A Pueblo sun looking at the earth. A Native view of the cosmos as well as a Native perspective of the world. It is a reminder that countless cultures view the cosmos in different ways and each is correct.
As the author of this textbook, I must explain the title, Native Nations of North America, at the outset. First, each chapter in the book explores a serious concern or issue experienced by currently existing peoples who are native to North America, or within its political jurisdiction, including those in Alaska, Canada, and Hawai‘i. The book also provides an ethnohistorical perspective, because one can only understand the present day through the lens of historical events unique to and from the perspective of the Indigenous people selected.

Second, the Native peoples featured in this book are rightly viewed as nations rather than as tribes. Therefore, the words Native and Indigenous are capitalized just as are Caucasian and European in conventional academic works. This book presents an Indigenous perspective, not an anthropological one, because analysis is from the point of view of Native scholarship, i.e., Native American (American Indian) Studies. The word tribe employed by cultural anthropologists as a generalized term inadequately defines the variable levels of sociopolitical integration found in North America among Indigenous peoples. The concept of nation, derived from the Latin natio, is more than two thousand years old and originally meant the family, language, customs, and beliefs of a people. The term was later extended to the populations of territories, states, individual nationalities, and eventually modern nation-states. It was during the early period of colonial expansion that the invading European powers applied the term tribes to American Indian societies to signify the inhabitants of a specific territory who share a common identity, origins, language, and culture. From an Indigenous perspective, if we define Native peoples as nations, it follows that the concept of sovereignty is also included, the right to govern themselves as distinct and independent peoples. This fundamental right was recently underscored when the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration On the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) on September 13, 2007. There are approximately 375 million Indigenous people in the world, including those in the Americas.

Third, the term Indigenous encompasses not only the Native American or Indian peoples of North America, but also Alaska Natives (Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos), and the First Nations of Canada (Indians, Métis, and Inuit). Native Hawaiians also are included under this rubric. They, along with Native Samoans and the Chamorros of Guam, are today living within the dominating orbit of the United States as semicolonized, Native peoples.

Finally, the term North America as used here includes also the Indigenous peoples of Mexico. The common usage of the term to include only the English-speaking part of the continent is clearly Anglo-centric and therefore unscientific. The artificial division of the northern part of the Western Hemisphere into English-speaking and Spanish-speaking spheres has occurred only in the last five hundred years and belies the many thousands of years prior to the European conquest during which the region was occupied solely by contiguous Indigenous societies speaking many languages other than English or Spanish, all of which existed without a Mexican border.

This book was conceived as a companion textbook to Native American Voices: A Reader (Reader) now in its third edition, by Susan Lobo, Steve Talbot, and Traci L. Morris (2010). This text expands on many of the themes detailed in the Reader, but in terms of specific Indigenous peoples rather than as thematic categories. For example, Chapter 2, “The Hidden Heritage: the Iroquois and the Evolution of Democracy,” presents a longer and more detailed account of the notable Iroquois Confederacy than is described in Part Two of the Reader. Similarly, Chapter 3, “Greed and Genocide: California Indians and the Gold Rush,” is a fuller treatment of the themes of racism and genocide than is discussed in Part Four of the Reader. Chapter 4 in the new book takes up the issue of Native American religious freedom by describing Lakota Sioux spirituality in the context of the 1890 Wounded Knee massacre, and is a case study of “the Sacred” discussed in Part Seven of the Reader. The history of the Native Hawaiian struggle for Indigenous sovereignty documented in Chapter 8 of the current book echoes articles in the Reader by Poka Lani (Part Three), Haunani-Kay Trask (Part Eight), and Leanne Hinton (Part Ten). And so on. In addition, each chapter of Native Nations of North America includes analytical concepts that can explain the issue under discussion, such as racism, ethnic cleansing, the erosion of tribal sovereignty, subsistence rights, or the abridgement of Indian religious freedom.
The chapters in Native Nations of North America: An Indigenous Perspective also present an ethnographic survey of Indigenous North America with issue-oriented essays on the Haudenosaunee Iroquois, California Indians, Lakota Sioux, Navajo and Hopi, Cherokee Nation, the fishing peoples of the Columbia River Basin, Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Natives. Chapter 9 on the Native peoples of Canada includes an Internet survey by Bruce E. Johansen, Professor of Communication at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, of issues facing Canada’s First Nations. 

