

# **To Be or Not to Be Indigenous: Identity, Race, and Representation in Education**

**Cornel Pewewardy**

## *Abstract*

In this article, personal experiences are described of being caught in the midst of oppressive discourses of “othering” during the work as a Comanche-Kiowa faculty member in a predominantly white research university. While Cornel Pewewardy was focusing on how to reform his relationship with Indigenous communities as a “privileged” educator, he missed the process by which he was being co-opted by the dominant English-speaking community to legitimate their discourse of Indigenous identity, race, and education as a “problem.” Through his story, Pewewardy recontextualizes theories about the multiplicity of tribal identities of the educator. He problematizes the “we” in the literature of Indigenous studies who analyze their identity, race, and representation in education. This challenges dominant-culture education as well as Indigenous scholars to move beyond the externally imposed concepts of identity race, and representation in education and to call upon their own tribal histories of complicity and marginalization in order to move toward new sovereign tribal identities and discourses. Similarly, educators are called upon from marginalized tribal cultures

to recognize their position within their professions as transformational leaders and realize that they are their own tribal voices of decolonization.

### *Introduction*

To speak of education in the 2000s is inevitably to speak of cultural identity. While the notion of identity remains subject to varying interpretations linked to particular methodological and theoretical paradigms and to the wide variety of social, cultural, and political contexts in which it is analyzed, in many ways identity has become an evolution of our times. While long recognized as a developmental stage marked as an “identity crisis” or “ethnic fever” many of today’s adolescents, especially those of distinct ethnic heritage, appear to be quite concerned about the “hybridization” of their backgrounds—“there’s also something going on out there (California) that transcends adolescent faddishness and pop exoticism.”<sup>1</sup> J. E. Trimble contends that youth appear to be choosing an ethnic group with which to identify, to assist in gaining entry into cliques, gangs, and segments of their social lives that bolsters self-esteem and perceived acceptance.<sup>2</sup> The Christopher Columbus voyages of 1492 provide only one metaphor for the ways Americans think of themselves and their history as well as the ways they shape their identities.<sup>3</sup>

The way Indigenous People define their cultural identity depends upon many factors in one’s tribal life.<sup>4</sup> While the politics of identity and the life experiences of Indigenous Peoples have been addressed more in recent years by scholars, activists, and novelists, there is little discussion addressing how and why Indigenous Peoples make their identity choices.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, seldom has this topic been emphasized in scholarly research and writing in the field of education, Indigenous Peoples history, or civil rights.

The present effort, written for the general reader as well as for scholars, is a treatment of the subject. My aim is to write an article that is objective that is based on what we as Indigenous Peoples know about race relations, and that point out the problems and policy issues related to defining cultural identity. This article has many implications for conflict theories, as well as for phenomenological, symbolic interactionist, structural, or other interpretations, but I chose to set these formal theoretical frameworks aside and highlight the cultural significance of the definition of identity—tribal identity. The cultural perspective in writing this article comes from an insider’s tribal worldview (rather than someone from outside the tribal community)—someone who was born, raised, and will be buried in his tribal homeland.

Additionally, the focus of this article is to explain tribal identity from the perspective of a person who has taught elementary school on the Navajo reservation; has been founding principal of the American Indian Magnet School; and who currently prepares classroom teachers in higher education. For me to do this as an Indigenous person, I must express my “cultural self” in the most natural way possible.<sup>6</sup> Speaking metaphorically comes natural to me as an

Indigenous person. Thus, this article is constructed with that element in mind: tribal identity and representation in education.

A paradox in writing this identity article is that I am writing in the English language and not communicating in the tribal languages of Comanche or Kiowa. I am writing in the language of the oppressor of our tribes—or in Joy Harjo’s terms—the “enemy” tongue.<sup>7</sup> “Reinventing” in the colonizer’s tongue and turning those images around to mirror an image of the colonized to the colonizers as a process of decolonization indicates that something is happening; something is emerging and coming into focus that will politicize as well as transform literary expression.<sup>8</sup>

In my natural way of non-discursive rhetoric expression, I have learned to integrate and move between a circular world and the linear thinking format of Western knowledge as well as to write sequentially. In essence this process is to “think outside of the box.”<sup>9</sup> The exercise of writing this article is an example of non-discursive methodology. One’s Indigenous thought process and language is so much a part of one’s tribal identity that to denigrate it is to effectively deny one’s human ability to communicate. Tribal language has a vital relationship to the philosophical thought process and worldview. In the process by which individuals and cultures seek their identity, language thus plays a supremely powerful role as both the bearer and Creator of all histories.<sup>10</sup>

Books and papers have their place and their purpose, but there is a special spiritual power in imparting ideas face-to-face in the oral tradition. Opportunities to speak directly with colleagues, with friends, with sisters and brothers can seriously inspire our thinking and reminds us that Indigenous People all over this planet are descendants of a long tradition of oral communications.

### ***Multitribal and Multicultural Perspective***

The complex issues surrounding tribal identity and representation in education cannot be understood through the cultural lenses of only one discursive tradition. Rather, our approach must be multi-tribal and multi-cultural. It also needs to draw from studies of popular mainstream white culture, literature, the role of the state in struggles over race, class, and gender relations, national and international economic structures, and the cultural politics of imperialism and postcolonialism. In structuring these perspectives, we recognize the need for different ways of understanding how race was constructed in this country theoretically as a social and cultural production. As Indigenous People, we need to see how the race construction process plays out in defining our cultural identity as well as how these institutions helped to form identities around these definitions.

With increasing emphasis on multicultural education within the last few decades, a change in description and the character of Indigenous People has been reported and described.<sup>11</sup> For many people, the quest for cultural identity is

a lifetime journey. How we define our children in schools today, and ourselves as Indigenous Peoples, is unmistakably different from what we remember of the character and definition of many of our grandparents.

The multifaceted aspect of cultural identity for Indigenous Peoples allows for journeys to begin from psychological, sociological, anthropological, political, spiritual, medical, and other perspectives. It is important for all these paths to be explored. Thus research on cultural identity, especially interracial identity has emerged from many disciplines.

