weeks at Standing Rock. She is very conscious of the difference in protesting and protecting. “I am not a protestor. I am *protecting* the very essence of what I am made up of, which is mostly water. I am protecting that for my future generations, all those that can’t speak for themselves. Not just the babies, but everything that flies in the sky, all those that swim in the waters, the four-leggeds. Somebody has to speak on their behalf, because they don’t have a voice” (Fusion 2016). In echoes of the descriptions from Brave Bird, Means and Camp of AIM women Mosset talks about the women at Standing Rock. “Women are the ones going and breaking down fences, running in front of bulldozers. Women are the ones locking arms with babies on their backs going in because it’s that desperate... The women, in my culture, are the keepers of the water. It’s no coincidence that when we’re pregnant we carry our babies in water” (Fusion 2016).

When asked about Standing Rock, young Dine student and poet Yitazba Largo-Anderson writes this:

To the Policemen of Bismarck, North Dakota:

Medicine Song
My eyes are drawn back

their sockets are looking straight through me.
my insides feel sharpened by
the whites of polar bear teeth.
but I can feel your heart shifting
as you water us down with genocide and oppression
and break our skins open
to water the Black Snake's tail with blood.

Limb by limb
you took my mother
apart
dug out her reproductive organs with
shiny little hands and Benja-
min Franklins
Your history bought our souls for
Some barrels of oil
costed us 98% of the land
just to get your fix.

Brothers, we can see your hearts have been twisted
hung backwards off of tire shops and
dog leashes.
you've been eating too many
calories from the fat of the rivers
disregarding her bones and regurgitating her saliva
year by 525 year.

We have called your names from the other side of this bridge
bend together and you will see the wings of our waters
the rebirth of women and period blood stains bring seasons with burning suns
we have scars etched on our backs and breasts
knotted and worn over
the map of America
and its inhalation of trucks.

From the graves of our grandmothers,
we give our love to you
as you cut us with pepper spray
an attempt to rinse the words "I love you"
from our colorful mouths.

Come stand with us
in the water.
Our mother has suffered for too
long.
We sing

We pray
Medicine:
We love you,
We love you (Largo-Anderson 2017).

At Standing Rock, Water Protectors continued the centuries long traditions of Indian women in protecting the earth, standing for their communities and listening to spirit. And they have been the fire that burns brightly for others.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION: SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORIES AND ANALYSIS

The preceding chapters have outlined and explained an Indigenous worldview and its divergence from mainstream ideology. Chapter one defined the sacred civics of Indigenous philosophy and lifeways. The next chapters listened to the words of Native peoples from the Trail of Tears to Standing Rock. These voices demonstrated a coherent pattern of Indian resistance through generations:

1. Framed around the importance of land as responsibility rather than property
2. Centered around spiritual principles and activities
3. Including a focus on community
4. With critical participation of women

The next sections will analyze Indian resistance using social movement theories including Snow and Benford's (1988) discussion of framing structures, Tarrow's (1998) and Tilly's (1978) concepts of "cycles of protest" and "repertoires of resistance," Taylor's (1989) concept of movements in abeyance and Armstrong and Bernstein's (2008) theory of Multi Institutional Politics as a means to analyze social movements. Finally, I will look at outcomes in the light of Meyer and Whittier's (1994) analysis of outcomes in terms of spillover effects. My research indicates that Indigenous movements fall outside of social movement analysis in areas such as cycles of protest because they have unique "home-culture" frames on land, community and gender and spiritual views. They conform to theories of abeyance and may match up well and provide further support for the Multi-Institutional Politics approach. I further find that Indigenous movements have produced both internal and external spillover effects as outcomes.

Framing

Before launching into a framing analysis, it is pertinent to establish exactly what the use of the term social movement encompasses in this analysis. Social movement definitions revolve around five primary characteristics: collective or joint action, change-oriented goals or claims, use of non-institutional actions, some degree of organization and some degree of temporal continuity. Social movements operate collectively outside of established channels in an organized manner and engage in contentious politics to halt or promote change. Various authors emphasize different components in differing degrees. However, some combination of three or more of these characteristics would qualify as a social movement (Tarrow 1998). While social movement scholarship sees the American Indian Movement (AIM) as a national and singular organization, it continues to be comprised of entirely autonomous local chapters over whom there is no national jurisdiction or hierarchy (Cobb 2008). This is consistent with the social organization in Indigenous cultures as Hall and Fenelon (2009) and Duane Champagne (2007) chronicle extensively. This analysis treats AIM as a single organization and considers it the flagship of the Red Power movement. I will also discuss the Water Protectors at Standing Rock as the focus of contemporary Native activist movement frames and actions even though I am certainly aware that a plethora of organizations are included in that umbrella.

Snow and Benford (1988) in their foundational text on social movement framing discuss four important elements to consider when gauging the robust nature of movement frames and their ability to support or inhibit resource mobilization: core framing tasks, infrastructure constraints of belief systems, phenomenological constraints and cycles of protest.

Core framing tasks are further divided into three components: diagnostic framing, prognostic framing and motivational framing. “Diagnostic framing involves identification of a

problem and the attribution of blame or causality” (Snow and Benford 1988:200). Native resistance from early contact to the Water Protectors at Standing Rock has no problem elaborating a direct and specific diagnosis of the problem. As Yvonne Swan (Colville), AIM activist, says, “We’re caretakers. We’re up against the destroyers” (Norrell 2010). Means says in his 1980 Black Hills speech, “A part of our survival is to resist.” He further elaborates the central themes of protecting the land, community and spirituality of Indigenous people as the means of survival. A Dine woman in Taos told me that Blue Lake is an altar for her. My Chickasaw great grandmother talked about her oldest friend the cypress tree. The land, with its spiritual nature and status as a relative, makes diagnostic framing simple for Native resistance movements. The resonance for my elderly grandmother and my young Dine friend is the same. And, it crosses geography and time without diminishing in strength. The diagnosis is that white duplicity and greed endanger the sacred land and survival of the people. This diagnosis is an entirely resonant frame from early contact through the current Water Protectors clear statement: Water is Life!

The second type of framing discussed by Snow and Benford (1988) is prognostic framing. This framing task demands that the movement “not only suggest solutions to the problem but also to identify strategies, tactics and targets” (Snow and Benford 1988:201). The early Indian speakers had ready solutions to the issues of land degradation and greed: simply stop destroying and taking more than needed. Live in harmony. Treat everyone with respect. In 1833, William Apess, Pequot and Methodist minister, accuses colonizers of not following their own Christian principles. “Jesus Christ and his Apostles never looked at the outward appearances. Jesus in particular looked at the hearts, looked at their fruit without any regard to the skin, color, or nation...” (O’Connell 1992:158). He indicts the colonizers explicitly.

“Everyone that is not white is treated with contempt; people of color are denied education and relief from poverty that Christian love should dictate” (O’Connell 1992:138).

Apress uses spirituality, albeit Christian spirituality, to indict and resist colonizing influence and repression. The Trail of Broken Treaties easily produced a 20 point plan that harkened to the age old issues of sovereignty, land protection, fostering community and allowing spiritual and cultural integrity. That plan also contained a healthy dose of redress your past wrongs and stop being greedy and duplicitous. The Water Protectors at Standing Rock have the same advice and solutions. Stop manipulating the process, honor the treaties you already signed and laws you passed yourself. Take care of the land and leave Indian people and their spiritual and cultural practices alone. As Means (1980) says in the Black Hills speech, “We don’t want to be a part of white institutions. We want white institutions to disappear.”

The final framing task outlined by Snow and Benford is motivational framing: “the elaboration of a call to arms or rationale for action that goes beyond the diagnosis and prognosis” (1988:202). Motivational frames function to spur action on the issue. Snow and Benford elaborate on this in a manner that is particularly applicable to Indigenous resistance efforts. “In his discussions of hegemony and revolution, Antonio Gramsci (1971) recognized the importance of “political education” and the development of a counter ideology or framing as an antidote to ruling class hegemony. But with his distinction between ‘organic’ and ‘nonorganic’ ideology he realized that any successful political education must begin with and be linked to the nature and structure of the belief system that is the objective of transformation” (Snow and Benford 1988:204).

They further note that the “mobilizing potential of protest beliefs and ideas is partly contingent on the degree to which it is built upon the stock of folk ideas and beliefs he refers to

as ‘inherent ideology’” (Snow and Benford 1988:204). This particular framing task appears custom made for Indigenous resistance movements. As pointed out in the early portion of this dissertation, Indigenous peoples have a fully developed and independent organic ideology that does not rely on the survival or efficacy of the hegemonic frame. Mandan tribal attorney Raymond Cross eloquently defines this distinctive organic ideology and its separation from the hegemonic frame:

Our Native American culture has been strip-mined by the European’s Judeo-Christian ethic. It is clear to Indigenous peoples that we are dealing with a desperate society trapped inside a crumbling mythology...Indians know how to play games with nature. Europeans—Whites—have been at odds with nature for many centuries. The Man vs. Nature argument is a contrived dichotomy with ancient roots in Christianity, Descartes and Francis Bacon. What you end up with is a race of people trapped by myth, striving to claw its way back to Eden against ever-growing odds. The project of nature is ongoing, we are part of it...Non-Indians will never have eyes so long as they cling to the Man versus Nature dichotomy (Quoted in VanDevelder 1998:45).

As for the “political education” Gramsci called for, Water Protector Nick Estes responds very succinctly, “To be Indigenous is to be political by default, because we’re not supposed to be here. We will always be in the way of development. There is no neutral stance that Indigenous people can take” (Brown 2019). As Feagin (2013) points out in *The White Racial Frame*, these Indigenous “organic” home-culture frames represent the “longest tradition of countering white oppression” (188).

Framing Constraints

It seems clear that Indigenous resistance movements are robust in performing Snow and Benford’s (1988) multiple core framing tasks. Now, we turn to the second point in the frame resonance platform they outline: infrastructure constraints of belief systems. They point out that framing “appeal and mobilization potency are affected by several sets of constraints that are external to it” (Snow and Benford 1988:205). They further break this point down into two

categories: centrality and range and interrelatedness. Centrality addresses the idea that “if the values and beliefs the movement seeks to promote or defend are of low hierarchical salience with the larger belief system, the mobilization potential is weakened considerably” (Snow and Benford 1988:205). This is a low hurdle for Indigenous movements to clear.

Land protection and cultural and spiritual integrity are the central themes of Indigenous movements from the Ghost Dance to Standing Rock as we have demonstrated in the preceding chapters. And these principles are the central tenets of the Indigenous home-culture frame that is so strong over generations as Water Protector Nick Estes notes. “The tradition of resistance in the Oceti Sakowin dates back to the first arrival of Americans. Those people who first met Lewis and Clark told their children, and their children told their children” (Brown 2019). Oglala Medicine Man Charles Chipps (2010) discusses the point further. “This land, these ways, the ceremonies, the medicine we walk through, the hawks in that tree, they are who I am. They are who my Dad was, who Woptura was. We do the same ceremony, to the same spirits, on the same land, in the same way as we always have because we are Woptura.” The beliefs and values expressed by Indigenous movements are preeminent in hierarchical salience. They are the beliefs of the movement because they are the beliefs of the people.

The second infrastructure issue discussed is range and interrelatedness. This addresses the danger of framing that is linked to only one core belief or value when that value is of limited range. This makes the movement vulnerable if the value is discounted or its prominence in the hierarchy slips. This caution is unnecessary for the Indigenous movements we have looked at. Again, they are squarely at the center of the values that define identity and spirituality for Native people. There is no danger of these values of land, community and spirituality being discounted in Indian nations. They align explicitly with the defining elements of Indigenous identity.

After finishing the discussion of infrastructure constraints, the second constraint Snow and Benford (1988) listed is phenomenological constraints. Phenomenological constraint asks the question “Does the framing strike a responsive chord with those individuals for whom it is intended? To what extent does it inform understanding of events and experiences within the world of potential constituents? Is it relevant to their life situations?”(Snow and Benford 1988:207). They further note that “three interrelated but analytically distinct constraints bear on this relevancy issue: (1) empirical credibility, (2) experiential commensurability, (3) narrative fidelity” (Snow and Benford 1988:208).

The empirical credibility issue is a question of whether the framing is testable. Can you point to events in the lifeworld of the constituency that verify the claims of the frame? This test is especially well suited to the frames and forms of Indian resistance. The oral culture and generational memories aid in the testing of this framing credibility. They can point to the Paha Sapa, the sacred Black Hills with gas stations and hotels built on them. They can point to Yucca Mountain with a national supply of nuclear waste stored on it. They can gaze at Mauna Kea, the sacred Hawaiian goddess home which has astronomy and weather equipment marring her summits. The early framers pointed to cleared fields where ancient forests of tree relatives used to make their homes. This empirical credibility test is the outline for much of the movement rhetoric over generations in Indian Country.

The second phenomenological constraint element is experiential commensurability. This item deals with the questions of which frame will be found more credible in a situation of competing frames. Snow and Benford (1988) note that an important consideration is the screen or filter through which the evidence is viewed. They ask if the framing of the troubling events harmonizes with the conditions experienced by the audience. They caution against frames that

are too abstract far away from the everyday experiences of potential participants. Again, this constraint is easily avoided in a culture with long standing oral traditions. As Estes noted above, the frames are passed down from generation to generation. The filter of everyday experience in Indian Country is filled with broken promises on the part of white people. The filter drives past environmental degradations of sacred land daily.

Speaking about the reasons to support Standing Rock and other resistance efforts, Winona LaDuke clearly addresses the experiential commensurability of the Indian resistance framing:

But, you know, what you get is intergenerational trauma, is what it is known as, historic trauma. And other people have it. But you have a genetic memory, and you look out there, and you see—every day you wake up, and you see that your land was flooded. And that big power line that runs through this land, that doesn't benefit you. You still have to—you know, everything that is out here was done at your expense, but you still have to pay for it. And every day you go out there, and some—you know, you got a roadblock, that the white people put up, coming into your reservation. And every day you go out there, and you look at your houses, and you see that you've got crumbling infrastructure, and nobody cares about it. And you've got a meth epidemic, and you've got the highest suicide rates in the country, but nobody pays attention. You know, and so you just try to survive (Goodman 2016).

There is no question that the frames of Native resistance movements fit smoothly into the everyday existence and filters of the potential participants. This is why so many joined the Trail of Broken Treaties at every reservation stop, why 300 Native nations were represented at Standing Rock. Why the Ghost Dance spread across Indian Country like a wildfire.

The final element of phenomenological constraint is narrative fidelity. They note that difference in framing can be “explained in part by the degree to which proffered framings resonate with cultural narrations, that is, with the stories, myths and folk tales that are a part and parcel of one's cultural heritage...In other words, the framing strikes a responsive chord in that it rings true with existing cultural narrations that are functionally similar to domain assumptions”

(Snow and Benford 1988:210). Once again, the Indigenous movements are strategically perfect on this score.

The alternative home-culture frame which provides the resistance tropes is also the narrative to which fidelity is required. The Ghost Dance promised harmony, healing of the land, reunification with relatives, all things a desperate population yearned for. As Estes points out, “Look at the Ghost Dance Movement, if they were completely harmless, then the United States wouldn’t have deployed its army against starving horseless people at Wounded Knee. The reason it represented such a threat was not because Lakota and Dakota Ghost Dancers were going around and murdering white settlers- it was because it was a vision of the future” (Brown 2019). It was also a vision that resonated with the past. As Rich (2004) discusses,

While AIM looked back to American Indian history, its members, whose tribes included Micmac, Lakota, Anishinabek and Ojibway, looked to Lakota resistance to shape the organization’s direction. Like the Ghost Dance Movement, the evocation of the Wounded Knee massacre became a point at which a collective of people from various tribal groups located a collective identity. Wounded Knee brings to AIM’s project people and events that are tied to one of the last, strongest moments of resistance that the U.S. faced from American Indian people (77).

The Water Protectors, products of the home-culture framing have no trouble finding the narrative fidelity in giving the pipeline a familiar identity- The Black Snake. Even the name, Water Protectors, is a piece of narrative fidelity in that it harkens to the central identity tenet of Indigenous peoples as protectors of the Earth Mother. The Water Protectors use the terms of Indian myth, story and folk tale to discuss the resistance and the movement actions and ideas. They have achieved pitch perfect narrative fidelity.