Chapter 11, “The Trouble with Stereotypes,” surveys the phenomenon of Indigenous urbanism, both in its ancient and contemporary manifestations, and is a fuller treatment and analysis of this important but often neglected subject, discussed in Part Nine of the Reader.

The selected Native nations also serve as examples for most of the cultural areas common in anthropological usage (see Kehoe 1981), i.e., the Iroquois chapter for the Northeast cultural area, Cherokee for the Southeast, the Lakota Sioux for the Plains, Navajo-Hopi for the Southwest, Alaska and Canada for the Arctic and subarctic, and the California and Northwest chapters for their respective culture areas in addition to Hawai’i. A note to instructors who use this textbook: the chapters do not have to be assigned consecutively. Any one chapter with its themes and its respective bibliography and Study Guide can stand alone.

THE NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL HERITAGE

This is a book about the Native Peoples of North America from an Indigenous perspective. First and foremost, this perspective includes a knowledge of and appreciation for the Indian heritage of the Americas. A listing of some of the major elements of this heritage will serve to demonstrate the enormity of the gift.

Population and Language

The importance of producing a textbook on the Native nations of the Americas is seen in the following demographics. Estimates of the number of people Indigenous to the Americas before 1492 range as high as 112 million, about one-fifth of the world’s population at the time. By the end of the nineteenth century, due to the subsequent genocide, their numbers reached a low of only a few million. Yet today, the majority population of both Bolivia and Guatemala is Indian, Peru has more than eight million, Mexico at least 10.5 million, and Ecuador about 3.8 million. In the three largest countries, Canada has over one million, the United States several million, and Brazil several hundred thousand American Indians. The Indigenous genetic heritage is clearly the dominant strain in Paraguay, Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador in South America; in Mexico and most of the countries of Central America; and in Greenland in North America. In Guatemala, Indian people constitute between 70 percent and 80 percent of the total population with at least half speaking one of the many Native languages. Many do not speak Spanish. Indigenous ancestry is one of the important elements in the racially mixed populations of Chile, Columbia, Venezuela, Brazil, and Panama. Native American Indians “survive in every mainland American republic (except in Uruguay where a rural mestizo or mixed-blood population alone survives) and even on a few Caribbean islands” (Forbes 1969, 7).

Linguists estimate fifty-six separate language families for the Native peoples of the Americas, a fact attesting to their long occupancy and complex relationships in the Western Hemisphere. There are as many as 1,700 to 2,000 Indigenous languages many with complex grammars and vocabularies containing up to 20,000 words. In Mexico alone there are thirty-three principal Indian languages still spoken, as little related to each other as are Finnish, Chinese, and Hebrew. It is estimated that there are more than thirty million Indigenous Americans in North, Central, and South America who speak one of the hundreds of still existent Indian languages, while perhaps as many as one hundred million people possess some degree of Indigenous ancestry.

Until recently, it was difficult to estimate the number of persons of Indigenous descent currently residing in the United States because of flawed research methodology by the U.S. Census and failure to enumerate those of mixed racial backgrounds. This changed with the 2000 Census of U.S. population, which found 4.5 million individuals with a significant degree of Indian ancestry, including at least 2.5 million Native Americans who identify primarily as Indian and Alaska Native only. In the 2010 Census, the number of respondents reporting Native American ancestry increased to 5.2 million, with 2.9 million reporting American Indian or Alaska Native alone. One must also consider that most Mexican Americans, and many African Americans, Puerto Ricans, French Canadians, and other population groups possess varying degrees of Indigenous descent. It is obvious that the Indigenous genetic legacy of the Americas is great indeed, especially if one considers the whole of the Americas.
Before the European conquest, the Americas were populated by thousands of different Native communities and nations, organized from the smallest sociopolitical unit, such as the family commune or band, to the largest, such as the urban civilizations of the Aztec, Maya, and Inca, which numbered tens of millions of people. Despite a precipitous decline due principally to the European conquest, a standard estimate for the current American Indian population is ten or more million living in what is now Mexico, another ten million at least in Central America, millions more in Peru, and three million Chibchas in Colombia and Panama.

For years anthropologists estimated that before the European conquest in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there were less than one million so-called American Indians living north of the Rio Grande River in the United States and Canada, but recent scientific estimates have pushed that figure up to seven or more million. Demographer Russell Thornton (1998, 19) conservatively estimates that there were “about 5 million people for the coterminous United States and about 2 million for present-day Canada, Alaska, and Greenland combined.” In the Andes of South America, twelve million still speak Quechua, the language of the Incas. Many Indians of Mexico still speak Nahuatl, the language of the Aztecs, and there are six million Mayan speakers in Central America. Such is the magnitude of the Indigenous population in Guatemala that were the country to have a completely free election, it could become a modern Mayan republic.