Additional research on interracial marriages and mixed identity flourished in the 1990s and authors like Jamake Highwater writing books attempting to validate their “Indianness,” sometimes forming rainbow tribes.<sup>12</sup> More than ever, mixed bloods are writing about their mixed-blood heritages with a keen sensibility toward the vitality of hybridization. Early identity books and articles were written mostly by non-Indigenous writers—about mixed-bloods trying to locate, define, and validate their tribal identities.<sup>13</sup>

### *Capturing the Image of the Vanishing Indian*

Toward the eve of the nineteenth-century, many people believed the *Indian* to be disappearing. Before the *Indians* vanished, many artist and photographers intended to preserve their traditional customs and appearance on canvas. George Catlin had ventured into the trans-Mississippi West during the 1830s to record the lifestyles of Indigenous Peoples. About 1900, Edward S. Curtis attempted to capture the image of the *Indian* in photography before he disappeared without a trace. According to D. Francis, a kind of “neo-noble-savagism” was all the rage and Curtis and Catlin provided the movement with some of its most striking icons of their era.<sup>14</sup>

Like George Catlin’s paintbrushes and, later, frontier photographic/artist Edward Curtis’ photographs over a hundred years ago, twenty-first century artist, Charles Banks Wilson drew Indigenous People in Oklahoma for 45 years (1936-1981) as portrayed in his classic, *Search for the Purebloods*. While sketching various tribes in Oklahoma, Wilson contends that “they did not always give their time simply as a courtesy to an artist but because they knew it to be inevitable the purebloods will disappear in every Indian tribe” (last page).<sup>15</sup> According to Herman Viola, “some tribes don’t have any purebloods left. And some have only one person left. There are still many full-blooded Indians, but it is unusual to find one who does not carry the genetic heritage of two or more tribes.”<sup>16</sup>

When Wilson and Catlin drew Indigenous People and Curtis took their photographs, many more artists were also taking possession of the *Indian* image. The image-makers returned from their expositions with their images and exhibited them as actual representations of the way they knew *Indians* to be. They began to create cultural myths by manipulating and displaying these images in the way

they wanted, often to achieve notoriety or financial gain. Romanticized as these images were in so many respects, they nevertheless became the *Indian* for most non-Indigenous People who knew no other.

The other form of grand narrative that dominates historical thinking in the United States, the history of Western progress, has gained much more attention than the exceptionalist narrative, largely due to the work of one historian, Frederick Jackson Turner. R. A. Jetty contends that Turner's Frontier Thesis regards Indigenous Peoples as a dangerous obstacle for Americans to overcome through united action.<sup>17</sup> Americans moving to the west achieved solidarity through their triumph over Indigenous Peoples. His "Frontier Thesis" would become the basis of the dominant school of American historical interpretation and would provide the historiographic rationale for the ideologies of both Republican progressives and Democratic liberals for much of the ensuing century.<sup>18</sup> Thus, once Turner declared the frontier closed in 1890, Indigenous People were no longer a worthy historical topic for discussion. It was at this point in history that all notions of tribal sovereignty as an important topic to macroculture America disappeared. Also from this universal perspective, M. K. Green asserts that all particularities were destined to disappear into the melting pot of a cosmopolitan civilization in which each person would give up his/her own particular cultural identity and take his/her place as a member of a new world order in which all cultural differences would disappear.<sup>19</sup>

### ***Defining Who We Are: Who's a Real Indian?***

An ongoing saga of defining "who's an *Indian*" continues on into another millennium as does the sociopolitical meaning of the phrase. Indigenous Peoples are subjected to many political definitions even within their own dynamic levels of tribal politics as well as by states and the federal government. The conflicting policies of tribal government acknowledgement, federal government blood quantum criteria, and a myriad of self-identifications contribute to this paradox of cultural identity. According to historian Donald Fixico,

To be an "Indian" involves a spectrum of identities from a generic Indianness to tribal culture, social need, societal judgement, and psychological self-examination. Placed in historical perspective, the range of meanings for "to be an Indian" has varied as each generation and each group's tribal existence is juxtaposed to or integrated into the American mainstream.<sup>20</sup>

At most, scholars know the term *American Indian* is an externally-imposed, invented ethnic category—an "ethnic gloss"—that was originally foisted on the Arawak, a now extinct Caribbean basin tribe.<sup>21</sup> J. E. Trimble asserts that no one is really certain why the category continues to be used to the extent that almost all Indigenous Peoples of the western hemisphere are referred to as

*Indians*.<sup>22</sup> I. Hernandez contends that Indigenous Peoples know that the term *Indian* is a misnomer, but they have made it their own, just as they have made *American Indian* and more recently *Native American* their own, even though in their original languages, each of their people had (and have) their own name for themselves and for this part of the earth that is now known as “America.”<sup>23</sup> Indigenous speakers who are able to come up with their own analyses of their tribal languages and who will develop writing systems, acknowledge that in any language community one is going to have numerous individual as well as dialectical ways to pronouncing the language and forming words.<sup>24</sup>

Along with forming words and labels, many historical stereotypical images persist and in some instances influence people’s decision to identify as an *American Indian*.<sup>25</sup> The persistence of the category, however, has led many contemporary Indigenous Peoples to express a common identity on the basis of having a common myth-like charter. By forging a common ethnic category, Indigenous Peoples have created a social and political force that has far greater strength and influence than individual tribal governments—the emergence of the “*pan-Indian*” category has created a conventional label with which one can identify.<sup>26</sup> While many individuals continue to maintain ties with tribal communities, others are second- or third-generation “urban” Indigenous People whose identity evolves around *pan-Indian* activities, multitribal, and multicultural urban communities.<sup>27</sup> Yet attached to the seemingly persuasive category is an array of identity definitions that vary appreciably.

### ***Federal Government Definition***

The only ethnic group to have a legal definition in the United States is *American Indians*. Through the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the definition has undergone many revisions in defining an *American Indian* person whose Indigenous blood quantum is at least one-fourth and who is a registered or enrolled member of one of the 500 or more federally-recognized tribes.

Some tribes recognized by the U.S. federal government do not agree with the BIA’s definition so, therefore, these tribes have developed their own tribal enrollment criteria. Some have lowered the BIA benchmark criteria of one-fourth blood quantum to one-eighth and even one-sixteenth; a few have increased it to one-half. The Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma in the late 1960s opened its rolls to anyone who could prove ancestral ties—the specificity of blood quantum was not viewed as an important criterion.

For many Indigenous People the BIA criteria is not representative of the diverse range of tribal lifestyles and levels of cultural identification. The U.S. Bureau of Census and Department of Education (DOE) both have developed their own criteria. The Census Bureau allows each person to declare his or her ethnic origin on the basis of the group with which he or she most identifies (self-

enumerative). As for the DOE, the definition closely resembles the BIA criteria but provides more latitude for tribal-specific criteria, regardless of federal status.<sup>28</sup>

Federal government definitions of who is *Indian* are developed largely to determine who is eligible for services provided by treaty arrangements and congressionally mandated programs. These definitions are mostly legal definitions and do not take into account the cultural aspect of an Indigenous person. As a result, many people are concerned when it comes to self-identification. It causes difficulties in those concerned with emerging “New Age” philosophies and lifestyles in quest for an Indigenous identity.<sup>29</sup>

### ***Tribal Identity and Representation in Education***

By cultural identity and representation in education, I am not simply referring to mimesis or the presence or absence of “positive” images of underrepresented populations in textbooks and other curriculum materials. By cultural identity and representation, I am referring to the question of the social power that resides in the specific arrangement and deployment of subjectivity in cultural and ideological practices in schooling and society. Complex relationships exist between culture, knowledge, and power. Issues of cultural identity and representation directly raise questions about who has the power to define whom, and when, and how.<sup>30</sup> I want to emphasize the fact that often underrepresented populations do not have central control over the production of cultural images about themselves in this society. For example, when *Indian* mascots and logos are being used in educational-related events, Indigenous People do not have “equal access” to the media to “tell their side of the story.”