Cycles of Protest

Having been so stellar thus far in adhering to the elements of Snow and Benford’s (1988) framing resonance discussion, the Indigenous resistance movements are about to be at odds with

this theory. The final point on constraints of framing is cycles of protest. Cycles of protest are the general movement activity within which specific movements are frequently embedded. Snow and Benford (1988) propose adding to the characteristics Tarrow (1998) imagines for cycles of protest a new element. They suggest that the cycles of protest “generate interpretive frames that either cognitively align structural material conditions with latent mobilizing strands of folk’ (inherent or organic) ideologies or transform the meaning or significance of those conditions for the aggregations affected by them” (Snow and Benford 1988:212). Social movement theorists have extensively relied on the importance of cycles of protest to analyze and discuss movements. This creates that “not good fit” that Champagne (2007) discusses. Neither the Ghost Dance, nor AIM nor the Water Protectors conform well to the constraining ideas associated with cycles of protest.

The theory is that cycles of protest define the available master frames from which movements can choose to resonate. Only the movements emerging early and successfully in a protest cycle are likely to shape the master frame ideology and all others must find a way to resonate with the already prominent tropes and ideologies. Snow and Benford (1988) suggest three constraints: the point at which a movement emerges affects the substance and latitude of its framing, the early movements configure the master frames that anchor all future ideological options and late emerging movements are constrained by the prior master frame (212).

While it could be argued that the Ghost Dance did not exist inside of a cycle of protest and therefore is exempt from this analysis, AIM sits squarely in the most often cited cycle of protest and the Water Protectors are in the most recent potential cycle. We have already established that based on Snow and Benford’s (1988) structures, the Native resistance movements have established robust and efficacious frames for mobilization that resonate with

their targeted potential participants. However, they do not conform to the elements attributed to the cycle of protest constraints. They did not emerge early in the cycle of protest so are not progenitors of the master frame and yet they have fully resonant frames that do not rely on the master frame and are not constrained by it.

Tarrow (1998) and Tilly (1978) along with others maintain that the repertoires available to a given movement are constrained by prior repertoires. Tarrow (1998) elaborates cycles of protest in which early movements reveal weaknesses and test strategies that later movements then adapt or shy away from depending on their perception of effectiveness (1998:40). The existence of prior movements and repertoires of contention can hinder or further the cause of later movements. Early movements, operating on the existing repertoires and frames within a culture, and drawing comparisons, establish a set of repertoires which govern a particular cycle of protest. Analysts of the cycle of protest in the 1960s and 1970s which encompassed the rise of AIM have frequently used the Black Panthers to illustrate the principles of protest cycles and repertoires. I will detail some of those prior analyses and then compare those examples to AIM.

The Black Panthers were in direct competition with other established movement organizations and leaders. Many common movement arenas for allies such as religious organizations were already mobilized for other organizations (Ziad 2008). Morality issues ensuing from spiritual roots and master frames of liberty and justice were already framed and aligned with other civil rights movement organizations. As noted above, AIM was the signature organization of Red Power and thus did not need to compete with other powerful activist groups within its home culture.

In sharp contrast to the conditions of the Black Panthers, AIM garnered the support of all the important elders of their community and bridged generational gaps to create cultural unity,

the academic leaders to ward of criticism, and the religious leaders which gave them moral authority and power (Smith and Warrior 1997). Additionally, arising from a culture with a lengthy violent and symbolically laden “protest history,” AIM was able to successfully draw upon repertoires of contention that were not constrained by the cycle of protest (Goodwin and Jasper 2004). While other movements were active and prominent, none dealt with American Indians. Ordinarily, a movement such as AIM would not be able to alter the frames of and repertoires of a cycle of protest. Tilly (1978) and Tarrow (1998) contend that movements operating outside the repertoires will not survive. AIM not only survived, it prospered. This same analysis and claim can be applied to the Water Protectors at Standing Rock.

Returning to Tarrow’s (1998) conception of the operation of repertoires of contention, let’s examine exactly how thoroughly AIM countermanded this theory which so successfully described the plight of the Black Panthers. AIM, while it engaged early in some activities that were commensurate with the dominant themes of social action such as efforts against poverty, soon radically diverged from the dominant civil rights framing of liberty and justice to concentrate its most vocal and powerful protest actions and activities around a demand for sovereignty. What might be seen as early accommodation to the dominant culture’s vision of history and social organization in the form of demanding rights under the purview of the state later became a full throated demand to be entirely free of the state. Unlike the Panthers, they were not seeking to control the current structures of governing and rights, they sought instead to put themselves outside of these structures (Means and Wolf 1995; Banks and Erdoes, 2004). It should be noted here that from an Indigenous theory or home-culture frame perspective, they were ideologically and for many intents and purposes physically outside of these structures already.

Militant efforts by the Panthers were framed as lawlessness by both the state and the media and white actors were frightened by the language and tactics of the Panthers (Feagin and Hahn 1973; McAdam 1999). The media, which shunned and denigrated the Black Power activists, were captivated by the tactics and rhetoric of AIM (Cobb 2008; Cornell 1990). They positively covered actions which were extremely escalated and militant on the part of AIM with sympathetic and supportive articles. Means tells about an incident around the Alcatraz event where reporters formed a barricade to prevent police from getting to the protesters. The police then demanded that all reporters leave or be arrested. “One of them said, ‘We’re sorry for you guys. We know what’s going to happen when we’re not here to report it’” (Means and Wolf 1995:106).

At the end of a cycle of protest, a new movement should not be able to garner such a favorable response from the media who function as elite actors in movement struggles and according to many theorists routinely report symbolic actions or large numbers without giving attention to the actual movement contentions (Goodwin and Jasper 2004:97-110). This idea is countermanded by Fortunate Eagle’s (1992) book examining the Alcatraz events, “They published not just the invasion [of Alcatraz] but also its underlying goals, which were to test the validity of the 1868 treaty and remind people of the more than 600 treaties which had been broken and other injustices that were still being committed against Native Americans by the federal government” (114). They particularly should not be able to do this with issues and frames that fall entirely outside the repertoires and tactics which are militant and illegal. Note that the Water Protectors received the same favorable press treatment and were also able to persuade journalists to discuss the broader issues of treaty rights and legislation protecting burial

sites as well as the intricacies of the long approval process with the Corps of Engineers. They too were bringing forth issues and frames well outside current frames and repertoires of protest.

In addition to expanding the frame at the end of a cycle of protest, AIM casts doubt on the structural integrity of Tilly's (1978) and Tarrow's (1998) concept of repertoires. Tilly (1978) and Tarrow (1998) distinguish between traditional and modern paradigms of protest. Traditional collective action protests are linked to the form of elite structures they are targeting, are largely local, homogenous and have no means to spread to national prominence or permanency. Tilly (1978) and Tarrow (1998) are not alone in conceiving of repertoires as being divided along traditional and modern cleavages. This particular cleavage may be the only one that social movement theorists from both the political process school and cultural constructionist school agree on. The rise of nation states theoretically gives the impetus to modern movement modules, which continue evolving and innovating and expanding beyond the state as the target. These modern modular actions can be utilized by many movements without regard to geography and targets. Traditional protests are seen as limited by their reliance on locales and specific geography. They are constrained by this from developing a wide spread structure of adherents.

AIM, while functioning quite well within a modern cycle of protest with modern repertoires and tactics, actually utilized a traditional paradigm. AIM protest events were by design at specific local geographic points laden with symbolism from their home culture which cast into doubt the fundamental legitimacy of the state. Alcatraz, Wounded Knee, Mount Rushmore, the BIA offices and other locales were chosen deliberately for their specific geographical importance within the home culture. Further, AIM utilized the sorts of tactics Tilly (1978) describes as reserved for traditional paradigms. AIM demands are inherently tied to traditional paradigms because the home culture is traditional and non-Western. Sovereignty as a

primary claim automatically places the venue in specific geographic locations. AIM, strategically employed the home-culture frame to upend the repertoire of contention. They did this through multiple means involving the use of symbols and rhetorical strategies tied to storytelling and metonymy, rather than the more commonly utilized framing mechanisms as described by Snow and Benford (1988). However, they accomplished the goal of framing processes, and succeeded in successfully advancing their repertoires.

The Water Protectors are an even more salient challenge to the concepts of traditional and modern repertoires. The Water Protectors movement in its inception was very specifically local in geography, a very small geography in rural North Dakota. Even in its spread, it has spread to other small rural locales in Louisiana and elsewhere. However, even more so than AIM, the Water Protectors have employed traditional symbolic frames and tactics. They have also transformed and adapted the very traditional and historic oral tradition and storytelling ethic of Indigenous peoples to operate with the new technology of modern protests: Facebook and Twitter.

Yet, the mobilization of the Water Protectors extended to thousands of people from dozens of countries and 500 Indigenous groups. The home-culture framing and symbolism crossed over not only to other Indigenous groups which we would expect given the nature of Indigenous frames, but also to non-Native groups and individuals from around the globe. A traditional local protest with symbolic home culture frames became a global movement. This certainly demands a reexamination of the efficacy of these theories or at least seriously undermines the value of their use in analyzing future Indigenous movements.

AIM emerges quite late in the cycle of protest. No prior frames are discussing treaties, sovereignty, spiritual or cultural integrity, land grants or federal tribal recognition. Yet, these

frames are fully functional resonant frames that act to mobilize AIM's participants. While there are current protest movements active and prominent such as Black Lives Matter, Everytown for Gun Safety, LGBT groups, Reproductive Rights groups, and others, none are talking about Black Snakes and chanting Water is Life! None are citing treaty rights or claiming human rights for the environment. None are protecting ancestral burial grounds with ancient prayer ceremonies. In short, whatever master frames existed in the prior cycle or exist in the current one are not resonant with the framing of the Indigenous movements. Yet, these movements themselves have frames which are robust and resonant and exceptionally effective at mobilization.

I contend that the alternative worldview, the organic home-culture ideology of Indigenous peoples is the reason for both the resonance and mobilization efficacy and the lack of coherence with the master frames in the cycle of protest. Because Indigenous memories, heroes and lifeways are antithetical to the hegemonic colonizer culture, frames that speak to that culture in ways that resonate are not a good match for Indigenous organizing. As discussed in the earlier chapter, Indigenous theory contrasts historically with Western paradigms in virtually all areas of discourse. This contrast also extends to social movement frames and master frames. Indigenous "rhetorics of survivance," the narrative from which the framing is born, is deeply linked to a cultural, political, social epistemology with foundational and organic concepts like time, kinship structures and reciprocity – with concomitant "sacred civics" of "blood and responsibility," and a unique cosmology held in memory and trafficked orally. These memories, ideologies and sacred civics are not shared by the hegemonic western colonizer culture. Thus, the resonant frames are not shared with the hegemonic master frame.

Water Protector Estes makes the point, "Growing up as a Lakota person, your heroes are Crazy Horse, Sitting Bull; they're also Russell Means, Madonna Thunder Hawk, Phyllis Young.

We don't choose those circles of resistance. We're born into it" (Brown 2019). It is pretty safe to assume that Madonna Thunder Hawk and Sitting Bull are not on the list of heroes for anyone outside of Indian Country. As Raymond Cross noted above, Descartes and Bacon form the narrative of the hegemonic white culture. I can promise their frames are worlds away from the ideology of Crazy Horse and Phyllis Young. So too, the movement message that mobilizes is different. In contrast to those repertoires of contention that Tilly (1978) made essential to most social movement analysis, Indigenous repertoires are drawn from an alternative universe with different laws of physics whose superheroes talk to the wind and trees. This has made accurate and insightful analysis of Indigenous social movements virtually impossible using popular institutionalized social movement theories.

Multi-Institutional Politics Approach

Specifically with relation to the activism of Native women, but also applied to Indigenous activism and movements in general, the most likely tool for effective analysis may be Armstrong and Bernstein's (2008) Multi-Institutional Politics Approach (MIP). Most researchers in the area of identity development posit that it is impossible to separate the development of ethnic identity from the development of gender identity particularly for females (Abrams 2003; Jones 2003). While the ethnic identity in question, the status of that ethnic group, the racial climate, and the gender climate all influence the ways in which ethnicity and gender development interact, it is widely accepted that the interaction does exist. Native women conceive of themselves and their world in ways that women in other cultures do not. Numerous social movement scholars have documented that differences in culture and identity elements have implications in the issues (Jasper 1997), tactics (Della Porta 1996), strategies (Bernstein 2005), organizational forms

(Munson 2008), goals (Gamson 1997), targets (Moore 1999), frames (Benford and Snow 2000), participants and discourse (Polletta 2006; Fine 1995) of social movement actors and groups.

More specifically in relation to women's activism in Native contexts, there often exists a tension and opposition to the master frames, strategies, goals and tactics employed by other feminist movements as Andrea Smith (2005) and others point out extensively. American Indian cultural contexts represent a formidable element in the activism of Native women. The identities they forge within these contexts create divergence on almost all levels of analysis used by social movement scholars. Therefore, the most plausible theory to utilize in discussing activism among Native women in specific and Native peoples in general is Armstrong and Bernstein's (2008) Multi-Institutional Politics Approach (MIP).

This approach seeks to link the theoretical critiques and insights of a body of social theorists who have eschewed the dominant Political Process Theory and provided insight into social movement theory from a cultural perspective. Armstrong and Bernstein synthesize the insights from this scholarship into a structure for analysis of social movements. They cite the work of Goodwin, Jasper, Downey, Buechler, Johnston, Klandermans, Polletta, Taylor and Whittier as having provided seminal insights into the need for an alternative approach.

This Multi-Institutional Politics approach (MIP) seeks to address the concern that "the political process model assumed that domination was organized by and around one source of power, that political and economic structures of society were primary and determining, and that culture was separate from structure and secondary in importance" (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008:74). The MIP "views domination as organized around multiple sources of power, each of which is simultaneously material and symbolic" (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008:75). This approach will impact choices in study, expectations of participation, understandings of strategies

and tactics and assessment of goals among other things. Beginning by challenging the dominant model assumptions about society and power, the MIP includes additional targets for social movement status, alteration in the understanding of what is political, expansion in the group of social movement actors, a change in the assessment of goals and shift in the focus of considerations on strategy and tactics.

Within the purview of this approach to social movement analysis are a wide array of authors and movements with divergent identity compositions, targets and goals. What unites the cited research is an alternate approach to the cultural implications inherent in various elements of movement analysis. Social movements themselves are expansively defined using David Snow's (2004) definition, "collectivities acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional or organizational channels for the purpose of challenging or defending extant authority, whether it is institutionally or culturally based, in the group, organization, society, culture, or world order of which they are a part" (11). The MIP utilizes this definition within a conception that power has multiple sources within society and is constituted both materially and symbolically in institutions which are themselves materially and symbolically constructed.

In defining politics, MIP borrows from Foucault's (1980) concept of power and politics which recognizes that "power isn't localized in the State apparatus and that nothing in society will be changed if the mechanisms of power that function outside, below and alongside the State apparatuses, on a much more minute and everyday level, are not also changed" (60). They further recognize the importance of the State in creating and maintaining systems and classifications of meaning as well as distributing resources in keeping with Bourdieu's (1994) assessment of the State. In discussing social movement actors, MIP sees movement categories as politically and historically created with institutional considerations establishing the field of

people for whom “collective action is thinkable” (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008:85). Certainly, Indigenous people are in the field for whom collective action is thinkable. In fact, their long and deeply held collective memories effectively make all actions collective. The concept that institutions are both material and symbolic opens up expanded lines of analysis in the arena of movement goals and collapses the distinction between expressive and instrumental goals which has created debate and confusion in social movement theory.

“Repertoires of contention” are influenced both positively and negatively by historical circumstances and process inside of movements themselves (Tarrow 1998). This suggests that strategies and tactics will vary among movements and over time. The MIP concept of multiple institutional sources of power further suggests “that the choice of and effectiveness of strategies will also vary by target” (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008:86). Elements of disruption, relationships between institutions, classifications among institutions and actor positions in relation to variable institutions over time and context are all impacted by the MIP conception that power is multiply located and historically and symbolically impacted. This particular element of the analysis which allows for strategy choices to vary by target based on relationships and actor positions to those relationships is especially helpful in tracking the actions of AIM which defied explanation with ‘repertoires of contention’ ideology. If you are AIM and the BIA is your target, occupation and destruction may be viable options. If you are targeting the illegal seizure of the Black Hills and desecration at Mount Rushmore, an altar and ceremony are the resonant strategies to employ.