The entry of Europeans into the so-called New World after 1492 led to the rapid collapse and decline of the Indigenous populations. The resultant genocide became the American holocaust. The population decline in Central and South America totaled tens of millions; “the Native American population of the United States, Canada, and Greenland combined reached a nadir of perhaps 375,000 around 1900” (Thornton 1998, 19).

Despite the tragic population collapse, the legacy of Indigenous languages has contributed to our geographical terminology in North America. Twenty-eight (some say twenty-four) states, numerous smaller political units, towns, rivers, lakes, mountain ranges, individual summits, and other landmarks have Native American place names in the United States.

According to the anthropologist Alfred Kroeber (1925), there are 196 place names in California that are derived from Indian languages, and 5,000 place names in New England. In addition, at least 300 other words—names of plants, animals, food, and materials—have contributed to our American English by the various Indigenous languages spoken north of Mexico. (See Keoke and Porterfield 2002).

**Food Production and Agriculture**

Population was densest in the highlands of Peru and Colombia in South America, and in the Yucatan and the Valley of Mexico. But everywhere “there is every reason to believe that the land was maintaining the maximum population consonant with the state of development of Indian agriculture and industry” (MacLeod 1928, 16). In North America there was no free land in spite of the European view to the contrary. From the European perspective there was plenty of room, “because with European agricultural methods, the Americas, particularly in the temperate zone, could be made to support a greater population” (MacLeod 1928, 17). But every bit of land was utilized by the Indigenous peoples using the methods of horticulture known to them, “and hunting was no haphazard pleasure-jaunting, but a careful and laborious systematic exploitation of the wild animals and wild vegetable products of each region” (MacLeod 1928, 17).

There have been countless economic and cultural contributions made by Indigenous peoples to the contemporary countries of Americas. Two important reference sources are the Encyclopedia of American Indian Contributions to the World, by Keoke and Porterfield (2002), and Native Roots: How the Indians Enriched America, by Jack Weatherford (1991).

Native Americans over the centuries developed eighteen plants but few draft animals.Corn, cotton, tobacco, potatoes, and peanuts were all gifts of the Native peoples. They also discovered and cultivated sweet potatoes, pumpkins, squash, beans, artichokes, sunflower seeds, and cranberries. Almost one-half of the world’s usable food supply came from the Americas. It was in Central America and the Andean region of South America where these basic foods were domesticated and widely cultivated.

Main areas of agriculture in North America were the Mississippi Valley eastward to the Atlantic Coast, from Florida to the 50th parallel, and the Southwest. Maize was so thoroughly domesticated that it will not produce in its wild state. The entire maize complex developed by the Indians was taken over by White settlers. The Euro-American’s single contribution was the substitution of the mill for the mortar in the grinding process.

The White settlement of America would have been delayed a century without maize having been available. It is estimated that 60 percent of crops grown in the world today came from the Americas, with corn...
were also used in curing ceremonies. Many are still surgery techniques. Psychosomatic techniques problems and for fractures and dislocation, and there Native people. There were treatments for childbirth widely acknowledged the overall excellent health of naturopaths, holistic doctors, and clinical ecologists of the harmful side effects of synthetic drugs, many used in modern medicine (Momaday 1996). Mindful curare, cocaine for the relief of pain, and ephedra, all plants for medicinal purposes, including winter- In addition, the Indians cultivated some sixty wild foods were especially important as a supplement. A large variety of fruits, nuts, seeds, and roots were gathered. In California there were wild seeds, especially the acorn; in the western Great Lakes area it was wild rice; on the Northwest Plateau roots were a staple, especially the camas, and on the Northwest coast and in south Alaska different kinds of berries augmented a diet of fish and animal foods. Many of these foods are still gathered, prepared, and eaten at traditional Indian ceremonies today and are widely appreciated in the Native American community as an important link to the cultural heritage of Indigenous America.