There are also some potent myths about Indigenous learners, myths about low ability, cultural deprivation, myths about poverty causing learning problems, and myths that school treatment is equitable for all children. These myths persist and are even adopted by many Indigenous People, even though we are a tribal community with a long history of creating powerful transforming educational and socialization institutions.

According to D. Francis, the *Indian* began as a white man’s mistake, and became a white man’s fantasy.<sup>31</sup> Through the prism of white hopes, fears, and prejudices, Indigenous People would be seen to have lost contact with reality and to have become *Indians*; that is, anything non-Indigenous Peoples wanted them to be. Therefore, hegemonic structures were created in this country to miseducate enslaved and colonized people, and people who promoted white supremacy influenced structures of domination. Indigenous Peoples and their independent systems were/are a part of a genocidal process—the American holocaust.<sup>32</sup> Colonial and slave structures, as well as apartheid and general white supremacy structures, were created, including BIA boarding schools, to separate children from parents and tribal communities and cultures, and especially mission schools to destroy tribal worldviews, thereby building a theological

base for the doctrine of Manifest Destiny, and to stigmatize colonized and enslaved people as savages, primitives, and pagans.<sup>33</sup> As a law school dean, Rennard Strickland regrets that this holocaust was, too often, “genocide-at-law.”<sup>34</sup> Based upon his 35 years of study of the documents of conquest, Strickland shares de Tocqueville’s view that it would be impossible to destroy men with more respect. The recent “culture wars” over the school curriculum is a continuation in a newer form of ideological structures of hegemony that follow the old path of separating children and communities from their cultural traditions.

The changing character of Indigenous People in the twenty-first century, the shedding of tribal identity, and his/her search for a new one are examined next. I believe that tribal identity is not lost, but adapted over time and change in culture. Therefore, cultural identity is not to be found; it is to be created, preserved, and achieved in order to endure in our lifetime.

### *Quest for Identity*

Times are changing as indicated by the political landscape of this country. The world of identity politics is complicated and perplexing. For example, I remember in the early 1970s family members and close friends saying “it’s not good to be *Indian*.” Today it’s in vogue; many of those same family members and close friends are saying just the opposite that “it’s good to be *Indian*.” There seems to be a more national concern in race, cultural consciousness, and changing character, with the loss of an older benchmark identity in search for a new one. People are more interested in their genealogy, ancestral heritage, and the meaning attributed to locating a long forgotten ancestor—the quest for identity.

Since 1960, when the U.S. Bureau of Census changed its enumeration procedures from ascription to self-identification, the Indigenous Peoples population has grown nearly threefold. Unable to attribute the population growth to the usual factors (improved enumeration procedures, immigration, births); researchers have concluded that much of the growth results from “ethnic switching” by individuals changing their racial self-identification to *American Indian*.<sup>35</sup> Joane Nagle suggests this “ethnic renewal” has been brought about by three political forces: (1) federal *Indian* policy, (2) American ethnic politics, and (3) Indigenous Peoples’ political activism. Federal *Indian* policies have contributed to the creation of an urban, intermarried, bicultural Indigenous Peoples population that lives outside traditional Indigenous Peoples geographic and cultural regions.<sup>36</sup> According to this perspective, A. Gonzales contends that we now live in a world where individuals are supposed to be able to decide—in some active sense—who they are.<sup>37</sup> Even once irrevocable personal characteristics are now imbued with an element of choice, of which ethnic identity is but one example. This is a pervasive cultural shift, associated with increased urbanization and individualization, and consistent with Eschbach’s “ethnic



switching,” Joane Nagle’s “ethnic renewal,” or Stephen Cornell’s “political resurgence.”<sup>38</sup>

### ***On/Off the Rez***

Many Indigenous People confront complex sociopolitical identity issues, both on the reservation and in urban communities. Many of these identity problems come from racial discrimination; adjusting to tribal norms on and off the reservation; cultural benchmarks established by tribal family; ability to participate in customs, ceremony, song, and dance; consciousness of creation stories; and a general lack of understanding of their educational, sociopolitical condition. In a study of urban Chicago Indigenous People, J. V. Fenelon traces many of these problems to government-driven divisions historically rooted in relocation during the termination period, and efforts to reduce *American Indians*’ federal eligibility and Indigenous Peoples’ organizational abilities.<sup>39</sup> Individuals also see Indigenous People participating in their own intertribal racism and oppression as well as perpetuating dysfunctions from the dominant society.

According to Terry Straus and D. Valentino in the 1970s, the late Bob Thomas (Cherokee) of the University of Arizona warned that Indigenous People were becoming “ethnic Indians” with no tribal knowledge or connection, especially in the intertribal, interethnic urban environment.<sup>40</sup> Susan Lobo asserts that also in urban areas, although no role exists comparable to tribal roles, there are a number of other ways that one is identified by self and others as a community member and as *Indian*.<sup>41</sup> The urban Indigenous community is most frequently invisible to the macrocultural world, both informally in the general public mind that has not discarded the stereotype that everything *Indian* is rural and in the past, but also formally via institutions such as the U.S. Census Bureau that has yet to adequately count urban Indigenous People. Therefore, defining *Indianness* in the city is released from the burden of the formalized documentation imposed on federally recognized tribes.

An important point to make here about *supratribal* Indigenous ethnicity is that it is purely a social construction.<sup>42</sup> That is, the Indigenous Peoples population is comprised of many linguistic, cultural, and religious groups, more than 500 of which are separately recognized by federal or state governments in the lower 48 states (with many more in Alaska and Hawaii); each group has its own political, legal, police system, economy, land base, and sovereign authority. Around two-thirds of Indigenous People identified in the U.S. Censuses are official members of these recognized communities.<sup>43</sup>

### ***Silent Genocide***

Defining who Indigenous is and who is not takes on many dimensions in various disciplines in this country. A brief look backward can help to explain this

paradox. According to A. Gonzales, when treaty making ended in 1871, the prevailing attitude of the federal government was that the Indigenous Peoples should be assimilated and transformed into productive members of society.<sup>44</sup> To hasten this transformation, Congress passed the General Allotment Act in 1887, aimed at the dissolution of collectively held tribal lands into individual land allotments. The criteria used to determine allotment eligibility was based on individual *Indian* “blood quantum.”