The MIP approach to social movement analysis is well suited to application in Native contexts for five reasons. First, Native American master frames, and often the political frames as well, are expressive rather than instrumental. Native culture values many things that are ascribed

as feminine and submissive by dominant cultural norms. Jasper and Nelkin (1992) noted in studying animal rights movements that they had an anti-instrumental world view in that they were against the utilitarian morality of large bureaucracies that pays attention to the ends over the means. Native women are on the forefront of movements to protect wilderness, animals, water rights, cultural identity and many other movement activities that are deeply anti-colonial and expressive in their concerns. Julian Groves (2001) notes that animal rights activists outside of native contexts face strategic choices and hierarchical structures within the movement based on the perception that women who are crusading for animals are weak. Groves (2001) sees emotions as “folk constructs” rather than psychological states (213). Activists use these folk constructs “rhetorically and ambiguously” (Groves 2001:213).

In *Rhetorics of Survivance*, Ernest Stromberg’s (2006) noted work on Native American protest discourse, he extensively discusses the use of folk constructs and the powerful ambiguity of Native American rhetoric. Winona LaDuke (1992) attempts to bridge the gaps in understanding Native peoples’ expressive outlooks and their commitments to both the forms of environmental protest and the motivations to save such things as beavers and trees by discussing the unique perceptions of Native peoples with regard to kinship, the earth, time and reciprocity. The structures of Native life and Native resistance are anti-instrumental. These expressive forms and contexts for Native activism can be effectively elaborated within the premises and tenets of the MIP approach.

Secondly, Indigenous peoples’ resistance involves multiple issues, institutions and levels of government and finds allies across many institutional venues. Native activists have been involved in movement activities in areas of law, arts, language, medicine, education, environment, animal rights, policing, water rights, sovereignty, fishing rights, history, racism,

religion, and literally countless others. These movements have sought changes in laws, policy, social norms, court decisions, executive orders, funding, control, and multiple other changes on various levels. They have challenged tribal leaders, federal agencies, military, congressional and presidential authority, rule making, development, corporate decision making, nonprofit motives and actions, sports teams, academics, entertainers, women's organizations, religious groups and many others. Conversely, all of these actors and institutions have been a source of coalitions and alliances as well.

The resistance efforts have happened both with and without favorable political climates and, given the nature of federal power over reservations, often under repressive conditions resembling totalitarian regimes in undeveloped nations. The points of contention and alliance have contained both material and symbolic significance. The MIP concept of power as residing in multiple institutional venues and being both materially and symbolically constructed as well as historically impacted provides a robust vehicle for analyzing these movements. As noted in the early chapter delineating an Indigenous world view, symbolic meanings with historical roots are the product of cyclical thinking and concepts of time in Indigenous worldviews.

Third, Jasper's (1998) concept of "moral shock" as a motivation for collective action is the most applicable to Native social movements. Moral shocks are frequent in Indian country. Wholesale sterilization without consent, the sale of expired and banned drugs to Native women, birth defects five times the national average from toxic exposure, failure to prosecute serial rapists, dams which will flood the homes of thousands, desecration of sacred sites, murders of fishermen, slaughter of animals, clear cutting of forests, schools declared death traps, uranium contamination of water supplies, abduction and transport of several generations of children to abusive boarding school environments, and similar actions create ample moral shock to motivate

and mobilize Native people regardless of the political climate and opportunities. As noted above, these challenges to power do not appear influenced by the political climate at large. Often, in their marginalized, all but forgotten lands, the political climate is irrelevant. And, because of their marginalized position in political discourse and the ease with which the government can let one branch give permission to another branch to decimate Native worlds, the things that are politically disastrous in Indian Country are nowhere close to the mainstream of politics or discussion.

Fourth, Indigenous peoples resistance in its form, strategies, issues and organizational structures is culturally embedded in original master frames and cultural repertoires which differ greatly from the prevailing frames. As Goodwin and Jasper (2004) note “Collective identities and injustice frames-not to mention group solidarity and commitment-are usually more than simply cognitive or discursive framings; they often have powerful emotional and psychological and not always conscious dimensions” (25). Meyer (2004) discusses cultural repertoires and concludes that “the tool kit metaphor is helpful here, as dissidents make choices about presentation of self and claims, but not in circumstances of their own design” (53). Polletta (2004) discusses the importance of collective memories inside of particular cultures in determining all facets of movement actions and posits that unique “protest histories” play a vital role in actors’ decisions and perceptions as well as analysis of these activities. The collective memory of Native peoples, enhanced and imprinted by the oral traditions of generations, provides “protest histories” that are vitally present and salient in the tool kit of Native activists and movements.

These master frames actually predate the frames which underpin social movement theory and indeed all Western ideologies and academic theories. Indigenous frames, because they are

embedded in a pre-existing culture and are not developed in reaction, are quite probably the most effectively sourced resistance frames. I have argued that Indigenous frames and movements are indeed a single movement in abeyance. I would further point out, as Feagin and Ducey (2017) have extensively elaborated, that Western imperialism itself is embedded in a system of elite-white-male dominance. Indigenous movements and their cultural frame are the only movements that are independently birthed prior to the rise of this elite-white-male dominance frame. All other movement frames are developed in reaction. And the social movement theories which analyze these movements are simply another incarnation of this elite-white-male dominance system and its master frames.

Kurzman (2004) concludes in his Iranian example that the perceptions of actors rather than the material reality of the situations and contexts created the opportunities and formed the foundations for all activities. His analysis is particularly relevant to Native peoples' resistance in that he notes that the protestors operated on the basis of perceptions and beliefs that were embedded in extensive cultural and historical contexts and that they are unintelligible without consideration of those contexts. Native peoples' resistance is embedded in a protest history that is centuries old and expressed through a collective identity that has been relatively stable over a long period and well prior to the collective actions under analysis. This is similar to Ringmar's (1996) assessment of cultural identity and stability as a precursor to action rather than as a result of it. It is precisely because of the generationally stable cultural identity of Indigenous peoples, which is reinforced by the experiences of daily life, that the protest actions are possible.

Finally, Native Americans have an oral culture. The importance of discourse and the many elements of rhetoric and communication in oral cultures are vastly divergent from literary cultures. In *Orality and Literacy*, Walter Ong (2002) elaborates on the intellectual,

psychological, social and linguistic implications of oral traditions versus written traditions. Stromberg (2006) details the distinct cultural implications of Native communication styles and forms and notes that they are not easily comprehended through Western analytical concepts. Elizabeth Rich (2004) chronicles the extensive metonymic character of the American Indian Movement. Storytelling is a central and privileged communication model within Native culture. This makes Polletta's (2006) work on storytelling discourse in social movements an invaluable theoretical tool for analysis of Native peoples' resistance. The present character of the land and the ready availability of detailed stories linking it to important cultural elements and connecting to the collective memory and identity of individual Native people is vital to understanding the nature and breadth of Indigenous resistance movements and strategies.

In contrast to the cultural constructionist approach embodied in MIP, the dominant Political Process Theory of social movements does not offer the flexibility and applicability necessary for analyzing movements in Indigenous contexts. Political Process Theory (PPT) postulates as a necessary condition for social movement mobilization the opening of windows of opportunity or conversely the imposition of threat (McAdam 1999). Native people's activism frequently happens without the opening of a structural opportunity window and often happens when those opportunities are firmly closed. PPT has been criticized for having an overwhelming structural bias, ignoring culture, and being state centered (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008). As noted above, Native peoples' activism often takes place in contexts having no particular bearing on visible state actions and arising from within embedded cultural frames and concepts rather than structural processes. To the extent that structural processes are present, they are culturally embedded. Or, they are effectively invisible outside of Native contexts and experiences.

Many critiques also point out that PPT reduces the emotions and passions of movement organizations and actors to cognitive contexts, thereby stripping them of their passion. Passion and emotion are definitively present and constitutive in the activities of Native activists. Koopmans (2004) points out that ethnic and women's movements are particularly ill suited for the analytical tools of PPT. He also notes that PPT will provide weak solutions "for longitudinal, single country studies" (Koopmans 2004:68). Given that my subjects are ethnic people, often women, in longitudinal patterns of resistance; this model would seem to be particularly ill suited for this analysis even though it has been extensively used. Goodwin and Jasper (2004) further elaborate that, "Emotions, rituals, moral institutions, psychology, personality, and individual idiosyncrasies have no place [in PPT]" (82).

Moral intuitions and rituals in particular are critical to understanding the actions and contexts of Native resistance. They charge that PPT "focuses attention by excluding a lot of things; they also distort reality to fit their own metaphors" (Goodwin and Jasper 2004:84). This indictment goes a long way to capture the repeated frustrations I encountered which led to this dissertation in the first place. It also accurately describes the experience of Native peoples with virtually all white people and white institutions for centuries. Reality as perceived and experienced by Indigenous peoples is already significantly distant from the metaphors of the dominant social paradigm which excludes far too many things already in its interactions with Native peoples. Adding further distortion and omission through academic theorizing cannot improve the chances for clarity and understanding.

PPT has been used to analyze several movements of Indigenous peoples and has fallen into many of the traps mentioned in the critiques above. A particularly egregious example is Oleson's (2005) work on the Zapatistas. Oleson (2005) credits them with "invigorating the

frames of opposition to neoliberalism” (189). He deems their successful outcomes to be that invigoration of opposition as well as the expansion of the internet as a movement tool. Anyone unfamiliar with the Zapatistas would be hard pressed to discern that these are Indigenous people whose stated goals are to live in a traditional manner and whose frames come from centuries of Indigenous oral traditions and practice. Their success is actually in achieving self-determination, not reigniting global opposition or revolutionizing internet communications. Their frames, like their goals, are born of an Indigenous world view. Their presentation in Oleson’s (2005) work as a subject of the Western worldview, is marginalized, even as their ideas are repackaged and appropriated. PPT does not have an encouraging track record in analyzing movements around Indigenous peoples.

Examining Native activism through MIP can make significant contributions to cultural constructionist social movement theorizing in general and MIP in particular. Kurzman (2004) specifically and others generally points out that “deviant cases are important for further developing the theory of opportunity in a non-structuralist direction” (119). The deviance he references is cases where opportunity exists and movements do not occur or succeed and cases where no opportunity exists but protest occurs or succeeds anyway. Native resistance can provide data to fill in the empirical blanks in the latter of these two scenarios, and possibly the former as well.

Certainly, this analysis describes the Water Protectors, both in their inception and their continued expanded resistances in other locations such as Louisiana. Polletta (2004) suggests that there is a need for studies that “probe the cultural templates that structure strategic decision making” while also “inquiring into the processes by which such templates come into being” and conditions responsible for their influence and change (108). This dissertation has probed those

cultural templates and pulled back the curtain on decision making processes. We have shown the historic processes that brought these Indigenous cultural templates into being. And, that process has exposed the flaws in traditional social movement paradigms of analysis when applied to the social movement actions of Indigenous peoples.

Arising as they do from an entirely different cultural template than the studies currently within this academic tradition, Native peoples illuminate previously unexamined facets of this analysis. Polletta (2004) posits that these sorts of studies will contribute to better understanding the variable nature of what is strategic. We have certainly seen in this work that what is strategic for Indigenous peoples is a consistent cultural template that repeats over geographies, leaders and timeframes.

In his recommendations for further study, Meyer (2004) suggests more research into why movements choose different venues and why states repress in different venues and with different strategies (58). Native activities span multiple venues and include multiple levels of state institutions and actors with multiple repression strategies which change over time and with context. These characteristics of Native resistance provide ample opportunity to amplify and explain this gap in research. However, this understanding can only be achieved by approaching Native resistance with the understanding of Indigenous world views and the knowledge of the historic colonizing experience from a Native lens.

Meyer (2004) also notes that policy functions as both an opportunity and an outcome and that there is a need to “develop a better understanding of how policy and movements affect one another” (58). Native resistance has both targeted policy and utilized it as an opportunistic organizing tool across multiple venues and time frames. We have reviewed the repeated citation by Native activists of treaty policies, executive orders, laws and court decisions as movement

tools and instrumental elements of movement demands. We will discuss policy gains as outcomes in the next section. This work seeks to provide a detail of Indigenous presence in movement activism and introduce the elements and salience of Native perspectives and worldviews as well as provide the missing detail of their voice, success and theory in the discourse. It is not my goal to revise social movement theory. However, the information contained in this work can serve as a toolkit for those interested in that project.

The most compelling arena and possibility for theory expansion lies in the ideas presented by Polletta (2006) in her analysis of storytelling in movement discourse. She argues that “narrative analysis can help explain the emergence of contentious issues and other processes that are central to politics and protest: mobilization, tactical choice, legal adjudication of equal rights claims, compromise in public deliberation and competition between activist elites and electoral ones”(21). Since storytelling is a normalized, privileged and frequently utilized discursive method within Native culture, the narrative analysis of storytelling within Native activities can transform and illuminate this analytic strategy on multiple fronts and in exciting new ways. In order to access this compelling tool, movement academics must access the continued collective memory and oral tradition of Indigenous cultures. The central tenets and sacred civics described in the early part of this work constitute a blueprint for understanding the communication style and importance of the stories being told. This access to Indigenous worldviews and perspectives coupled with the long tradition of storytelling could be a powerful tool to begin to erase the whitewashed aspects of current analysis.

When Northwest natives tell the story of the eruption of Mount St. Helens, they tell it as a sympathy story for the mountain. They are sad and mourning for the trauma she suffers. Native Hawaiians speak eloquently of the recent activities of Pele, the volcano goddess who lives in the

volcano. The stories of these eruptions are the stories of trauma to a relative, not disassociated climate events. News reports discuss property damage. Native speakers discuss the pain and anger of Pele against the desecration of the land. When AIM went to Mount Rushmore for protests, they cited treaties, but the story they told was of the trauma suffered by the mountain when these carvings were made. Trudell says, “Standing up on those ledges where the carvings were was like witnessing the human trauma and mutilation in Walter Reed hospital or on the battlefield. It leaves an imprint on the soul that does not fade. The Paha Sapa have limbs missing just like so many veterans. They are a wounded veteran of the ongoing Indian wars” (2009). This work and its ancillary distribution of hundreds of hours of oral history tapes is a part of the storytelling tradition. This storytelling and the Indigenous world view that underpins it are the cultural template from which Indigenous resistance movements are born and sustained.

Abeyance

Before taking up the discussion of outcomes and spillover, I would like to discuss the social movement concept, which has the most promise for understanding Indigenous social movements: Verta Taylor’s (1989) theory of movement abeyance. Taylor (1989) posits that the women’s movement did not arise anew in the 1960s; rather it had been in abeyance in the decades since the passing of suffrage. She further opines that this idea of abeyance has larger application for other movements that have been previously seen as new. “What scholars have taken for ‘births’ were in fact breakthroughs or turning points in movement mobilization...The term abeyance depicts a holding process by which movements sustain themselves in nonreceptive political environments and provide continuity from one stage of mobilization to another” (Taylor 1989:761). I contend that this effectively describes the continuous Indigenous movement activism from the Ghost Dance to Standing Rock. Taylor (1989) goes on to say that

“the significance of abeyance lies in its linkages between one upsurge in activism and another” (762). We have seen repeated indication of linkages from the time and frames of the Ghost Dance and Indian Wars through the activities of AIM and in the current Water Protectors.

Taylor (1989) delineates three ways that abeyance structures function to provide linkage: “through promoting the survival of activist networks, sustaining a repertoire of goals and tactics, and promoting a collective identity that offers participants a sense of mission and moral purpose” (762). As Means and others have pointed out, the sense of mission and purpose for Indigenous peoples is effectively survival and protection of land and lifeways. It is clear through the preceding pages of this work that those goals, tactics and collective identity has been sustained in recognizable form from the Ghost Dance to Standing Rock. Taylor (1989) spends a great deal of time discussing the ways in which abeyance structures are created and sustained. She notes that, “Movement organizations that cultivate and sustain rich symbolic lives, then, enhance the abeyance function by helping to hold members” (Taylor 1989:770). In the case of Indigenous people, I contend that the cultural template or matrix itself is the abeyance structure that sustains the movement through time. It is abundantly rich in symbolism and membership is a birthright.