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

For some people, the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 may suggest a form of ethnic cleansing. The purpose of the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990, signed by President George Bush, was to rectify the mess created by 100 years of incompetent legislation thereby to protect Indigenous craftspersons from the flood of counterfeit Indigenous Peoples arts and crafts imported from Taiwan and other foreign countries. Under the Act, an artisan may not use the words “Native American Artisan” to sell crafts they produce unless they are certified as genuine *Indians* by the federal government. The language of the 1990 Act defines an *Indian* as “any individual who is a member of an Indian tribe or is certified as an Indian artisan by an Indian tribe.”

Many Indigenous People are strongly divided on the necessity and effectiveness of this legislation. For some, the arts and crafts legislation is seen as a first step in prohibiting the sale of items billed as Indigenous art that are actually made in Korea, China, Mexico, or the Philippines. For others, the law is seen as yet another interference by government in Indigenous Peoples’ affairs that succeeds only in placing further limitations and restrictions on Indigenous People.<sup>45</sup>

The most disturbing piece of the Arts and Crafts Act allows non-Indigenous people to define “Indigenous products.” Gross contends that if defining *Indian* is left to tribal government, then defining Indian products should also be left to tribal governments.<sup>46</sup> If Indigenous People take ownership for defining who Indigenous is, then eventually the frauds will be weeded out. In many ways, this argument has substance. Indigenous People are now taking on more responsibility for defining their art, education, lifestyles, and themselves.

Identity issues also arise in the certification process. The applicant must be able to prove that she or he was born in a tribe that is officially recognized by the

U.S. government. Many people initiating the certification process cannot obtain the necessary documents as the result of government sponsored the relocation program of 1952 and the confusion created by the Dawes Act of 1887. As a result, many applicants have been legislated out of tribal artistic existence. Their ancestral tribes may have been dissolved long ago and at the present, no authority remains by which they can obtain tribal certification even if they wanted to. The penalties for defying the law are fines of up to \$1,000,000 and up to 15 years in prison. Corporations or groups who defy this law face up to \$5,000,000 in fines.

On the flipside of this identity controversy are discussions about individuals who are clearly not Indigenous, but try to psychologically and physically manifest themselves into Indigenous Peoples communities. A. Neskahi provides an excellent example of the confusion of ethnic identity in the music industry. Neskahi's Rainbow Walker website explains how some artists are trying to identify themselves as a "Native" person by labeling their music as "Native Inspired" or "Native Influenced."<sup>47</sup> Neskahi contends that these non-Indigenous musicians develop a musical genre derived from Indigenous Peoples forms. Neskahi posted his website for the following reasons:

1. to dispel any notions that these people are Native,
2. to assist the consumer in knowing what is authentic *Native American* musical product, and
3. to deter the exploitation of Native music, culture, and spirituality.<sup>48</sup>

Neskahi requests that "if you are a Native musician, please clearly and proudly offer the Nation/Tribe to which you belong in your cover text." His Rainbow Walker website lists those non-Indigenous musicians that he deems are "Native Inspired," "Native Influenced," and "Outright Frauds."

### ***Ethnic Fraud***

Given the luxury of self-identification as *Indian* today, the temptation enhances the likelihood for securing employment, receiving awards and incentives, receiving admission preference to academic institutions, receiving preference to financial assistance in higher education, and placing them in unique positions of entitlement that would otherwise not be available. J. Clifton contends that the "academic Indian" has emerged out of this momentum whereby a person in academia claims their tribal ancestry to gain a professional advantage in the promotion and tenure process.<sup>49</sup> A pejorative term used to describe those suspected of identifying as Indigenous People for personal advantage is "ethnic fraud." A. Gonzales defines ethnic fraud as "the deliberate attempt to achieve personal gain by individuals who falsify or change their ethnic identity."<sup>50</sup> For

example, ethnic fraud occurs when a student or faculty member falsifies himself or herself as *Indian* to gain financial aid, employment, or professional reward.

This phenomenon has become so widespread that the Association of American Indians and Alaska Native Professors have taken a stand on this issue by drafting a resolution having individuals declare their tribal membership to their respective higher education institutions as well as request that the institutions request tribal membership from the candidate and/or faculty member.<sup>51</sup> Perceptions of ethnic fraud, whether real or imagined, have spawned a debate among Indigenous Peoples as to what constitutes legitimate identity and has resulted in regulatory practices requiring individuals to prove their identity.

Aside from the economic benefit to self-identify as *Indian*, many people with Indigenous Peoples' ancestry choose to identify themselves to create a new cultural identity that brings pride along with the desire to learn more about their tribal language and customs. Moreover, there are many individuals who are obligated to carry on family customs and traditions regardless of their degree of blood quantum.

### ***Ethnic Cleansing and Identity Cops***

Articles carried by *Indian Country Today* throughout most of 1993 wrestled with writers accusing each other of fostering an attitude of "ethnic cleansing." On one side, writers want publications to abandon bigotry, instead of adopting policies of dealing with everyone as individuals with no regard to genetic makeup. Some individuals feel that the proposed legislation to insure *American Indian* religious freedom is patently racist and bigoted. While protecting enrolled tribal members and those who can prove a genetic connection, it does nothing to protect the rights of traditionally or legally adopted children who are not of Indigenous Peoples extraction, or other earnest practitioners of Indigenous Peoples religions who are not of the approved genetic makeup.

On the other hand, proponents opposing another perspective of being Indigenous are sometimes divided on the wannabe issue, particularly Indigenous students in higher education. The main concern comes when tribes include those individuals who want to be Indigenous on paper (referred to "paper Indians") only and not have to deal with the sociopolitical nature their respective tribes. For many of these individuals, defining oneself on paper seems to be a step-by-step process. Still, one step is also to define the wannabee.

Those newly identifying as Indigenous People become targets of the "identity police" and other individuals who position themselves as gatekeepers to protect Indigenous Peoples' interests from ethnic frauds and others who seek to benefit from identifying as *Indian*.<sup>52</sup> According to Ward Churchill, this "purity police" theme was quickly picked up, tabloid-style, by papers like *Indian Country Today* and *News From Indian Country*, while the Internet came figuratively alive with a swarm of essentially anonymous rumors that dozens of Indigenous Peoples'

most distinguished artists, authors, thinkers, and activists were not “really” *Indians* after all.<sup>53</sup>

### *Pseudo Names and the Wannabee Paradox*

The 1970s and 1980s brought new terms and definitions into being with the federal government’s recognition that nearly one-half of the identifiable Indigenous People resided off the reservation and in urban areas. Referred to as “urban Indians” or “city Indians,” these groups began to form enclaves of Indigenous Peoples communities in certain geographical areas of relocation cities. Because of the lack of any clear definition as to who could and who could not be a member of these urban communities, there evolved a new set of pseudo definitions of who was and was not an official *Indian*.<sup>54</sup>

The debate among Indigenous People over what constitutes legitimate identity has spawned a vocabulary of terms used to describe individuals whose ethnic identity is considered to be dubious. Some common pseudo-terms became part of everyday peoples’ lexicon.<sup>55</sup> Some of these terms are: *Wannebe* (short for “I want to be”); *Iwishiwias* (short for “I wish I Was”); *Canbe* (short for “Can Not Be”); *Maybe* (slight possibility); *Arebe* (short for “Are Be”); *Shouldbe* or *Oughtabe* (short for “Should Be” and Ought to Be”); *Gonnabe* (short for “Going to Be”); and *Iwishtheywernt* (short for “I wish they weren’t on the tribal rolls”). Finally, the term *Pretender* describes the non-Indigenous person who falsely claims to be Indigenous or to have some vast knowledge of tribal culture or spirituality. For example, two celebrity *Indians*, Grey Owl and Chief Buffalo Child Long Lance, turned out not to be who they said they were.<sup>56</sup>

Another pseudo-version of the “*real Indian*” is the “born-again” Indigenous person. Simply borrowed from the terminology of the born-again Christians, the born-again Indigenous person is a person who reidentifies himself/herself as Indigenous, never having practiced the beliefs or understood the way of tribal life until now, after personally experiencing life’s cultural awakening. P. P. Hilden asserts that for those whose ancestry is just too improbable, Europeans, say, or the children of European immigrants—often claim the ancestry of reincarnation.<sup>57</sup> A. Smith details a recent attack on such identity collectors in her telling message, “For all those who were Indian in a former life.”<sup>58</sup> AIM member, Clyde Bellecourt, refers to these people who have gone through this instant cultural transformation of tribal consciousness as “shake-n-bake Indians.”

With today’s technology, we have several controversies surrounding “Internet” Indigenous People. The Indigenous Peoples chat rooms over the internet on the commercial services attract a number of people who, armed with a personal computer and a modem, claim to be *Indian*, just as countless people in chat rooms all over the Internet adopt imaginary identities. At the same time, unidentified individuals have taken it on themselves to question publicly via the Internet the identity of others. Some tribes and individuals have considered

suing over what they see as cybersmear. For instance, copies of an unsigned inventory of “charlatans” distributed over the Internet claiming to list 225 phony medicine men and spiritual leaders spread across the southwest South Dakota reservations like wildfire a few years ago. Many legitimate practitioners felt their characters had been defamed. Like *counterculture* itself, New Age spans an ambiguous time period and serves as a general rubric for a wide range of practices.<sup>59</sup> While imposters and New Age enthusiasts pose a threat to the integrity of tribal spiritual practices, it is especially hard to tell on the Internet—with its amazing speed, reach, and capacity for anonymity—who is real and who is the imposter.

If you want to see how a bunch of European drunks really understand how to have good time at the expense of Indigenous People, go to their website: <http://www.crude-apache.freemove.co.uk/>. Still on another webpage, I located over the internet is the Wannabe Alert.<sup>60</sup> This webpage was created to protect and defend Indigenous Peoples traditions and cultures against wannabes who, for the most part, claim Indigenous Peoples ancestry in correctional facilities.

As you can see from the mentioned discussions, pseudo names and words can hurt. Understanding and sharing the definition of these words can heal. We must have more sharing, more understanding, and more healing. It is our professional responsibility as educators—as teachers. No child should have to make the painful choice between family and school which inevitably becomes the choice between belonging or succeeding. The costs of such a choice are too high, from becoming a “cultural schizophrenic” to developing doubts about one’s worth and dignity.<sup>61</sup> To help build healthy ethnic identities in the classroom, it is our ethical duty and professional responsibility to eliminate racism in the classroom.

### ***Tribal Consciousness***

Individuals behave not in accordance with reality, but in accordance with their perception of reality. The fact that we, literally, become what we think about most of the time. What you “see” in your mind’s eye is what you get. Each of us becomes that make-believe self that we have imagined and fantasized most. Therefore, for many people ethnic identity can be a state of mind or tribal consciousness.

To examine tribal identity, a multi-tribal view is important for including nontraditional methods of affecting reality. We must raise our tribal consciousness of the potential power of the individual body/mind system—the power to manipulate reality. We must be willing to retake control of our past, present, and, ultimately, our future. We must be able to consciously deconstruct our tribal histories. Even after centuries of an aborted attempt to assimilate all that is our Indigenous culture, after centuries of misinformation, Indigenous Peoples still

respond to the conscious right call. Respond we must. We cannot sit silent while others outside our tribal families define our realities for us.

There are also potent myths about Indigenous learners, myths about low ability, cultural deprivation, myths about poverty causing learning problems, and myths that school treatments are equitable for all children. These myths persist and are even adopted by many of the Indigenous Peoples community, even though we are a community with a long standing history of creating powerful transforming educational and socialization institutions. Therefore, it would be foolish of me to think that all Indigenous People ascribe to my particular way of identifying with their tribal identity. I am too familiar with the story of how American policymakers sought to use the schoolhouse—specifically the boarding schools—as an instrument for assimilating Indigenous youth to “American” ways of thinking and living.<sup>62</sup> Howard Adams asserts that after 500 years of colonial oppression, Indigenous People have internalized a colonized consciousness.<sup>63</sup> The colonizer’s falsified stories have become universal truths to mainstream society, and have reduced Indigenous culture to a Hollywood cartoon caricature. This distorted and manufactured reality is one of the most powerful shackles subjugating Indigenous People today. When we begin to decolonize our minds, which are what sovereignty is all about, we can see that boundaries and colonial structures created by the European invaders are, first, transient and, second, barriers to our self-determination.<sup>64</sup>

P. C. Rollins and J. E. O’Connor assert that the film industry, because of its ability to define the *Indian* past in dramatic cinematic terms, helped to promote the recovery of the contemporary *Indian* in the early and mid-twentieth century and the renaissance of the *Indian*—particular in art and literature—in the most recent decades of the century.<sup>65</sup> Motion pictures did this first by not letting the *Indian* identity be absorbed into the larger American society as just another—and tiny—ethnic minority, and, secondly, by reminding other Americans of the worthy character of the *Indian* adversaries of the other principal *dramatic personae* of American history, the frontiersmen and pioneers who form the subject of the current debate over the “new” and “old” Western history.