Taylor (1989) discusses the importance of collective identity to abeyance, “Collective identity is the shared information of a group that derives from its member’s common interests and solidarity” (771). She points out the significant aspects of collective identity with relevance to social movement activism. A collective consciousness has significance because it serves as a resource for future mobilization. Collective identities have common histories and develop symbols to reinforce movement goals and strategies. Also, original leaders become symbols and rallying points. This research has highlighted repeatedly the symbolic reinforcement apparent in the goals and strategies born of the collective memory and history of Indian Country. And

respondent after respondent has mentioned the importance and inspiration of former leaders. Throughout this research, we have seen the power of collective identity contained in the Indigenous world view and its sacred civics.

Taylor (1989) highlights the cultural significance of the symbolism attached to Belmont House as a womb for the movement through the time of abeyance and then as a place of “regular pilgrimages in order to remain a part of the women’s community” (769). This instinct is abundant in Native peoples who return to the reservation and homelands regularly to remember who they are. Several respondents in this paper have emphasized that point. And, Native resistance movements make pilgrimages to places that have symbolic meaning such as Wounded Knee and Alcatraz and the site of the execution of the Dakota 38. Many current actions of protest begin in places like Alcatraz or follow the path of the Dakota 38. Reservations are the source place to which Native people return in the same way that Taylor (1989) describes women’s movement activists using Belmont House. It is clear that the abeyance structures of cultural history and memory create a salient and powerful identity element that keeps the fires burning in Indian Country.

Repeatedly in this work, we have heard from Indigenous activists in AIM (Camp and CrowDog) and the Water Protectors (Estes), referencing the Ghost Dance as the birth of their movement activism or AIM as the womb for Water Protectors. In many cases, the same people who were at the Wounded Knee occupation such as CrowDog and Winona LaDuke were also at Standing Rock in the same manner that Taylor describes Alice Paul and the National Women’s Party (NWP) as the strategy council and mentors for the National Organization for Women (NOW). Winona LaDuke is very specific on this point when interviewed at Standing Rock:

So, a lot of people are coming here, united. You know, so what I know is out here is like—you know, I go walk in here, and I’ve seen people from the—you know,

from Wounded Knee in 1973. I've seen people I worked with in opposing uranium mining in the Black Hills in the 1970s and '80s, you know, out here. I mean, I've been at this a while. You know, it's like Old Home Week out here. I've seen people from Oklahoma that opposed the Keystone XL pipeline, and Nebraska. And I've seen people from, you know, out in our territory that are opposing the pipelines here. The tribal chairman of Fond du Lac is here, and, you know, a whole host of Native and non-Native people. And there are a lot of people that just do not believe that this should happen anymore in this country, that are very willing to put themselves on the line, non-Indian people, you know, as well as tribal members, and they are here. And it is a beautiful place to defend (Goodman 2016).

CrowDog's (2016) response when I ask him about this continuity is a testament to the cultural template and endurance of Indigenous frames and world views. "Yes," he says at first when I ask if the Water Protectors and AIM trace to the Ghost Dance. Because I figure I need a bit more for a dissertation discussion, I ask how? "Because we were there, and we are still here," he replies. I understand his logic perfectly. We are still here is the rallying cry for AIM and many other Native groups. I have a huge poster in my office with his picture on it, signed, from 25 years ago celebrating AIM activism. I spend some time trying to figure out how many pages it will take me to explain that particular Indigenous philosophy of continuity and survival and 'we are still here' to an academic committee and then decide to try again. Uncle, I ask, can you tell me what the Ghost Dance means to the movement at Wounded Knee and at Standing Rock? He finally gives me something I can work with. Though, it should be noted that the quote below is the end point of a half hour answer to the question. "We were at Wounded Knee before, in our blood, in our spirit, in our hearts is the memory of being there. We carry that in our bodies, our cannupas carry it. The spirits we walk with walked there... and walked with Bigfoot... and walk with the Water Protectors. It is the same. It is who we are. We are the oyate [people] and we are still here" (CrowDog 2016).

Means (2011), like LaDuke, was more direct. He walked on to become a spirit himself before the Water Protectors gained prominence at Standing Rock, but he does reference the Keystone XL resistance.

When we say, ‘we are still here’ we are speaking not just for ourselves. We are speaking for all of our relatives, not just the human ones either. We are speaking for all of the 405 nations. We are still here, like Kicking Bear [reservation leader of the Ghost Dance] and Crazy Horse, they are still here, with us, in us. Our memories include their memories because we are an oral people. Our stories are our history and our spirits make that history now. Then, now, next year, they are all present. And those spirits are in Nebraska now fighting the Keystone pipeline. The same spirits that fought the uranium at Pineridge with AIM. Our memories and our words are theirs” (Means 2011)

I ask at the time if he would consider AIM the same movement as the Ghost Dance and Indian Wars. “That is what I just said,” he replies. And then he launches into an extensive discussion that the Indian Wars are not finished and won’t ever be similar to the one which is quoted earlier in this work.

Every activist, regardless of whether they were AIM identified or too young to have even been born when AIM occupied Wounded Knee, replied affirmatively to the question of whether these movements were the same continuous movement. Wakinyan na (2010) says “There is only one struggle, there is the land and the people and our struggle has always been for the land and the people. It is not that struggle and this struggle, it is THE struggle.” Charles Chipps (2010) was an Oglala medicine man but not seen as an activist in AIM or any other movement. He had this to say about the abeyance subject.

The spirits need us to finish their work. When my cousin Leonard [CrowDog] was at Wounded Knee, he was helping Crazy Horse finish the work to make the people free. The spirits help us do our work and then we will become spirits too and others will help us finish our work. So it’s the same work, it keeps on and moves seven generations forward and seven generations back. That’s why we always say that what’s done today will affect seven generations before and after.” The abeyance and continued relevance of Indigenous movements is literally embedded in their cultural identity and spiritual practice. It is an excellent example of that cultural matrix and templates theorized in the MIP discussion above. Indigenous culture itself serves as the abeyance structure which

houses and sustains movement repertoires and activism between mobilizations (Chippis 2010).

Outcomes

Citing Tarrow (1983), Taylor (1989) discusses outcomes which we will turn to next. “Focusing on short term gains ignores the possibility that social reform proceeds in a ratchetlike fashion, where the gains of one struggle become the resources for later challenges by the same aggrieved group” (Taylor 1989:772). I will turn now to that discussion of outcomes and spillover effects from one movement action to another inside Native activism.

We begin with the cumulative message from this dissertation that is repeated by every activist when they say they were inspired or carrying on the work of prior activists and actions. We take as a given that the impetus and inspiration as well as the frames and repertoires are a spillover effect or outcome of the abeyance structure of Indigenous culture and activism. In my entire life, I have never met a single Native person in this country who did not know what AIM was. I would be surprised if that could be said for any other movement and culture. The first spillover and outcome of AIM, which could also be claimed for the Ghost Dance Movement, is that it returned hope, pride and dignity to Indian Country. It gave voice to the story that was the collective identity of Native peoples. That voice was loud and proud and it echoed down through the decades to sing once again at Standing Rock.

The second important, indeed vital, outcome of AIM was the passage of the American Indian Religious Freedom Joint Resolution in 1978. This act protects and preserves the traditional religious rights and cultural practices of American Indians, Eskimos, Aleuts and Native Hawaiians. The rights include, but are not limited to, access of sacred sites, repatriation of sacred objects held in museums, freedom to worship through ceremonial and traditional rites, including within prisons, and use and possession of objects considered sacred. The Act required

policies of all governmental agencies to eliminate interference with the free exercise of Native religion, based on the First Amendment, and to accommodate access to and use of religious sites. It also acknowledged the prior violation of that right.

To get a concept of how directly the passage of this law is connected to AIM efforts it is useful to cite some of the specific provisions. The tone and language of these statements are much more commensurate with an AIM rally than a congressional document. It reads in part:

Whereas the religious practices of the American Indian (as well as Native Alaskan and Hawaiian) are an integral part of their culture, tradition, and heritage, such practices forming the basis of Indian identity and value systems; Whereas the traditional American Indian religions as an integral part of Indian life, are indispensable and irreplaceable; Whereas the lack of a clear, comprehensive, and consistent Federal policy has often resulted in the abridgment of religious freedom for traditional American Indian (American Indian Religious Freedom Act 1978).

The act did not stop all of the violations in Indian Country and indeed more acts were needed to protect graves from archeologists and art and artifacts from imposters, but those, too, were passed as a direct outcome of the efforts of AIM and other Indigenous groups.

What this final discussion will illuminate are some of the structures and organizations as well as specific policy implementations or repeals that are the outcome of various periods of movement mobilization. Meyer and Whittier (1994) point out that one of the most overlooked but perhaps most potent outcomes of social movement organizations are the spillover effects they create, “Because social movements aspire to change not only specific policies, but also broad cultural institutions and structures, they have effects far beyond their explicitly articulated goals. The ideas, tactics, style, participants and organizations of one movement often spill over its boundaries to affect other social movements” (277). I have adopted the concept that Indigenous movements conform to Taylor’s (1989) abeyance model. But, I would like to utilize

this concept of spillover to discuss the effects of AIM activism over time on organizations and policies pertaining to Indigenous peoples.

Cherokee Donna Langston (2006), Ethnic Studies Director at Cal Poly, compiled an extensive list of the outcomes, or spillover effects, of Alcatraz alone. She says,

Before Alcatraz, Indian activism had been more tribal and regional, with a focus on specific treaty issues. Alcatraz remains the longest occupation of a federal site by Indians to this day. Alcatraz heralded an intertribal militancy that awakened the American public to the status of American Indians. Cross-country marches by Indian groups continue to use Alcatraz as their starting point, as it was the beginning of a new movement and of a newfound pride and racial consciousness (Langston 2006)

Alcatraz helped to shape public opinion and influence public policy. A top aide to President Nixon later cited at least nine major policy shifts that resulted from the occupation of Alcatraz, including passage of the Indian Self Determination and Education Act, revision of the Johnson O'Malley Act to improve Indian education, and passage of the Indian Financing Act and an Indian Health Act, and the return of Mount Adams to the Yakima in Washington State as well as the return of 48,000 acres of the Sacred Blue Lake lands to Taos Pueblo in New Mexico. Nixon had also quietly signed papers ending the Termination policy during the occupation (Eagle 1992, 148; Winton 1999, 9). Perhaps most importantly, Alcatraz raised political consciousness, as noted by John Trudell: "Alcatraz made it easier for us to remember who we are" (Winton 1999:9).

Many women's organizations came from the activities at Alcatraz and other AIM actions. One important organization was Women of All Red Nations. Made up of three hundred women from thirty nations at their founding conference, WARN shared a similar philosophy with AIM (Emery 1981:8). Many of its efforts focused on struggles over energy resources and sterilization abuse uncovered in BIA confiscated documents. Some felt that WARN attracted urban young college-educated women more than others (Power 1986:151). The Northwest Indian Women's

Circle was founded in 1981 by Janet McCloud and worked on issues connected to Indian women and children.

Indian women's groups raised different issues than their counterparts in white women's groups. Sterilization abuse was uncovered when AIM took BIA documents during their 1972 occupation. From these files, they learned that forty-two percent of Indian women had been sterilized, the majority without their consent (Shoemaker 1995:326). In 1980, sterilization abuse was the theme of the Longest Walk across America (Tomkin 1981:17). Another issue for Indian women's groups was that of adoption. In earlier times, children had been taken away from Indian families at young ages and shipped to boarding schools at great distances. Today, Indian children are placed in foster care and adoption at high rates (Emery 1981:191). Sometimes the reasons children are removed from homes are based in cultural differences and differing family models that value extended families among Indians (Brave Bird 1994:190). In Native culture, it is the job of grandparents to care for and teach the children. Parents must take care of the land, the community, and the day to day demands of life. The elders, with more time and wisdom, are the teachers of children. Indian women's groups have also raised awareness of their high infant mortality rates, and the fact that Indians have the highest school dropout rate of any group in the United States. This again has something to do with cultural tenets. Indigenous peoples, unlike many other marginalized groups, have a tendency to see white education in a negative light. It is not the way to success. It is the way to losing your soul.

Indian women's groups also organized around land and resource struggles. A number of Indian women's groups formed in the early 1970s. A civil rights oriented group formed in 1977 out of the International Women's Year conference and was funded by the Women's Educational Equity Program (Medicine 1978, 343). Ohoyo, the Choctaw word for women, lasted just a

couple of years, but produced a number of conferences for professional women (Ohoyo 1981:5). Several of the women I interviewed for this work mentioned this short lived organization and connected it to the efforts of AIM and the women of AIM.

Tim Baylor (2007) notes:

In 1970 AIM and other Indian protesters made several attempts to occupy Fort Lawton, an idle military installation near Seattle. Eventually, an organization representing Seattle's Indians was given title and the Daybreak Star Cultural Center was born. Also in 1970, AIM and other activists occupied a 647 acre surplus military facility near Davis, California. The site was eventually given to the Board of Trustees of Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University, whose primary mission was to serve a Native American and Chicano constituency. Dennis Banks, one the major leaders of AIM, would later serve some time as Chancellor.

One spillover effect of the rise of AIM is the way in which it motivated the government to deal with the more established National Council of American Indians which had a much more institutional and conservative approach to activism. They were forced to move left to maintain their base of support in the face of the radical Indian nationalism spurred by AIM. And when faced with dealing with AIM radicals or NCAI, government groups chose NCAI. As one member of the National Congress of American Indians put it, "Before now, we could exhaust every appeal to the government and then sit back and wait without any hope of anything happening. Now, we can always threaten to call in AIM as a last resort" (Burnette 1974:282). Baylor (2007) says, "The role that AIM and other activists Indians played in moving along Indian reform indirectly cannot be underestimated. It becomes the most logical explanation to understand the substantial changes that brought a greater degree of self-determination to Indian country after AIM arrived on the scene."

Many court cases began out of the activism of AIM. In 1980, the federal government agreed to pay \$81.5 million to the Passamaquoddy and Penobscot of Maine, and \$105 million to the Sioux in South Dakota. The Sioux funds continue to draw interest as the Lakota have made it

clear they want the Black Hills which were illegally stolen, not the blood money in payment for the theft. Court decisions also permitted tribal authorities to sell cigarettes, run gambling casinos, and levy taxes. Perhaps the most famous case is the Cobell case which brought to light the virtually nonexistent accounting integrity of the Department of Interior in its administration of tribal funds and lands in trust. The suit had 500,000 plaintiffs and lasted more than 15 years. The government was not even able to provide an accounting of the monies in question. The case was settled in 2010 for 3.9 billion dollars, but in keeping with the lengthy history of official lying and theft of Indian assets, it has yet to be paid.

I spent significant research time attempting to track down all of the organizations that were born out of AIM activism or started by AIM activists. This effort proved impossible to thoroughly achieve. Through various sources, I arrived at a count of over 150 national organizations and more than 500 local or regional organizations. The AIM website claims more than a hundred national organizations and over 300 local and regional organizations. The spillover is too far reaching and scattered to accurately reflect. That being the case, I will conclude this point by discussing what is perhaps the most influential and wide-reaching organization to arise out of the activism of AIM: the International Indian Treaty Council.

AIM founded the International Indian Treaty Council in 1974. The following is from the IITC website:

We, the sovereign Native Peoples recognize that all lands belonging to the various Native Nations now situated within the boundaries of the U.S. are clearly defined by the sacred treaties solemnly entered into between the Native Nations and the government of the United States of America.

We, the sovereign Native Peoples, charge the United States of gross violations of our International Treaties. Two of the thousands of violations that can be cited are the “wrongfully taking” of the Black Hills from the Great Sioux Nation in 1877, this sacred land belonging to the Great Sioux Nation under the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868. The second violation was the forced march of the Cherokee people from their ancestral lands in the state of Georgia to the then “Indian Territory” of

Oklahoma after the Supreme Court of the United States ruled the Cherokee treaty rights inviolate. The treaty violation, known as the “Trail of Tears,” brought death to two-thirds of the Cherokee Nation during the forced march.

The Council further realizes that securing United States recognition of treaties signed with Native Nations requires a committed and unified struggle, using every available legal and political resource. Treaties between sovereign nations explicitly entail agreements with represent “the supreme law of the land” binding each party to an inviolate international relationship.

We acknowledge the historical fact that the struggle for Independence of the Peoples of our sacred Mother Earth have always been over sovereignty of land. These historical freedom efforts have always involved the highest human sacrifice.

We recognize that all Native Nations wish to avoid violence, but we also recognize that the United States government has always used force and violence to deny Native Nations basic human and treaty rights.

We adopt this Declaration of Continuing Independence, recognizing that struggle lies ahead – a struggle certain to be won – and that the human and treaty rights of all Native Nations will be honored. In this understanding the International Indian Treaty Council declares:

The United State Government in its Constitution, Article VI, recognizes treaties as part of the Supreme Law of the United States. We will peacefully pursue all legal and political avenues to demand United States recognition of its own Constitution in this regard, and thus to honor its own treaties with Native Nations.

We will seek the support of all world communities in the struggle for the continuing independence of Native Nations.

We the representatives of sovereign Native Nations united in forming a council to be known at the International Indian Treaty Council to implement these declarations.

The International Indian Treaty Council will establish offices in Washington, D.C. and New York City to approach the international forces necessary to obtain the recognition of our treaties. These offices will establish an initial system of communications among Native nations to disseminate information, getting a general consensus of concerning issues, developments and any legislative attempt affecting Native Nations by the United States of America.

The International Indian Treaty Council recognizes the sovereignty of all Native Nations and will stand in unity to support our Native and international brothers and sisters in their respective and collective struggles concerning international treaties and agreements violated by the United States and other governments.

All treaties between the Sovereign Native Nations and the United States Government must be interpreted according to the traditional and spiritual ways of the signatory Native Nations.

We declare our recognition of the Provisional Government of the Independent Oglala Nation, established by the Traditional Chiefs and Headmen under the provisions of the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty with the Great Sioux Nation at Wounded Knee, March 11, 1973.

We condemn the United States of America for its gross violation of the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty in militarily surrounding, killing and starving the citizens of the Independent Oglala Nation into exile.

We demand the United States of America recognize the sovereignty of the Independent Oglala Nation and immediately stop all present and future criminal prosecutions of sovereign Native Peoples. We call upon the conscionable nations of the world to join us in charging and prosecuting the United States of America for its genocidal practices against the sovereign Native Nations; most recently illustrated by Wounded Knee 1973 and the continued refusal to sign the United Nations 1948 Treaty on Genocide.

We reject all executive orders, legislative acts and judicial decisions of the United States related to Native Nations since 1871, when the United States unilaterally suspended treaty-making relations with the Native Nations. This includes, but is not limited to, the Major Crimes Act, the General Allotment Act, the Citizenship Act of 1924, the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, the Indian Claims Commission Act, Public Law 280 and the Termination Act. All treaties made between Native Nations and the United States made prior to 1871 shall be recognized without further need of interpretation.

We hereby ally ourselves with the colonized Puerto Rican People in their struggle for Independence from the same United States of America.

We recognize that there is only one color of Mankind in the world who are not represented in the United Nations; that is the Indigenous Redman of the Western Hemisphere. We recognize this lack of representation in the United Nations comes from the genocidal policies of the colonial power of the United States.

The International Indian Treaty Council established by this conference is directed to make the application to the United Nations for recognition and membership of the sovereign Native Nations. We pledge our support to any similar application by an aboriginal people.

This conference directs the Treaty Council to open negotiations with the government of the United States through its Department of State. We seek these negotiations in order to establish diplomatic relations with the United States. When these diplomatic relations have been established, the first order of business shall be to deal with U.S. violations of treaties with Native Indian Nations, and violations of the rights of those Native Indian Nations who have refused to sign treaties with the United States.

We, the People of the International Indian Treaty Council, following the guidance of our elders through instructions from the Great Spirit, and out of respect for our sacred Mother Earth, all her children, and those yet unborn, offer our lives for our International Treaty Rights (International Indian Treaty Council 1974).

By now, the language, worldview and sacred civics of Indigenous peoples are obvious and easy to spot in this declaration. The International Indian Treaty Council (IITC) is the body which originally brings the rights of Indigenous Peoples to the United Nations. The resulting working group is formed from the efforts of the IITC. That working group spends 20 years working for passage of the United Nations Resolution on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Indigenous Movements are in abeyance with spillover effects down the years and generations. This organization also stands in the lineage of abeyance and resistance of Indigenous peoples which this paper has discussed. Note the site of the gathering is none other than Standing Rock. The IITC has done a great deal of vital and important work since its formation, but in the context of this paper, it has a singular hallmark achievement. It is the organization that put together the original U. N. Council for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

This conference, which was discussed in an early chapter of this dissertation, established the definition of Indigenous peoples and the outline for the 20 year process to pass the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples which was finally passed in September 2007. In a very clear and direct way, AIM was a birthplace for the United Nations International Council for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. And, in a very Indigenous circular turn, it is the efforts of this Council that contributed greatly to the international impact and prominence of the Water Protectors. The support from more than 200 international Indigenous groups is the outgrowth of the U.N. Council. As I marveled at this impressive confluence of events, abeyance, social movement spillover and such, I discussed some of it with CrowDog (2016). His reply was again, intrinsically Indian. “Mitakuye Oyacín, we are all relatives. You know, the spirits are at Standing Rock. They know those spirits around the world. They can travel with just an intent.”

As Feagin (2013) notes, Indigenous peoples have the longest uninterrupted resistance to the white racial frame. This centuries-long resistance to the colonization of the earth and the mind, has not only impacted Indian Country, but has left its mark on the dominant elite white male paradigm. One of the earliest spillover effects of Native worldviews is adeptly captured by Sally Wagner (2001) in *Sisters in Spirit*, where she chronicles the impact that seeing the freedom and independence of Native women had on the early women’s suffragists such as Elizabeth Cady

Stanton who lived near the Iroquois and Seneca and Lucretia Mott and Jocelyn Gage who knew many Native peoples. Wagner (2001) notes they stopped by to visit Native friends on the way to the famous Seneca Falls gathering. And further references the influence of Native people in Stanton's writing of *The Woman's Bible*.

American Indian women, with their egalitarian gender roles and importance in decision making provided an untenable threat to the European hierarchical notions of life itself. White women, the mothers of the superior race, were firmly circumscribed into rigid gender roles long before they landed on American shores. Indian women, with their dangerous positions of authority and habits, needed to become dirty and shameful in the colonial rhetoric in order to preserve the "natural" order of being. Indians must become savages; if not, what was to stop white women from emulating their Indian counterparts?

Lucretia Mott saw this egalitarian Indigenous world in practice when she and her husband visited the Seneca in the summer of 1848. She watched women who had equal responsibilities with men in all aspects of their lives—family, spiritual, governmental and economic. At this time the Seneca women were deeply involved in the decision of dropping their traditional clan system of government to adopt the constitutional form insisted upon by the Quakers. While the Cattaraugus Seneca finally did accept the United States model, they refused to accept the element of male dominance. They placed in their constitution that no treaty would be valid without the approval of three-fourths of the "mothers of the nation." With this in mind, Mott traveled to visit friends in western New York where they planned and held the first women's rights convention in Seneca Falls (Wagner 2001).

Elizabeth Cady Stanton's cousin was named for an Oneida (one of the six Iroquoian nations), and her closest Seneca Falls neighbor was an adopted Onondagan who regularly

received guests from the reservation (Wagner 2001). Wagner (2001) further notes that Matilda Gage was perhaps the most involved with the Iroquois nations, being adopted into the Wolf Clan of the Mohawk Nation. Gage wrote that the U.S. form of government was borrowed from that of the Six Nations, and thus "the modern world [is] indebted for its first conception of inherent rights, natural equality of condition, and the establishment of a civilized government upon this basis" to the Iroquois (Wagner 2001). The influences of these interactions with the Iroquois were readily apparent in the writings of Stanton and Gage. Beyond equal suffrage, Stanton marveled that "the women were the great power among the clan," and "the original nomination of the chiefs also always rested with the women." The clan mother had the authority to nominate, hold in office and remove the representative of her clan, Stanton explained. Gage pointed out that, "Division of power between the sexes in this Indian republic was nearly equal" (Wagner 2001). White women saw this equality in Indian country and began their quest for equal rights which continues today.

As this dissertation has repeatedly illustrated, Native peoples with their culturally embedded frames of resistance which predate the paradigms of elite white male dominance have spent centuries enforcing course corrections on the ruling Western imperialist social order. They have continued to stand in the way of destruction of the Earth. From the Gold Rush in the Black Hills to the Black Snake at Standing Rock, Indian people have been a voice for responsible stewardship of the land. These voices have joined with others in community to shine a light on uranium mining at Pineridge and oil pipeline processes at Standing Rock.

As we have seen repeatedly, Indigenous resistance:

- Protects the land
- Centers on the spiritual
- Fosters Community
- Features vital contributions from women

And this resistance has remained consistent and coherent for centuries. These alternative worldviews and repertoires of contention are important wake up calls for the dominant culture.

When I was talking to Charles Chipps (2010) about this long term influence, he was unsurprised. “White people need a conscience. They cannot hear their conscience, if they even have one. But we hear the spirits and we are the conscience they try to deny. They kill us; steal our land and then our children. But, still, we are here. And we are the conscience they cannot deny.”

This dissertation has traced the recurring discourse of Indigenous survivance themes across time in different eras. These coherent frames formed the activism of a movement in abeyance with vast spillovers and outcomes that reach globally. It is my hope that these voices of Indigenous peoples can be heard and respected as salient in their own worldview without being subverted to western colonial projects in academics or elsewhere.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, L. S. 2003. "Contextual Variations in Young Women's Gender Identity Negotiations." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 27(1):64-75.
- Aichaga. 2010. "Dine Activist."
- Allen, Chadwyck. 2002. *Blood Narratives: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literature and Activist Texts*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- American Indian Movement Interpretive Center. 2015. "About the AIM Interpretive Center." *American Indian Movement Interpretive Center*. Retrieved October 15, 2015 (<http://www.aim-ic.org/about>).
- Andrews, Kenneth T. 2004. *Freedom Is A Constant Struggle: The Mississippi Civil Rights Movement and Its Legacy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anon. 1831. *Cherokee Nation v. State Of Georgia*.
- Anon. 1832. *Worcester v. State Of Georgia*.
- Anon. 1978. *American Indian Religious Freedom Joint Resolution*. Washington D.C.: 95th Congress.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth A, and Mary Bernstein. 2008. "Culture, Power and Institutions: A Multi-Institutional Politics Approach to Social Movements." *Sociological Theory* 26(1):74-99.
- Banks, Dennis, and Richard Erdoes. 2004. *Ojibwe Warrior: Dennis Banks and The Rise Of The American Indian Movement*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Bar-On, Reuven, and James Parker. 2000. *The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Development, Assessment, and Application At Home, School, and in the Workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baylor, Tim. 2007. "The American Indian Movement's Strategic Choices: Environmental Limitations and Organizational Outcomes."

Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611-639.

Bernstein, Mary. 2005. "Identity Politics." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31:47-74.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1994. "Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of The Bureaucratic Field." *Sociology Theory* 12:1-18.

Bracey, Glenn. 2016. "Black Movements Need Black Theorizing: Exposing Implicit Whiteness in Political Process Theory." *Sociology Focus* 49:11-27.

Brave Bird, Mary. 1994. *Ohitika Women*. New York: Grove Press.

Brave Bull Allard, Ladonna. 2016. "Why the Founder of Standing Rock Sioux Camp Can't Forget the Whitestone Massacre." *Yes! Magazine*. Retrieved January 27, 2017 (<https://www.yesmagazine.org/people-power/why-the-founder-of-standing-rock-sioux-camp-cant-forget-the-whitestone-massacre-20160903>).

Brown, Alleen. 2019. "A Lakota Historian on What Climate Organizers Can Learn from Two Centuries of Indigenous Resistance." *The Intercept*. Retrieved March 11, 2019 (<https://theintercept.com/2019/03/07/nick-estes-our-history-is-the-future-indigenous-resistance/>).

Buechel, Eugene. 1970. *Lakota-English Dictionary*. Vermillion: Institute of Indian Studies.

Burnette, Robert and John Koster. 1974. *The Road to Wounded Knee*. New York: Bantam Books.

Butler, Judith. 1999. *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, Judith. 2002. "Is Kinship Always Already Heterosexual." *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 13(1):14-42.

Camp, Carter. 2007. "Sergeant at Arms, AIM."

Camp, Carter. 2011. "AIM Sergeant at Arms."

Cetan hunka. 2009. "Lakota Activist and Teacher."

Champagne, Duane. 2007. *Social Change and Cultural Continuity among Native Nations*. New York: Altamira Press.

Chanka hdo. 2010. "Female Elder Pineridge Reservation."

Charles, Mark. 2017. "The Hanging of the Dakota 38 and the Troubling Legacy of President Lincoln." *Native News Online*. Retrieved December 26, 2017 (<https://nativenewsonline.net/opinion/hanging-dakota-38-troubling-legacy-president-lincoln/>).

Chipps, Charles. 2010. "Oglala Lakota Medicine Man."

Chipps, Victoria. 2009. "Oglala Medicine Woman."

Churchill, Ward. 2002. *Struggle for Land*. Monroe: Common Courage Press.

Churchill, Ward, and Jim Vander Wall. 2002. *The COINTELPRO Papers: Documents from the FBI's Secret War against Dissent in the United States*. Cambridge: South End Press.

City University of New York Brooklyn College Department of English. 2009.

"Introduction to the Renaissance." *City University of New York Department of English*. Retrieved March 26, 2019 (<http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/english/melani/cs6/ren.html>).

Cobb, Daniel M. 2008. *Native Activism in Cold War America: The Struggle for Sovereignty*. Lawrence: The University Press of Kansas.

Colbert, Levi. 1826. "Plea from the Chickasaw." *Journal of Chickasaw Council (American State Papers, Indian Affairs)* 2.

Comes with Thunder. 2011. "AIM Foot Soldier."

Conger, Beasley. 1991. *E Magazine*. Retrieved October 13, 2008
(<https://emagazine.com/?s=beasley+conger>).

Cornell, Stephen. 1990. *The Return of the Native: American Indian Political Resurgence*.
New York: Oxford University Press.

Cornell, Stephen, and Joseph Kalt. 1988. *Assessing the Causes and Consequences of
Economic Development on American Indian Reservations*. Cambridge: The Harvard Project on
American Indian Economic Development.

Courlander, Harold. 1978. *Big Falling Snow: A Tewa-Hopi Indian's Life and Time and
the History and Traditions of his People*. New York: Crown Publishers.

CrowDog, Leonard. 2007. "Lakota Spiritual Leader."

CrowDog, Leonard. 2011. "Spiritual Leader of AIM."

CrowDog, Leonard. 2012. "AIM Spiritual Leader."

CrowDog, Leonard. 2016. "AIM Activist Leader."

CrowDog, Leonard. 2017. "Lakota Medicine Man."

CrowDog, Mary. 1990. *Lakota Woman*. New York: Harper.

Della Porta, Donatella. 1996. "Social Movements And The State: Thoughts on the
Policing of Protest." in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities,
Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* edited by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy and
Mayer N. Zald. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeLoria Jr., Vine. 1973. *God Is Red*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap.

DeLoria Jr., Vine. 1974. *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties*. New York: Delacorte Press.

- Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. 2014. *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Duneier, Mitch. 2000. *Sidewalk*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Durham, Jimmie. 1987. "Those Dead Guys for a Hundred Years." Pp. 155-166 in *I Tell You Now: Autobiographical Essays by Native American Writers* edited by Brian Swan and Arnold Krupat. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Elbein, Saul. 2017. "These Are the Defiant "Water Protectors" Of Standing Rock." *National Geographic*. Retrieved January 27, 2017 (<https://news.nationalgeographic.com/2017/01/tribes-standing-rock-dakota-access-pipeline-advancement/>).
- Emery, Marge. 1981. "Indian women's groups." *Indian Truth*. (May-June): 23-26.
- Feagin, Joe. 2006. *Systemic Racism*. New York: Routledge.
- Feagin, Joe, and Kimberley Ducey. 2017. *Elite White Men Ruling: Who, What, When, Where, and How*. New York: Routledge.
- Feagin, Joe. 2013. *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing*. New York: Routledge.
- Feagin, Joe, and Harlan Hahn. 1973. *Ghetto Revolts: The Politics of Violence in American Cities*. New York: Macmillan.
- Feagin, Joe, and Hernan Vera. 2014. *Liberation Sociology*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Ferree, Myra Marx. 2005. "Soft Repression: Ridicule, Stigma, and Silencing in Gender-Based Movements." Pp. 138-158 in *Mobilization and Repression* edited by Hank Johnston, Carol Mueller and Christian Davenport. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fine, Gary Alan. 1995. "Public Narration and Group Culture: Discerning Discourse in Social Movements." Pp. 127-143 in *Social Movements and Culture* edited by Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fire, John, and Richard Erdoes. 1972. *Lame Deer, Seeker of Visions*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Foot Soldier. 2016. "AIM Leader and Standing Rock Activist."

Fortunate Eagle, Adam. 1992. *Alcatraz! Alcatraz! The Indian Occupation of 1969-1971*. Berkeley: Heyday Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. New York: Pantheon.

Fusion. 2016. *Dakota Access Pipeline: Protectors Not Protesters*. Retrieved October 17, 2017 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U8Uwo6ZAEG4>).

Fuss, Diana. 1989. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism Nature and Difference*. New York: Routledge.

Gamson, Joshua. 1997. "Messages of Exclusion: Gender, Movements, and Symbolic Boundaries." *Gender & Society* 11(2):178-199.

Gonzales, Tirso, and Melissa Nelson. 2001. "Contemporary Native American Responses to Environmental Threats in Indian Country." Pp. 512-539 in *Indigenous Traditions and Ecology* edited by John A. Grim. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Goodman, Amy. 2016. "Native American Activist Winona Laduke at Standing Rock: It's Time to Move on from Fossil Fuels." *Democracy Now!* Retrieved January 22, 2017 (https://www.democracynow.org/2016/9/12/native_american_activist_winona_laduke_at).

Goodwin, Jeff and James Jasper. 2004. "Caught in a Winding, Snarling Vine." Pp. 3-30 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotion* edited by Jeff Goodwin and James Jasper. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Greeley, Horace. 2006. *The American Conflict: A History of the Great Rebellion*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Groves, Julian M. 2001. "Animal Rights and the Politics of Emotion: Folk Constructs of Emotions in the Animal Rights Movement." Pp. 212-229 in *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements* edited by J. Goodwin, J. Jasper and F. Polletta. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Guerrero, Jaimes. 2003. "Colonialism and Indigenism: Implications for Native Feminist Spirituality and Native Womanism." *Hypatia* 18(2):57-81.

Ha hin hda. 2017. "Water Protector Organizer."

Hall, Thomas D. and James V. Fenelon. 2009. *Indigenous Peoples and Globalization: Resistance and Revitalization*. Boulder: Paradigm Press.

Haraway, Donna. 1989. *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science*. New York: Routledge.

Haraway, Donna. 2003. *The Haraway Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Harjo, Joy, and Gloria Bird. 1998. *Reinventing the Enemy's Language*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Hendricks, Steve. 2006. *The Unquiet Grave: The FBI and the Struggle for the Soul of Indian Country*. New York: Avalon Publishing.

Hennessey, Frank. 1996. "Wounded Knee Legal Defense/Offense Committee Records."

Ho tan inku. 2017. "Shawnee Water Protector."

Hudson, Angela Pulley. 2006. "Elias Boudinot and Cherokee Removal." Pp. 50-68 in *American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance* edited by Ernest Stromberg. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Hulan, Renee, and Renate Eigenbrod. 2008. *Aboriginal Oral Traditions: Theory, Practice, Ethics*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Indian Law Resource Center. 2016. "Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Takes #NODAPL to the United Nations." *Indian Law*. Retrieved October 9, 2018 (<https://indianlaw.org/undrip/Standing-Rock-Sioux-Tribe-Takes-NODAPL-to-the-United-Nations>).

International Indian Treaty Council. 1974. "Declaration of Continuing Independence by the First International Indian Treaty Council at Standing Rock Indian Country." *International Indian Treaty Council*. Retrieved October 25, 2018 (<https://www.iitc.org/about-iitc/the-declaration-of-continuing-independence-june-1974/>).

Irigaray, Luce. 1977. *The Sex Which Is Not One*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Jacket, Red. 1845. "We Never Quarrel about Religion." in *Indian Biography*, edited by B. B. Thatcher. New York: J & J Harper.

Jackson, Helen Hunt. 1893. *A Century of Dishonor*. Boston: Roberts Brothers.

Jaimes, Annette. 1992. *American Indian Women: Center of Indigenous Resistance*. Boston: South End Press.

Jasper, James M. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jasper, James M. 1998. "The Emotions of Protest: Affective and Reactive Emotions in and around Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 13:397-424.

Jasper, James M., and Dorothy Nelkin. 1992. *The Animal Rights Crusade: The Growth of a Moral Protest*. New York: The Free Press.

Jenkins, Jack. 2016. "The Growing Indigenous Spiritual Movement That Could Save the Planet." *Think Progress*. Retrieved January 22, 2017 (<https://thinkprogress.org/indigenous-spiritual-movement-8f873348a2f5/>).

Johnson, Hank, and Paul Almeida. 2006. *Latin American Social Movements: Globalization, Democratization, and Transnational Networks*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Johnson, Troy. 1996. *The Occupation of Alcatraz Island*. Chicago: University of Illinois.

Johnson, Troy, Joanne Nagel, and Duane Champagne. 1997. *American Indian Activism: Alcatraz to the Longest Walk*. Chicago: University of Illinois.

Jones, Sandra J. 2003. "Complex Subjectivities: Class, Ethnicity, and Race in Women's Narratives of Upward Mobility." *Journal of Social Sciences* 59(4):803-821.

Joseph, Chief. 1876. "We Are Not Children."

Joseph, Alvin. 1971. *Red Power: The American Indians Fight for Freedom*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Katchongva, Dan. 1957. "He Will Use Any Means to Get What He Wants." in *The Great Resistance: A Hopi Anthology*, George Yamada. Ed. Privately Printed.

Katz, Jane. 1995. *Messengers of the Wind*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Kehoe, Alice Beck. 1989. *The Ghost Dance: The Ethnohistory and Revitalization*. Washington, D. C.: Thompson Publishing.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. 2001. "Gender And Science Updated." Pp. 75-87 in *Women, Science and Technology* edited by Mary Wyr. New York: Routledge.

Klein, Laura F. and Lillian A. Ackerman. 1995. *Women and Power in Native North America*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Koopmans, Ruud. 2004. "Political Opportunity Structure." Pp. 61-73 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotion* edited by Jeff Goodwin and James Jasper. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kurzman, Charles. 2004. "The Poststructuralist Consensus in Social Movement Theory." Pp. 111-120 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotion* edited by Jeff Goodwin and James M. Jaspered. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

LaDuke, Winona. 1999. *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land And Life*. Cambridge: South End Press.

LaDuke, Winona. 1992. "Indigenous Environmental Perspectives." *Akweskan Journal* Summer: 52-71.

Lambert, Valerie. 2007. "Political Protest, Conflict, and Tribal Nationalism: The Oklahoma Choctaws and the Termination Crisis of 1959-1970." *American Indian Quarterly* 31(2):289-309.

Langston, Donna Hightower. 2006. "American Indian Women's Activism in the 1960s and 1970s." *Indybay*. Retrieved October 3, 2018 (<https://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2006/03/21/18095451.php>).

Largo-Anderson, Yitazba. 2017. "Spiritual Essentialism at Standing Rock." *Hollins Digital Commons*. Retrieved October 29, 2018 (<http://digitalcommons.hollins.edu/researchawards/37>).

Loew, Patty. 2017. "We Are the Seventh Generation: A Conversation with Winona LaDuke." *Edge Effects*. Retrieved December 13, 2017 (<http://edgeeffects.net/winona-laduke/>).

- Maka te najin. 2017. "AIM and Water Protector Activist."
- Malinowski, Sharon. 1995. *Notable Native Americans*. New York: Gale Group.
- Matthiessen, Peter. 1983. *in the Spirit of Crazy Horse*. New York: Viking.
- May, Charlie. 2016. "'We Beg for Your Forgiveness': Veterans Join Native Elders in Celebration Ceremony." *Salon*. Retrieved November 6, 2016 ([http://www.salon.com/2016/11/06/we_beg_for_your_forgiveness': Veterans join Native elders in celebration ceremony\)](http://www.salon.com/2016/11/06/we_beg_for_your_forgiveness_veterans_join_native_elders_in_celebration_ceremony/)).
- McAdam, Douglas. 1999. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency 1930-1970*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Means, Russell. 2011. "AIM Activist Leader."
- Means, Russell. 2007. "AIM Leader."
- Means, Russell. 1980. "For America to Live, Europe Must Die."
- Means, Russell, and Marvin J. Wolf. 1995. *Where White Men Fear to Tread: The Autobiography of Russell Means*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- Medicine, Bea. 1978. *The Native American Woman: A Perspective*. Las Cruces: National Educational Laboratory Publishers.
- Meyer, David. 2004. "Tending the Vineyard" Pp. 53 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotion* edited by Jeff Goodwin and James Jasper. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Meyer, David S., and Nancy Whittier. 1994. "Social Movement Spillover." *Social Problems* 41(2):277-298.
- Mohawk Nation. 1974. "Trail of Broken Treaties." *Akwesasne Notes*.

Moore, Kelly. 1999. "Political Protest and Institutional Change: The Anti-Vietnam War Movement and American Science." Pp. 271-292 in *How Social Movements Matter* edited by M. Giugni, D. McAdam and C. Tilly. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Morgan, Rhiannon. 2007. "On Political Institutions and Social Movement Dynamics: The Case of the United Nations and the Global Indigenous Movement." *International Political Science Review* 28(3):273-292.

Nabokov, Peter. 1978. *Native American Testimony*. New York: Penguin Group.

Nagel, Joanne. 1995. "American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Politics and the Resurgence of Identity." *American Sociological Review* 60(6):947-965.

Neil, Michael. 1996. "Torch Bearer Fights Dumping of Nuclear Waste on Tribal Lands." *People Weekly*, 73-74.

Nepstad, Sharon and Christian Smith. 2001. "Moral Outrage and the U.S. Central American Peace Movement." Pp. in *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements* edited by J. Goodwin, J. Jasper and F. Polletta. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Norrell, Brenda. 2010. "The Women of AIM." *CounterPunch*. Retrieved January 17, 2011 (<https://www.counterpunch.org/2010/11/26/the-women-of-aim/>).

O'Connell, Barry. 1992. *The Complete Writings of William Apess, A Pequot*. Amherst: U. of Massachusetts.

Ohoyo. 1981. "Words of Today's American Indian Woman."

Oleson, Thomas. 2005. *International Zapatism: The Construction of Solidarity in the Age of Globalization*. London: Zed Books.

Olson, James. 1984. *Native Americans in the Twentieth Century*. Chicago: University of Illinois.

- Ong, Walter. 2002. *Orality and Literacy*. New York: Routledge.
- Oyate tonwan. 2010. "Hopi Farmer."
- Payne, Diane. 1994. "Each of My Generation." *Indian Truth*, 5-7.
- Peltier, Leonard. 1999. *Prison Writings*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Polletta, Francesca. 2004. "Culture is Not Just in Your Head." Pp. 97-110 in *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning, and Emotion* edited by Jeff Goodwin and James Jasper. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Polletta, Francesca. 2006. *It Was Like a Fever: Storytelling in Protest and Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Price, David. 1998. *The Second Civil War*. St. Paul: Second Source.
- Ratcliffe, Daniel. 2016. "John Trudell: What It Means To Be a Human Being – Hidden History Center." *Hidden History Center*. Retrieved September 12, 2016 (<https://hiddenhistorycenter.org/john-trudell-what-it-means-to-be-a-human-being/>).
- Rich, Elizabeth. 2004. "Remember Wounded Knee: AIM's Use of Metonymy in 21st Century Protest." *College Literature* 31(3):70-91.
- Ringmar, Erik. 1996. *Identity, Interest and Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, Lindsay G. 2005. *Conquest By Law: How the Discovery of America Dispossessed Indigenous People of Their Land*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Saint-Marie, Buffy. 2017. "Buffy Sainte-Marie's Highly Anticipated Brand New Album Power in the Blood Is Available in Stores Now!" *Buffysainte-marie.com*. Retrieved December 17, 2017 (<http://buffysainte-marie.com/>).

Sanders, Douglas. 1980. "United Nations World Council of Indigenous People." *United Nation World Council of Indigenous People*. Retrieved October 14, 2014

(<http://www.un.wcip.org>).

Sayer, John William. 1997. *Ghost Dancing the Law*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Shoemaker, Nancy. 1995. *Negotiators of change*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, Andrea. 1997. "Ecofeminism through an Anticolonial Framework." Pp. 26-37 in *Ecofeminism* edited by Karen Warren. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Smith, Andrea. 2005. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Boston: South End Press.

Smith, Paul, and Robert Allen Warrior. 1997. *Like A Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*. New York: The New Press.

Snow, David. 2004. "Social Movements as Challenges to Authority: Resistance to an Emerging Conceptual Hegemony." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 25:3-25.

Snow, David, and Robert Benford. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance and Participant Mobilization." *International Social Movement Research* 1:197-217.

Speck, Frank Gouldsmith. 1915. *Basis of American Indian Ownership of the Land*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Spivak, Gayatri. 1987. *Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography*. New York: Routledge.

Standing Bear, Luther. 1928. *My People, The Sioux*. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin and Riverside Press.

Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. 2019. *Stand With Standing Rock*. Retrieved February 10, 2017 (<https://standwithstandingrock.net/>).

Stern, Kenneth. 1994. *Loud Hawk: The United States versus the American Indian Movement*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Stromberg, Ernest. 2006. *American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Tallman, Valerie. 1991. "Tribes Speak out on Toxic Assault." *Lakota Times*, 17-20.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney G. 1983. *Struggling to Reform: Social Movements and Policy Change During Cycles of Protest*. Ithaca: Center for International Studies, Cornell University Press.

Taylor, Verta. 1989. "Social Movement Continuity: The Women's Movement in Abeyance." *American Sociological Review* 54(5):761-776.

Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Tomkin, Merle. 1981. "Listening To Native America Women." *Heresies* 13(4.1):17-21.

Trudell, John. 2001. "Address In Honor of the U'wa Resistance in Colombia."

Trudell, John. 2009. "Poet and AIM Leader."

Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People*. London: Zed Books.

VanDevelder, Paul. 1998. "A Coyote for All Seasons." *Native Peoples*.

Vizenor, Gerald. 1989. *Narrative Chance: Postmodern Discourse on Native American Indian Literatures*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Wagner, Sally. 2001. *Sisters in Spirit: Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Influences on Early American Feminists*. Summerton, TN: Native Voices Book Publishing.

Wakinyan na 2010. "Cheyenne AIM Activist."

Weyler, Rex. 1982. *Blood of the Land: The Government and Corporate War against the American Indian Movement*. New York: Everest House.

Williams, Robert. 2005. *Like A Loaded Weapon: The Rehnquist Court, Legal Rights and the Legal History of Racism in America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Williams, Samuel C. 1930. *Adair's History of the American Indians*. Johnson City: The Wautaga Press.

Wilson, Shawn. 2008. *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Canada: Fernwood Publishing.

Winant, Howard. 2002. *The World Is a Ghetto*. New York: Basic Books.

Winton, Ben. 1999. "Alcatraz Changed Everything." *News from Indian Country*, 8-11.

Wittstock, Laura Waterman, and Elaine J. Salinas. 2015. "A Brief History of the American Indian Movement." *American Indian Movement Interpretive Center*. Retrieved October 17, 2015 (<http://www.aim-ic.org/history-aim>).