One question embodies myth—the other frames lasting truth. The key is always to be able to tell the myth from the truth in life. Being a teacher, I have learned the hard way that creating a reality can be challenging and very difficult. A long time ago I used to ask myself why we cannot create a reality that is not only equitable, but also truthful? Later in my adult life, I found out the issues were sociopolitical and ultimately related to “power and control.” You see, *power and control are the ability to define reality and to get other people to respond to that reality as if it were their own.* What we believe with feeling becomes our reality—that if we wish to change our realities, we must change our beliefs about ourselves in relationship to our realities. If we have self-limiting beliefs, they become true to us irrespective of whether they are based on fact or fiction.

Power and control (Western hegemony) usually come from those who have the ability to define reality. The pictures that people have for what they perceive as real and what is true in the world are pictures that come out of the work of those who conduct research, teach, establish definitions, interpretations, and constructs. Contributors to what they think are real come from the media, churches, family, and schools—all constructing what they think is real.

According to S. Bok, the boundary between reality and unreality is especially permeable for small children.<sup>66</sup> They are unable, through at least the age of three or four, to distinguish fact from fantasy. Even older children rarely manage to keep “real life” and vicarious experience in watertight compartments. Children are also more likely to conclude that violence on the screen reflects real-life abuses if they have personal experience of abuse in their family or neighborhood. For them, what they witness at home and on the streets reinforces what they see enacted on the screen. They are exposed, before they are in any position to distinguish what they see on the screen from real life, to amounts and levels of entertainment violence that are potentially more brutalizing than many adults—parents, script writers, and TV producers among them realize.

Unfortunately, most children younger than six years old do not understand that the purpose of commercial advertising is to sell a product.<sup>67</sup> The bottom line is that television is a business and businesses exist to make money. Television provides entertainment, education, news and information by selling you the products advertised in the commercials on your favorite TV shows.

The sociology of knowledge understands human reality as socially constructed reality. Since the constitution of reality has traditionally been a central problem of philosophy, this understanding has certain philosophical implications. Therefore, we do not see the world as it is. We see the world as we are. Our perceptions are our cultural lens for how we see the world. We see the interpretation of the world through the lenses of our experiences. Issues of identity and representation directly raise questions about who has the power to define whom, and when, and how.

Areas of media concentration are surveillance, correlation, transmission, entertainment and economics. These areas must be addressed in order to bring equality of identity and representation for all communities. Indigenous children must truly know their tribal histories before United State history. You will never know the history of America until you know and come to grips with its history of cultural genocide of Indigenous Peoples. As educators, we must teach our children so that our children can show the world that where there is oppression, there is also resistance.

### *Names Are Our Identity*

Identifying members within one’s tribe is critical to understanding the cultural characteristics of name giving. How an individual receives his/her name is



ceremonial in the culture of Comanches and Kiowas. The worst disservice a culture can do to another culture is to take away their cultural names. This process means that their culture was/is being taken away, because the naming ceremony is how relatives give names to their children.

Indigenous Peoples have always had names for themselves and names for other tribal groups. Within the past decade or so, efforts to replace the terms *American Indian* and *Native American* were initiated by Indigenous Peoples activist groups and organizations.

For me, tribal identity is what I was born into and will forever be what I am until I leave this earthly land and return to my ancestors in the next world. Unfortunately, I believe many tribal people's identity gets locked into the historical past, although I believe some individuals may have manifested that belief and carried out stereotypical tribal behavior that was manufactured by Hollywood scriptwriters. I believe tribal people must literally fight everyday of their lives to maintain and preserve their tribal identities. The reason I believe this way is that we live in a country that tries its hardest to make English be your first language and prizes people who manifest the Melting Pot concept of conforming to white, middle-class cultural norms—in essence to create an American identity and thereby, “Americanize” Indigenous Peoples.<sup>68</sup>

### ***Conclusion***

Among the most vexing issues afflicting Indigenous People at the beginning of another millennium are the questions of who does or does not hold a legitimate right to say he or she is Indigenous, and by what criteria—whose definition—this may or may not be true.<sup>69</sup> Such inquiries and their answers hold an obvious and deeply important bearing upon the cultural identity of millions of individuals across the continent. The quest for an Indigenous cultural identification during the last three decades has resulted from a combination of factors in American politics. Assimilationist federal policy for Indigenous People helped to create a bicultural, intermarried, mixed race, urban *Pan-Indian* population living in regions of the country where ethnic options were most numerous; this was a group “poised” for individual ethnic renewal.<sup>70</sup> A. Gonzales contends that today, individuals are considered members of ethnic groups to which they self-identify, but as the census data indicates, the ability to self-identify racially has resulted in a substantial number of people changing their racial identity to Indigenous People.<sup>71</sup>

The areas I have identified above as potent ones for discussing who we are as Indigenous People in the field of education are not, by any means, the only areas or perceptions. Reconceptualizing identity and self in the context of Indigenous education may highlight the importance of workable strategies to relate cultural/tribal identity to the demands of participation in the mainstream.<sup>72</sup> Awareness of implicit models of tribal identity can also help us to examine

assumptions regarding the nature of teacher-student relationships, good teaching practice, teacher authority, and classroom discipline.

According to I. Hernandez, what we have most in common today might be called the two major components of our identity. One is our identification with this hemisphere as our original land base, articulated through the oral tradition in the sacred stories of our beginnings, as well as in the stories (or teachings) about our sacred principles, our relationship to the earth and all of life. The other component is our historical experiences of colonization that began to be imposed on us over 500 years ago, and that is marked by the arrival on the shores of this hemisphere a man named Columbus (who was lost).<sup>73</sup>

Most tribal cultures are not static. If it is a form of knowledge, then it is intrinsically dynamic and developmental. It changes, expands and adapts to new circumstances. But this paradigm is difficult to dislodge, due to the generous access that its advocates have to the media and the huge sums of money that back their point of view. The ability to “fight back” is found in many of the original teachings that honor our humanity, our dignity, and our spirits as necessary components of our indigenous identity.

The 500-year struggle for Indigenous People has been a legitimate education for the children, a high quality, and culturally appropriate, truthful education/socialization for our children. It has been a struggle against American hegemony and for control over socialization of our own children. We begin another millennium with the same issues that we have always had just new faces and new forms. To talk openly and truthfully about identity today, we must be able to destroy myths and illuminate reality. Contrary to some popular opinion and even some professional opinion, educators and systems are extremely powerful. We can choose either powerful positive or powerful negative effects, and we can bring either into being. The futures of children and their cultural identities truly are in our hands.

While the willingness for many Americans to identify as part *Indian* or having *Indian* blood may be little more than their conscious (or unconscious) ability to recall a Indigenous ancestor, such self-declarations are a source of personal pride grounded in family history. But for the many Indigenous People who have heard endless stories about someone’s great-great-great Cherokee grandmother, it is little wonder that these assertions are greeted with suspicion.<sup>74</sup>

To conclude, I would just like to reiterate that I am able to identify myself as Comanche and Kiowa. That is who I am over any other type of identifier like American or citizen of the United States. I am first a citizen of the Comanche Tribe of Oklahoma, secondly a citizen of the United States of America, and last a resident of Lawrence, Kansas.

Personally, it is difficult to define one’s self culturally, tribally, spiritually, emotionally, mentally and so forth. Moreover, the trauma that has occurred over my lifetime is part of my healing journey. As an Indigenous person, I try to understand the present condition of Indigenous Peoples is a direct result of

intergenerational deficits, benefits, grief and injury. I see that trauma and response to the pain of the emotional, spiritual, mental, physical, and tribal rape in many people. I see Indigenous People inflicting the same on their own and other tribal people. I see Indigenous People using their tribal identities and spirituality as a shield against others. They bring it out when it is necessary to protect them from facing themselves and taking responsibility for their own healing and definition. I see blood quantum as a double-edged sword, and people have no identity without that degree of blood. The more blood, the more power or validity that they think they have. I see blood quantum as a tool devised by dominant society to further divide and negate Indigenous Peoples. I see people who have married outside of the tribal communities, and their grandchildren have no tribal recognition because of blood quantum. Their own people strip their identities because they have bought into this system.

Self-determination is a powerful weapon for change, and Indigenous People do not even understand how to effectively implement this. To many tribes, it is a buzz word among tribal entities. According to Standing, an elder once told her:

Our blood remembers, our skin holds memory, that we have a genetic DNA that holds a spiritual memory. Another elder once shared that we can talk to our DNA and go back to the beginning of time. Those memories are that powerful, and they are stored right within us.<sup>75</sup>

As I have attempted to explain, identity is a very complex issue today. Elders have shared that if we quiet ourselves and listen, we will find the answers we are seeking. That what is within us, is connected to every living thing in this universe, which energy and vibration are so powerful and it is so simple that we clearly miss it.

To engage in a serious discussion about identity and race, I reflect not on the problems of Indigenous Peoples, but rather with the flaws of American society—flaws rooted in historic inequalities and longstanding cultural stereotypes.<sup>76</sup> Therefore, given the sociopolitical makeup of Indigenous People in this country, I see my life as being “political” since the day I was born. My tribal homeland is located in Lawton, Oklahoma. It is my tribal homeland because that’s where all my immediate family members were born (including me) and where most of our tribal members are buried and will be buried once they leave this earthly world.

Finally, the challenge for educators is to keep an ongoing dialogue who defines whom and understand that many of the present terms for Indigenous People were composed by people outside our immediate families. To keep this from happening again, I contend that the descriptions and terminology should come from within Indigenous Peoples themselves. It is an inside not outside approach to knowing your tribal identity.<sup>77</sup> For many individuals newly identifying themselves as Indigenous People, this “ethnic option” may be more a matter of

personal choice, independent of tribal affiliation, cultural traditions, or community relations that are critical to an Indigenous Peoples identity of others. This model (or discussion) of ethnic identity suggests that, given the capacity of individuals to reinvent, recapture, and/or rename themselves and their tribal communities, ethnicity occupies an enduring place in modern societies to discuss whether “to be or not to be Indigenous.”

### Notes

1. N. Bernstein “Teens today “claim” racial identity,” *UTNE Reader*, (March – April): 87-89.

2. J. E. Trimble, “Social Psychological Perspectives on American Indian and Alaska Native Self Identification,” (Paper presented at the workshop on the demography of American Indian and Alaska Native Populations, National Research Council Committee on Population, Washington, D.C., 1995).

3. D. Thelen and F. E. Hoxie, *Discovering America: Essays on the Search for an Identity* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994).

4. Previous research focusing on aboriginal peoples in the United States have used the terms *American Indian*, *Indian*, and *Native American* as the nomenclature for this population. This article subverts this tradition by instead using the term “Indigenous Peoples.” These terms are capitalized because they are proper nouns (particular persons) and not adjectives (words describing nouns). It is also capitalized to signify and recognize the cultural heterogeneity and political sovereignty of Indigenous Peoples in the western hemisphere (Yellow Bird, 1999).

5. D. A. Mihesuah, “American Indian Identities: Issues of Individual Choices and Development,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 22 (2) (1998): 193-226.

6. C. D. Pewewardy, “American Indian and White Students Talking About Ethnic Identity in Teacher Education Programs: Helping Students Know Themselves as Cultural Beings,” *Action in Teacher Education*, 24 (2) (2002): 22-33.

7. J. Harjo, “Introduction,” In Joy Harjo and Gloria Bird, Eds., *Reinventing the Enemy’s Language: Contemporary Native Women’s Writings of North America*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1997).

8. G. Bird, “Introduction,” In Joy Harjo and Gloria Bird, Eds., *Reinventing the Enemy’s Language: Contemporary Native Women’s Writings of North America* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1997).

9. In this respect, the consciousness of the oppressor transforms Indigenous Peoples identity into a commodity of its domination and disposal (Freire, 1997). Ceasing to call Indigenous Peoples, *American Indians* is more than an attempt at political correctness. It is an act of intellectual liberation and it is a correction to a distorting narrative of imperialist “discovery and progress” that has been maintained far too long by Europeans and Euro-Americans. Thus, *American Indian* and *Indian* are sometimes used interchangeably as a common vernacular in this article only when trying to make a point in an attempt to liberate and combat linguistic hegemony, which is both a direct and indirect power block to the identity of Indigenous Peoples (Yellow Bird, personal communication, 2000).

10. S. B. Vickers, *Native American Identities: From Stereotype to Archetype in Art and Literature* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1998).

11. C. D. Pewewardy, “Will the “Real” Indians Please Stand Up,” *Multicultural Review*, 7 (2), 36-42, (June 1998) and T. Wilson, “Blood Quantum: Native American Mixed Bloods,” In Maria P. P. Root, Ed., *Racially Mixed People in America* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1962), 108-125.