Younging, Gregory. 2018. *Elements of Indigenous Style: A Guide for Writing by and About Indigenous Peoples*. Canada: Brush Education.

Ziad, Munson W. 2008. *The Making Of Pro-Life Activists: How Social Movement Mobilization Works*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX

4/30/2019

Trail of Broken Treaties 20-Point Position Paper - An Indian Manifesto



PREAMBLE TO TRAIL OF BROKEN TREATIES 20-POINT POSITION PAPER

TRAIL OF BROKEN TREATIES 20-POINT POSITION PAPER

We want to have a new **RELATIONSHIP** with you...an **HONEST** one!

OUR **20 POINT** PROPOSAL

October 1972, Minneapolis, Minnesota

**"TRAIL OF BROKEN TREATIES": FOR RENEWAL OF CONTRACTS-
RECONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN COMMUNITIES & SECURING AN INDIAN FUTURE IN
AMERICA!**

1. RESTORATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL TREATY-MAKING AUTHORITY:

The U.S. President should propose by executive message, and the Congress should consider and enact legislation, to repeal the provision in the 1871 Indian Appropriations Act which withdrew federal recognition from Indian Tribes and Nations as political entities, which could be contracted by treaties with the United States, in order that the President may resume the exercise of his full constitutional authority for acting in the matters of Indian Affairs - and in order that Indian Nations may represent their own interests in the manner and method envisioned and provided in the Federal Constitution.

2. ESTABLISHMENT OF TREATY COMMISSION TO MAKE NEW TREATIES:

The President should impanel and the Congress establish, with next year, a Treaty Commission to contract a security and assistance treaty of treaties, with Indian people to negotiate a national commitment to the future of Indian people for the last quarter of the Twentieth Century. Authority should be granted to allow tribes to contract by separate and individual treaty, multi-tribal or regional groupings or national collective, respecting general or limited subject matter..and provide that no provisions of existing treaty agreements may be withdrawn or in any manner affected without the explicit consent and agreement of any particularly related Indian Nation.

3. AN ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE & JOINT SESSSIONS OF CONGRESS:

The President and the leadership of Congress should make a commitment now and next January to request and arrange for four Native Americans - selected by Indian people at a future date - and the President of the United States and any designated U.S. Senators and Representatives to address a joint session of Congress and the American people through national communications media regarding the Indian future within the American Nation, and relationships between the Federal Government and Indian Nations - on or before June 2, 1974, the first half century anniversary of the 1924 "Indian Citizenship Act."

4. COMMISSION TO REVIEW TREATY COMMITMENTS & VIOLATIONS:

The President should immediately create a multi-lateral, Indian and non-Indian Commission to review domestic treaty commitments and complaints of chronic violations and to recommend or act for corrective actions including the imposition of mandatory sanctions or interim restraints upon violative activities, and including formulation of legislation designed to protect the jeopardized Indian rights and eliminate the unending patterns of prohibitively complex lawsuits and legal defenses --which habitually have produced indecisive and interment results, only too frequently forming guidelines for more court battles, or additional challenges and attacks against Indian rights. (Indians have paid attorneys and lawyers more than \$40,000,000 since 1962. Yet many Indian people are virtually imprisoned in the nation's courtrooms in being forced constantly to defend their rights, while many tribes are forced to maintain a multitude of suits in numerous jurisdictions relating to the same or a single issue, or a few similar issues. There is less need for more attorney assurances than there is for institution of protections that reduce violations and minimize the possibilities for attacks upon Indian rights).

5. RESUBMISSION OF UNRATIFIED TREATIES TO THE SENATE:

The President should resubmit to the U.S. Senate of the next Congress those treaties negotiated with Indian nations or their representatives, but never heretofore ratified nor rendered moot by subsequent treaty contract with such Indians not having ratified treaties with the United States. The primary purpose to be served shall be that of restoring the rule of law to the relationships between such Indians and the United States, and resuming a recognition of rights controlled by treaty relations where the failure to ratify prior treaties operated to affirm the cessions and loss of title to Indian lands and territory, but failed to secure and protect the reservations of lands, rights, and resources reserved against cession, relinquishment, or loss, the Senate should adopt resolutions certifying that a prior de facto ratification has been affected by the Government of the United States, and direct that appropriate actions be undertaken to restore to such Indians an equitable measure of their reserved rights and ownership in lands, resources, and rights of self-government. Additionally, the President and the Congress should direct that reports be concluded upon the disposition of land rights and land title which were lawfully vested or held, for people of Native Indian blood under the 1840 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo with Mexico.

6. ALL INDIANS TO BE GOVERNED BY TREATY RELATIONS:

The Congress should enact a Joint Resolution declaring that as a matter of public policy and good faith, all Indian people in the United States shall be considered to be in treaty relations with the Federal Government and governed by doctrines of such relationship.

7. MANDATORY RELIEF AGAINST TREATY RIGHTS VIOLATIONS:

The Congress should add a new section to Title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the judicial enforcement and protection of Indian Treaty Rights. Such section should direct that upon petition of any Indian Tribe or prescribed Indian groups and Individuals claiming substantial injury to, or interference in the equitable and good faith exercise of any rights, governing authority or utilization and preservation of resources, secured by Treaty, mandatorily the Federal District courts shall grant immediate enjoinder or injunctive relief against any non-Indian party or defendants, including State governments and their subdivisions or officers, alleged to be engaged in such injurious actions, until such time as the District U.S. Court may be reasonably satisfied that a Treaty Violation is not being committed, or otherwise satisfied that the Indians' interests and rights, in equity and in law, are preserved and protected from jeopardy and secure from harm.

8. JUDICIAL RECOGNITION OF INDIAN RIGHT TO INTERPRET TREATIES:

The Congress should by law provide for a new system of federal court jurisdiction and procedure, when Indian treaty or governmental rights are at issue, and when there are non-Indian parties involved in the controversy, whereby an Indian Tribe or Indian party may by motion advance the case from a federal District Court for hearing, and decision by the related U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. The law should provide that, once an Interpretation upon the matter has been rendered by either a federal district or circuit court an Indian Nation may, on its own behalf or on behalf of any of its members, if dissatisfied with the federal court ruling or regarding it in error respecting treaty or tribal rights, certify directly to the United States Supreme Court a "Declaratory Judgment of Interpretation", regarding the contested rights and drawn at the direction or under the auspices of the affected Indian Nation, which that Court shall be mandated to receive with the contested decision for hearing and final judgment and resolution of the controversy - except and unless that any new treaties which might be contracted may provide for some other impartial body for making ultimate and final interpretations of treaty provisions and their application. In addition, the law should provide that an Indian Nation, to protect its exercise of rights or the exercise of treaty or tribal rights by its members, or when engaging in new activities based upon sovereign or treaty rights, may issue an interim "Declaratory Opinion on Interpretation of Rights", which shall be controlling upon the exercise of police powers or administrative authorities of that Indian Nation, the United States or any State(s), unless or until successfully challenged or modified upon certification to and decision by the United States Supreme Court - and not withstanding any contrary U.S. Attorney General's opinion(s)...solicitor's opinion(s), or Attorney General's Opinion(s) of any of the States.

9. CREATION OF CONGRESSIONAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON RECONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN RELATIONS:

The next Congress of the United States, and its respective houses, should agree at its outset and in its organization to withdraw jurisdiction over Indian Affairs and Indian-related program authorizations from all existing Committees except Appropriations of the House and Senate, and create a Joint House-Senate "Committee on Reconstruction of Indian Relations and Programs" to assume such jurisdiction and responsibilities for recommending new legislation and program authorizations to both houses of Congress - including consideration and action upon all proposals presented herewith by the "Trail of Broken Treaties Caravan," as well as matters from other sources. The Joint Committee membership should consist of Senators and Representatives who would be willing to commit considerable amounts of time and labors and conscientious thought to an exhaustive review and examining evaluation of past and present policies, program and practices of the Federal Government relating to Indian people, to the development of a comprehensive broadly-inclusive "American Indian Community Reconstruction Act", which shall provide for certain of the measures herein proposed, repeal numerous laws which have oppressively disallowed the existence of a viable "Indian Life" in this country, and affect the purposes while constructing the provisions which shall allow and ensure a secure Indian future in America.

10. LAND REFORM AND RESTORATION OF A 110-MILLION ACRE NATIVE LAND BASE:

The next Congress and Administration should commit themselves and effect a national commitment implemented by statutes or executive and administrative actions, to restore a permanent non-diminishing Native American land base of not less than 110-million acres by July 4, 1976. This land base and its separate parts, should be vested with the recognized rights and conditions of being perpetually non-taxable except by autonomous and sovereign Indian authority, and should never again be permitted to be alienated from Native American or Indian ownership and control.

A. Priorities In Restoration of the Native American Land Base:

When Congress acted to delimit the President's authority and the Indian Nations' powers for making treaties in 1871, approximately 135,000,000 acres of land and territory had been secured to Indian ownership against cession or relinquishment. This acreage did not include the 1867 treaty-secured recognition of land title and rights of Alaskan Natives, nor millions of acres otherwise retained by Indians in what were to become "unrelated" treaties of Indian land cession as in California; nor other land areas authorized to be set aside for Indian Nations contracted by, but never benefiting from their treaties. When the Congress, in 1887, under the General Allotment Act and other measures of the period and "single

system of legislation," delegated treaty-assigned Presidential responsibilities to the Secretary of the Interior and his Commissioner of Indian Affairs and agents in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, relating to the government of Indian relations under the treaties for the 135 million acres, collectively held, immediately became subject to loss. The 1887 Act provided for the sale of "surplus" Indian lands - and contained a formula for the assignment or allocation of land tracts to Indian individuals, dependent partly on family size, which would have allowed an average-sized allotment of 135 acres to one million Indians - at a time when the number of tribally-related Indians was less than a quarter million or fewer than 200,000. The Interior Department efficiently managed the loss of 100-million acres of Indian land, and its transfer to non-Indian ownership (frequently by homestead, not direct purchase- in little more than the next quarter century. When Congress prohibited further allotments to Indian individuals, by its 1934 Indian Reorganization Act, it effectively determined that future generations of Indian people would be "land-less Indians" except by hiership and inheritance. (110-million acres, including 40-million acres in Alaska, would approximate an average 135 acres multiplied by .8 million Native Americans, a number indicated by the 1970 U.S. Census. Simple justice would seem to demand that priorities in restorations of land bases be granted to those Indian Nations who are land-less by fault of unratified or unfulfilled treaty provisions; Indian Nations, land-less because of congressional and administrative actions reflective of criminal abuse of trust responsibilities; and other groupings of land-less Indians, particularly of the land-less generations, including many urban Indians and non-reservation Indian people - many of whom have been forced to pay in forms of deprivation, loss of rights and entitlements, and other extreme costs upon their lives, an "emigration-migration-education-training" tax for their unfulfilled pursuit of opportunity in America - a "tax" as unwarranted and unjustified as it is unprecedented in the history of human rights mature nations possessed of a modern conscience.

B. Consolidation of Indians' Land, Water, Natural and Economic Resources:

The restoration of an equitable Native American Land Base should be accompanied by enlightened revision in the present character of alleged "trust relationships and by reaffirmation of that creative and positive characters of Indian sovereignty and sovereign rights. The past pattern of treating "trust status" as wrongful "non-ownership" of properties beyond control of individual interests and "owners," could be converted to a beneficial method of consolidating useable land, water, forests, fisheries, and other exploitable and renewable natural resources into productive economic, cultural, or other community-purpose units, benefiting both individual and tribal interests in direct forms under autonomous control of properly-defined, appropriate levels of Indian government. For example, the 13.5 million acres of multiple and fractionated hiership lands should not represent a collective denial of beneficial ownership and interests of inheriting individuals, but be considered for plans of collective and consolidated use. (The alternatives and complexities of this subject and its discussion require the issuance of a separate essay at a later date.)

C. Termination of Losses and Condemnation of Non-Indian Land Title:

Most short-term and long term leases of some four million acres of Indians' agricultural and industrial-use lands represent a constant pattern of mismanagement of trust responsibilities with the federal trustees knowingly and willfully administering properties in methods and terms which are adverse or inimical to the interests of the Indian beneficiaries and their tribes. Non-Indians have benefit of the best of Indian agricultural range and dry farm lands, and of some irrigation systems, generally having the lowest investment/highest return ratios, while Indians are relegated to lands requiring high investments/low returns. A large-scale, if selective, program of lease cancellations and non-renewals should be instituted under Congressional authorization as quickly as possible. As well, Indian Tribes should be authorized to re-secure Indian ownership of alienated lands within reservation boundaries under a system of condemnation for national policy purposes, with the federal government bearing the basic costs of "just compensation" as burden for unjustified betrayals of its trust responsibilities to Indian people. These actions would no way be as extreme as the termination, nationalization, confiscation and sale of millions of acres of reservation land by a single measure as in the cases of the Menominee and Klamath Indian Tribes, and attempted repeatedly with the Colvilles.

D. Repeal of the Menominee, Klamath, and Other Termination Acts:

The Congress should act immediately to repeal the Termination Acts of the 1950s and 1960s and restore ownership of the several million acres of land to the Indian people involved, perpetually non-alienable and tax-exempt. The Indians rights to autonomous self-government and sovereign control of their resources and development should be reinstated. Repeal of the terminal legislation would also advance a commitment towards a collective 110-million acre land base for Native Americans - when added to the near 55-million acres already held by Indians, apart from the additional 40-million acres allocated in Alaska. (The impact of termination and its various forms have never been understood fully by the American people, the Congress, and many Indian people. Few wars between nations have ever accomplished as much as the total dispossession of a people of their rights and resources as have the total victories and total surrenders legislated by the Termination Laws. If the Arab States of the present Mid-East could comparably presume the same authority over the State of Israel, they could eliminate Israel by the purchase or by declaring it an Arab State or subdivision thereof, on the one hand, evicting the Israelis from the newly-acquired Arab lands, or on the other, allowing the Israelis to remain as part of the larger Arab Nation and justify the disposition to the world by the claim that, whether leaving or remaining, but without their nation, the Jewish people would still be Jewish. Such an unacceptable outrage to American people would quickly succeed to World War III - except when such actions are factually taken against Menominees, Klamaths, Senecas, Utes, and threatened against many other landed nations of Indian people.

11. REVISION OF 25 U.S.C. 163; RESTORATION OF RIGHTS TO INDIANS TERMINATED BY ENROLLMENT AND REVOCATION OF PROHIBITIONS AGAINST "DUAL BENEFITS":

The Congress should enact measures fully in support of the doctrine that an Indian Nation has complete power to govern and control its own membership - but eradicating the extortive and coercive devices in federal policy and programming which have subverted and denied the natural human relationships and natural development of Indian communities, and committed countless injuries upon Indian families and individuals. The general prohibition against benefiting dually from federal assistance or tribal resources by having membership or maintaining relationships in more than one Indian Tribe has frequently resulted in denial of rights and benefits from any sources. Blood quantum criteria, closed and restrictive enrollment, and "dual benefits prohibitions" have generated minimal problems for Indians having successive non-Indian parentage involved in their ancestry - while creating vast problems and complexities for full-blood and predominant Indian blood persons, when ancestry or current relationships involve two separate Indian tribes, or more. Full-blood Indians can fail to qualify for membership in any of several tribes to which they may be directly related if quantum-relationships happen to be in wrong configuration, or non-qualifying fractions. Families have been divided to be partly included upon enrollments, while some children of the same parents are wrongly (if there are at all to be enrollments) excluded. There should be a restoration of Indian and tribal rights to all individual Indians who have been victimized and deprived by the vicious forms of termination effected by forced choices between multiply-related Tribes, abusive application of blood-quantum criteria, and federally-engineered and federally-approved enrollments. The right of Indian persons to maintain, sever, or resume valid relations with several Indian Nations or communities unto which they are born, or acquire relationships through natural marriage relations or parenthood and other customary forms, must again be recognized under law and practice and also the right of Indian Nations to receive other Indian people into relations with them --or to maintain relations with all their own people, without regard to blood-quantum criteria and federal standards for exclusion or restrictions upon benefits. (It may be recognized that the general Indian leadership has become conditioned to accept and give application to these forms of terminating rights, patterns which are an atrocious aberration from any concepts of Indian justice and sovereignty).