12. P. P. Hilden, *When Nickels Were Indians: An Urban, Mixed-Blood Story* (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995); M. P. Root, *Racially Mixed People in America* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1992), M. P. Root, *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New Frontier* ( Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1996); W. S. Penn, *As We Are Now: Mixblood Essays on Race and Identity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1996); J. Highwater, *Anpao: An American Indian Odyssey* (New York: Scholastic Inc, 1977) and E. McGaa, *Rainbow Tribe: Ordinary People Journeying on the Red Road* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1992).
13. Arkeketa, personal communication, 2000.
14. D. Francis, *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture* (Vancouver, B.C.: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1992).
15. C. B. Wilson, *Search for the Purebloods* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989).
16. Wilson, 1989.
17. R. A. Jetty, *They're Supposed To Be Sovereign Nations (?)*: Hegemonic constructions of contemporary American Indian issues in current United States history textbooks, (Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1998).
18. R. Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-Century America* ( New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1992).
19. M. K. Green, "Cultural Identities: Challenges for the Twenty-First Century," In Michael K. Green, Ed., *Issues in Native American Cultural Identity* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1995).
20. D. L. Fixico, "Introduction to the Reprint Edition," In Joseph H. Cash and Herbert T. Hoover, Eds., *To Be an Indian: An Oral History* (St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1995).
21. Trimble, 1995.
22. Ibid.
23. I. Hernandez, "Foreword: Reflections on Identity and Culture," In Patricia Riley, Ed., *Growing Up Native American* ( New York: Avon Books, 1993).
24. J. D. Forbes, "Intellectual Self-Determination and Sovereignty: Implications for Native Studies and for Native Intellectuals," *WICAZO SA Review*, 13 (1), (1998): 11-23.
25. Timble, 1995.
26. H. W. Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1971).
27. J. Weibel-Orlando, *Indian Country L.A.: Maintaining Ethnic Community in a Complex Society* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1991).
28. United States Department of Education, "A Study of Definitions and Measures Relating to Eligibility and Service Under Part A of the Indian Education Act." (Unpublished report, United States Department of Education, Washington, D.C., 1982).
29. R. Howarth, "Fake Healers: Tribes crack down on bogus medicine men," *American Indian Report*, p. 24, (1997), A. M. Eaglestaff,, "Readers give opposing views on Indianness," *Indian Country Today*, C. Parker, "Playing Indian" *Twin Cities Reader*, (November 29-December 5, 1995): 11-16; MN, Minneapolis, and A. Smith, "For All Those Who Were Indian in a Former Life," *Ms.* (November-December 1991): 44-45.
30. C. McCarthy and W. Crichlow, " Introduction: Theories of Identity, Theories of Representation, Theories of Race." In Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow, Eds., in *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
31. Francis, 1992.
32. D. E. Stannard, *American Holocaust: The Conquest of the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995) and R. Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: Population History Since 1492* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987).
33. D. W. Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1995) and G. E.

Tinker, *Missionary Conquest: The Gospel and Native American Cultural Genocide* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993).

34. R. Strickland, *Tonto's Revenge: Reflections on American Indian Culture and Policy* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1997).

35. K. Eschbach, *Shifting Boundaries: Regional variation in patterns of identification as American Indian*, (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1992).

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

37. A. Gonzales, "The (Re)Articulation of American Indian Identity: Maintaining boundaries and regulating access to ethnically tied resources," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 22 (4) (1998): 199-225.

38. J. Nagle, *American Indian Ethnic Renewal, Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996) and S. Cornell, *The Return of the Native: American Indian Political Resurgence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

39. J. V. Fenelon, "Discrimination and Indigenous Identity in Chicago's Native Community," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 22 (4), (1998): 273-303.

40. T. Straus, and D. Valentino, "Retribalization in Urban Indian Communities," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 22 (4), (1998): 103-115.

41. S. Lobo, "Is Urban a Person or a Place? Characteristics of Urban Indian Country," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 22 (4), (1998): 89-102.

42. *Supertribal or supertribalism* is an improvement over the term *pan-Indian* used previously, but includes much more than relocated urban Indigenous People, such as the political and social movement groups working within reservations (Fenelon, 1998).

43. M. C. Snipp, "Some Observations About Racial Boundaries and the Experiences of American Indians," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 20 (4), (1997): 667-689.

44. Gonzales, 1998.

45. N. H. Gross, "Who's an Indian?: The Arts and Crafts Act is No Help," *Colors*, 2 (1), (1993): 16-19.

46. Gross, 1993.

47. A. Neskahi, "Rainbow Walker" (website available: <http://www.rainbowwalker.com/influenced.htm>), (2000).

48. Most powwow hobbyists enjoy playing *Indian* in order to address longings for meaning and identity that arose from the anxieties of their time. Powwows granted them freedom from their own culture, but, as with the rebels in Boston, such escape did not result in the solidity of a secure identity (Deloria, 1998).

49. J. Clifton, *Being and Becoming Indian: Biographical studies of North American frontiers*, Ed., (Chicago: Dorsey, 1989).

50. Gonzales, 1998.

51. Micheal Pavel, May 20, 2000. personal communication.

52. Gonzales, 1998.

53. W. Churchill, "The Crucible of American Indian Identity: Native Tradition Versus Colonial Imposition in Postconquest North America," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 23 (1) (1999) 39-67.

54. J. D. Forbes, *Only Approved Indians* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995).

55. The slang term "everyday people" was popularized by Sly Stone's hit titled, *Everyday People* meaning the common reasoning and conversation of the lay person (non-sophisticated jargon). This song can be heard in Epic's 1981 recording of *Sly and the Family Stone Anthology*.

56. Francis, 1992.

57. Hilden, 1995.

58. Smith, 1991.

59. P. J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).

60. Wannebe Alert, webpage available: <http://users.bart.nl/~caglebbs/wannabe.html>, (2000).

61. S. Nieto, *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education* (New York: Longman, 2000) and Patricia Penn Hilden's *When Nickels Were Indians* (1995). An urban, mixed-blood story recounts her life of an urban child of mixed blood ethnic heritage, recognizing "cultural schizophrenia": on the one hand, one lives a "white" life, slipping into the mainstream of habits, expectations, actions, language almost without disguise.
62. H. Adams, *A Tortured People: The Politics of Colonization* (Penticton, B.C.: Theytus Books LTD, 1995).
63. Adams, 1995.
64. Forbes, 1998.
65. P.C. Rollins and J. E. O'Connor, *Hollywood's Indian: The Portrayal of the Native American in Film* (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1998).
66. S. Bok, *Mayhem: Violence as Public Entertainment* (Reading, MA: Perseus Books, 1998).
67. Center for Media Education, *Commercials*. Available: [http://www.cme.org/children/kids\\_tv/commercial.html](http://www.cme.org/children/kids_tv/commercial.html), (1997).
68. Jill Lepore (1998) shows how King Philip's War helped to create the origins of an American identity.
69. Churchill, 1999.
70. Nagel, 1995.
71. Gonzales, 1998.
72. D. M. Hoffman, "A Therapeutic Moment? Identity, Self, and Culture in the Anthropology of Education," *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 29 (3), (1998): 324-346.
73. Hernandez, 1993.
74. Gonzales, 1998, A. C. Yallup, "Not Indian Enough" *Red Ink*, 8 (1), (1999): 55.
75. Standing, 2000.
76. C. West, *Race Matters* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994).
77. M. Foster, *Being and Becoming Comanche: A Social History of an American Indian Community* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1991).