12. REPEAL OF STATE LAWS ENACTED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 280 (1953):

State enactment's under the authority conferred by the Congress In Public Law 280 has posed the most serious threat to Indian sovereignty and local self-government of any measure in recent decades. Congress must now nullify those State statutes. Represented as a "law enforcement" measure, PL280 robs Indian communities of the core of their governing authority and operates to convert reservation areas into refuges from responsibilities, where many people, not restricted by race, can take full advantage of a veritable

vacuum of controlling law, or law which commands its first respect for justice by encouraging an absence of offenses. These States' acceptance of condition for their own statehood in their Enabling Acts - that they forever disclaim sovereignty and jurisdiction over Indian lands and Indian people - should be binding upon them and that restrictive condition upon their sovereignty be reinstated. They should not be permitted further to gain from the conflict of interest engaged by such States' participation in enactment of Public Law 280 -- at the expense of the future of Indian people in their own communities, as well as our present welfare and well-being.

13. RESUME FEDERAL PROTECTIVE JURISDICTION FOR OFFENSES AGAINST INDIANS:

The Congress should enact, the Administration support and seek passage of, new provisions under Titles 18 and 25 of the U.S. Code, which shall extend the protective jurisdiction of the United States over Indian persons wherever situated in its territory and the territory of the several States, outside of Indian Reservations or Country, and provide the prescribed offenses of violence against Indian persons shall be federal crimes, punishable by prescribed penalties through prosecutions in the federal judiciary, and enforced in arrest actions by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Marshals, and other commissioned police agents of the United States - who shall be compelled to act upon the commission of such crimes, and upon any written complaint or sworn request alleging an offense, which by itself would be deemed probable cause for arresting actions.

A. Establishment of a National Federal Indian Grand Jury:

The Congress should establish a special national grand jury consisting solely of Indian members selected in part by the President and in part by Indian people, having a continuous life, and equipped with its own investigative and legal staff, and presided over by competent judicial officers, while vested with prescribed authorities of indictments to be prosecuted in the federal and Indian court systems. This grand jury should be granted jurisdiction to act in the bringing of indictments on basis of evidence and probable cause within any federal judicial district where a crime of violence has been committed against an Indian and resulting in an Indian's death, or resulting in bodily injury and involving lethal weapons or aggressive force, when finding reason to be not satisfied with handling or disposition of a case or incident by local authorities, and operating consistent with federal constitutional standards respecting rights of an accused. More broadly and generally, the grand jury should be granted broad authority to monitor the enforcement of law under Titles 18, 25, and 42, respecting Indian jurisdiction and civil rights protections; the administration of law enforcement; confinement facilities and juvenile detention centers, and judicial systems in Indian country; corrupt practices or violations of law in the administration of federal Indian agencies or of federally-funded programs for Indian people - including administration by tribal officials or tribal governmental units - and federal employees, and issue special reports bringing indictments when warranted, directed toward elimination of wrong-doing, wrongful administration or practices; and improvement recommendations for-systems to ensure proper services and benefits to communities, or Indian people.

B. Jurisdiction over Non-Indians Within Indian Reservations:

The Congress should eliminate the immunity of non-Indians to the general application of law and law enforcement within Reservation Boundaries, without regard to land or property title. Title 18 of the U.S. Code should be amended to clarify and compel that all persons within the originally-established boundaries of an Indian Reservation are subject to the laws of the sovereign Indian Nation in the exercise of its autonomous governing authority. A system of concurrent jurisdiction should be minimum requirement in incorporated towns.

C. Accelerated Rehabilitation and Release Program for State and Federal Indian Prisoners:

The Administration should immediately contract an appropriately staffed Commission of Review on Rehabilitation of Indian Prisoners in Federal and State institutions, funded from Safe Streets and Crime Control funds, or discretionary funds under control of the President, and consisting of Indian membership. The review commission would conduct census and survey of all Indian prisoners presently confined, compile information on records of offenses, sentences, actions of committing jurisdictions (courts, police, pre-sentence reports, probation and parole systems) and related pertinent data. The basic objective of the

review commission would be to arrange for the development of new systems of community treatment centers, or national/regional rehabilitation centers as alternatives to existing prison, situations; to work with Bureau of Prison and federal parole systems to arrange for accelerated rehabilitation and release programs as justified, and to give major attention to the reduction of offenses and recidivism in Indian communities. The commission would act to provide forms by which Indian people may assume the largest measures of responsibility in reversing the rapidly increasing crime rates on Indian reservations, and re-approaching situations where needs for jails and prisoner institutions may again be virtually eliminated. The Congress should provide appropriate authorizations in support of such effort - perhaps extending the protective jurisdiction of the United States over Indians in State institutions to provide for transfer to Indian operated rehabilitation and treatment centers, at least probation systems, in a bargain of responsibility for bringing about vast reduction in incidences of offenses among Indian communities. (The \$8,000,000 BIA budget for Law and Order is not directed toward such purpose - spending nearly half of its present increases on new cars to gauge the increases in reported offenses.)

Note on 13 - 13c:

The U.S. has asserted its jurisdiction over Indians nationwide, and may now do so again protectively. The Congress controlled liquor sales to Indians nationally until 1953, allowing prosecution for non-Indian offenders. Education of Indians in public state schools is essentially a contracting of jurisdiction to States.)

14. ABOLITION OF THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS BY 1976:

A New Structure: The Congress working through the proposed Senate-House "Joint Committee on Reconstruction of Indian Relations and Programs," in formulation of an Indian Community Reconstruction Act should direct that the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be abolished as an agency on or before July 4, 1976; to provide for an alternative structure of government for sustaining and revitalizing the Indian-federal relationship between the President and the Congress of the United States, respectively, and the respective Indian Nations and Indian people at last consistent with constitutional criteria, national treaty commitments, and Indian sovereignty, and provide for transformation and transition into the new system as rapidly as possible prior to abolition of the BIA.

15. CREATION OF AN "OFFICE OF FEDERAL INDIAN RELATIONS AND COMMUNITY RECONSTRUCTION:

The Bureau of Indian Affairs should be replaced by a new unit in the federal government which represents an equality of responsibility among and between the President, the Congress, and the Governments of the separate Indian Nations (or their respective people collectively), and equal standing in the control of relations between the Federal Government and Indian Nations. The following standards and conditions should be obtained:

A. The Office would structurally be placed in the Executive Offices of the President, but be directed by a tripartite Commission of three Commissioners; one being appointed by the President, one being appointed by the joint congressional committee, and one being selected by national election among Indian people, and all three requiring confirmation by the U.S. Senate.

B. The Office would be directly responsible to each the President, the Congress, and Indian people, represented by a newly-established National Indian Council of no more than twenty members selected by combination national and regional elections for two-year terms with half expiring each year.

C. All existing federal agencies and program units presently involved or primarily directed toward serving Indians would be consolidated under the office, together with the budget allocations of the Departments assisting Indians although primarily oriented toward other concerns. All programs would be reviewed for revision of form, or elimination altogether, or continuance.

D. A total personnel and employee structure ceiling of no more than 1,000 employees in all categories should be placed upon the new office for its first live years of operation. Employment in the new office would be exempt from Civil Service regulations and provisions. (The Civil Service Commission and federal employee unions should be requested to propose a plan for preference hiring in other agencies and

for transfer of benefits to new employment, for presentation to Congress, incident to abolition of the BIA and other Indian-related federal programs.)

E. The Office would maintain responsibility over its own budget and planning functions, independent from any control by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and should be authorized \$15,000,000,000 budget, reviewing the efficiency of the Office and the impact and progress of the programming. The Appropriations Committees should not impose undue interference in plans - but should insist upon equitable treatment of all Indian Nations and general Indian people who would not be denied their respective direct relations with the Congress, or with the President.

F. The office of Federal Indian Relations would assume the administrative responsibility as trustee of Indian properties and property rights until revision of the trust responsibility might be accomplished and delegated for administration as a function and expression of the sovereign authority of the respective Indian Nations.

16. PRIORITIES AND PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED NEW OFFICE:

The central purpose of the proposed "Office of Federal Indian Relations and Community Reconstruction" is to remedy the break-down in constitutionally-prescribed relationships between the United States and Indian Nations and people and to alleviate the destructive impact that distortion in those relationships has rendered upon the lives of Indian people. More directly, it is proposed for allowing broad attacks upon the multitude of millions of problems which confront Indian lives, or consume them, and which cannot be eliminated by piecemeal approaches, jerry-built structures, or bureaucracies, or by taking on one problem at a time, always to be confronted by many more. The Congress with assent of the Courts, has developed its constitutional mandate to "regulate Indian commerce" into a doctrine of absolute control and total power over the lives of Indians - through failing to give these concerns the time and attention that the responsibilities of such power demand. The Congress restricted the highest authority of the President for dealing with Indian matters and affairs, then abandoned Indian people to the lowest levels of bureaucratic government for administration of its part-time care and asserted all-powerful control. The constitution maintained Indian people in citizenship and allegiance to our own Nations, but the Congress and the Bureau of Indian Affairs has converted this constitutional standard into the most bastardized forms of acknowledged autonomy and "sovereign self-governing control" - scarcely worthy of the terms, if remaining divested of their meaning. A central priority of the proposed Office should be the formulation of legislation designed to repeal the body of "Indian Law that continues to operate most harmfully against Indian communities - including sections of the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act and prior legislation which instituted foreign forms of government upon our Nations, or which have served to divorce tribal government from responsibilities and accountability to Indian people. At this point in time, there is demonstrable need for the Congress to exercise highest responsibilities to Indian people in order that we might have a future in our homeland. This requires that Congress now recognize some restrictions upon its own authority to intervene in Indian communities and act to totally exclude the exercise of local tribal sovereignty and self-governing control. The proposed Office of Federal Indian Relations and Community Reconstruction should be authorized the greatest latitude to act and to remove restrictions from the positive actions of Indian people. This can be achieved if the Congress establishes a new Office in the manner proposed and authorizes it in promising degree to operate as instrumentality of its responsibilities.

17. INDIAN COMMERCE AND TAX IMMUNITIES:

The Congress should enact a statute or Joint Resolution certifying that trade, commerce, and transportation of Indians remain wholly outside the authority, control, and regulation of the several States. Congressional acts should provide that complete taxing authority upon properties, use of properties and incomes derived therefrom, and business activities within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations, as well as commerce between reservations and Indian Nations, shall be vested with the respective or related tribal governments, or their appropriate to subdivisions - or certify that consistent with the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 2 statehood enabling acts, prevailing treaty commitments, and the general policy of the United States, that total Indian immunity to taxing authority of states is reaffirmed and extended with uniformity to all Indian Nations as a matter/established or vested right. (These questions

should not have to be constantly carried to the courts for reaffirmation- disregarded as general law, and attacked by challenge with every discernable variation or difference in fact not considered at a prior trial). (Tribes have been restricted in their taxing authorities by some of the same laws which exclude federal or state authority. However, there are areas where taxing authorities might be used beneficially in the generation of revenues for financing government functions, services, and community institutions.) (The Congress should remove any obstacles to the rights of Indian people to travel freely between Indian Nations without being blocked in movement, commerce, or trade, by barriers of borders, customs, duties, or tax.)

18. PROTECTION OF INDIANS' RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND CULTURAL INTEGRITY:

The Congress shall proclaim its insistence that the religious freedom and cultural integrity of Indian people shall be respected and protected throughout the United States, and provide that Indian religion and culture, even in regenerating or renaissance or developing stages, or when manifested in the personal character and treatment of one's own body, shall not be interfered with, disrespected, or denied. (No Indian shall be forced to cut their hair by any institution or public agency or official, including military authorities or prison regulation, for example.) It should be an insistence by Congress that implies strict penalty for its violation.

19. NATIONAL REFERENDUMS, LOCAL OPTIONS, AND FORMS OF INDIAN ORGANIZATION:

The Indian population is small enough to be amenable to voting and elective processes of national referendums, local option referendums, and other elections for rendering decisions, approvals, or disapproval on many issues and matters. The steady proliferation of Indian and Indian-interest organizations and Indian advisory boards and the like, the multiplication of Indian officials and the emergence of countless Indian "leaders", represent a less preferable form for decision-making a state of disorganization, and a clear reflection of deterioration in the relations between the United States and Indian people as contracting sovereigns holding a high standard of accountability and responsibility. Some Indians seem to stand by to ratify any viewpoints relating to any or all Indians; others conditioned to accept any viewpoint or proposal from official source. Whereas Indian people were to be secure from political manipulation and the general political system in the service of Indian needs, political favor, and cutthroat competition for funds with grants made among limited alliances of agency-Indian friends have become the rule - while responsibilities and accountability to Indian people and Indian communities have been forgotten. While the treaty relationship allows that we should not be deprived by power what we are possessed of by right - little personal power and political games are being played by a few Indians while we are being deprived our rights. This dissipation of strength, energies, and commitment should end. We should consolidate our resources and purpose to restore relations born of sovereignty and to resume command of our communities, our rights, our resources, and our destiny. (The National Council on Indian Opportunity Association on American Indian Affairs, and the National Tribal Chairman's Association are examples of government, non-Indian directed, and Indian organizations which are among may which could and should be eliminated). (At least none should be funded from federal sources).

20. HEALTH, HOUSING, EMPLOYMENT, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND EDUCATION:

The Congress and Administration and proposed Indian Community Reconstruction Office must allow for the most creative, if demanding and disciplined forms of community development and purposeful initiatives. The proposed \$15,000,000,000 budget for the 1970s remainder could provide for completed construction of 100,000 new housing units; create more than 100,000 new permanent, income and tribal revenue-producing jobs on reservations and lay foundation for as many more in years following; meet all the economic and industrial development needs of numerous communities; and make education at all levels, and provide health services or medical care to all Indians as a matter of entitlement and fulfilled right. Yet, we now find most Indians unserved and programs not keeping pace with growing problems under a billion dollar plus budget annually - approximately a service cost of \$10,000 per reservation Indian family per year, or \$100,000 in this decade. Our fight is not over a \$50-million cutback in a mismanaged and misdirected budget, and cannot be ended with restoration of that then invisible amount - but over the part that it, any and all amounts, have come to play in a perennial billion-dollar indignity upon the lives of Indian people, our aged, our young, our parents, and our children. Death remains a

standard cure for environmentally induced diseases afflicting many Indian children without adequate housing facilities, heating systems, and pure water sources. Their delicate bodies provide their only defense and protection - and too often their own body processes become allies to the quickening of their deaths as with numerous cases of dysentery and diarrhea. Still, more has been spent on hotel bills for Indian-related problem-solving meetings, conferences, and conventions, than has been spent on needed housing in recent years. More is being spent from federal and tribal fund sources on such decision-making activities that is being committed to assist but two-thirds of Indian college students having desperate financial need. Rather, few decisions are made, and less problems solved, because there has developed an insensitivity to conscience which has eliminated basic standards of accountability. Indian communities have been fragmented in governmental, social, and constitutional functions as they have become restructured or de-structured to accommodate the fragmentation in governmental programming and contradictions in federal policies. There is a need to reintegrate these functions into the life and fabric of the communities. Of treaty provisions standard to most treaties, none has been breached more viciously and often as those dealing with education - first by withdrawing education processes from jurisdiction and responsibility of Indian communities, and from the power of Indian self-government - and falling yet to restore authority to our people, except through increased funding of old advisory and contract-delegation laws, or through control to conduct school in the conditioned forms and systems devised by non-Indians, or otherwise commended by current popularity. At minimum, Indian Nations have to reclaim community education authority to allow creative education processes in forms of their free choice, in a system of federally-sanctioned unit or consolidated Indian districts, supported by a mandatory recognition of accreditation in all other systems in this land.

declassified FBI/CIA/Justic Dept/White House docs on AIM: see [Council on Security & Intelligence](#)

[home](#) | [AIMGGC Profile](#) | [A Brief History](#) | [NCRSM](#) | [Archives](#)
[AIM/IITC Speakers Bureau](#) | [Peacemaker Center](#) | [Leonard Peltier](#)
[Ministry for Information Press Releases](#) | [Council on Security and Intelligence](#) | [AIM Store](#)

email: AIMGGC@att.net