Medicine

The Native American contribution to medicine is both significant and lasting. More than half of the medicines found in the modern pharmacy, such as aspirin, are from Native American-derived sources. In addition, the Indians cultivated some sixty wild plants for medicinal purposes, including winter-green, witch hazel, cascara sagrada, chinchona bark, curare, cocaine for the relief of pain, and ephedra, all used in modern medicine (Momaday 1996). Mindful of the harmful side effects of synthetic drugs, many naturopaths, holistic doctors, and clinical ecologists are using natural medicines derived from generic sources as a better alternative for the treatment of the sick.

Indigenous medical knowledge represented the studied accumulation of thousands of years of observation and skilled practice, and the early Europeans widely acknowledged the overall excellent health of Native people. There were treatments for childbirth problems and for fractures and dislocation, and there were surgery techniques. Psychosomatic techniques were also used in curing ceremonies. Many are still widely in use today and are acknowledged as effective by contemporary psychiatrists. “American Indian physicians used holistic health practices for centuries before the arrival of Europeans” (Keoke and Porterfield 2002, 129)

Other Contributions

Several varieties of Native tobacco were adopted by Europeans. Tobacco circled the world in less than two centuries and was reintroduced by the Russians into Alaska. Originally it was introduced into Europe by Spain in 1558, and then into England in 1586. Tobacco became immensely important to the colonies and was indirectly responsible for the eventual dispossession of the Five Civilized Tribes in Georgia and other southern states. Today, tobacco is one of the most valuable cash crops grown in the United States. Tobacco was used spiritually (and sparingly) in Native religious ceremonies, and in a pure form—not laced with chemicals to make it burn continuously or taste and smell good. As far as can be determined, there were no cancer-related deaths from tobacco used in this manner.

Cotton was known in the Old World, but is also grown in the Americas. Some was originally grown in the Southwest, but mostly it was not grown in North America. Corn and tobacco were at first important to the colonies for two centuries. Cotton, on the other hand, was shipped to England until the late eighteenth century. Invention of the cotton gin in 1793 led to its economic importance in southern United States. The value of Indian lands in the South, and the forced dispossession of the Indians from these lands under the 1830s Indian Removal Acts, was due in large part to the increasing value to Anglo-Americans of cash crops like cotton and tobacco.

Indigenous societies respected the environment by living in harmony with nature. To do otherwise would be to destroy the food sources for societies that were hunters and gatherers or horticulturists. The land ethic of stewardship was reinforced by Indian spirituality. Supernatural powers governed the natural world and formed a link between mankind and all things both animate and inanimate. “The Indian had a respect bordering on awe for everything he could see, hear or touch: the earth was the mother of life, and each animal, each tree, each living thing was locked into an interrelated web of spiritual existence of which the individual was a small part” (Udall, 1972, 19). This view contrasted to that of land-hungry European immigrants who saw themselves as mastering nature.
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Rubber was another Native American contribution. Balls, enema tubes, syringes, water proof clothing all are made from rubber.

Various forms of Native housing influenced early European settlements. These include the adobe pueblo construction, especially in the North American Southwest and California; the bark or thatch covered wigwam (adopted by the first settlers of New England); and the palisaded Indian village. The latter became the defense against attack for eastern forts. The log cabin, on the other hand, was of Scandinavian origin rather than Indian.

The hammock, used by Amazonian Indians, was adopted by the navies of the world. They were infinitely better than fixed bunks when at sea. The parka, the poncho, moccasins, and textile fibers (cotton and sisal) were also borrowed from the American Indians. Tailored clothing made of skins, textiles (cotton), and the use of an outer robe of unshaped animal hide (buffalo, deer, or moose) were all borrowed from Native Americans. One type of Indian clothing used extensively in North America was that of the frontiersman—the deerskin outfit consisting of a shirt, leggings, moccasins, and breechcloth. Taken over by the early settlers or borderers of the trans-Allegheny frontier, it became famous as the dress adopted by Daniel Boone. It was admirably adapted to the conditions of wilderness life. George Washington even recommended a modified form of this costume as uniform equipment for the Revolutionary soldier.

The hammock, used by Amazonian Indians, was adopted by the navies of the world. They were infinitely better than fixed bunks when at sea. The parka, the poncho, moccasins, and textile fibers (cotton and sisal) were also borrowed from the American Indians. Tailored clothing made of skins, textiles (cotton), and the use of an outer robe of unshaped animal hide (buffalo, deer, or moose) were all borrowed from Native Americans. One type of Indian clothing used extensively in North America was that of the frontiersman—the deerskin outfit consisting of a shirt, leggings, moccasins, and breechcloth. Taken over by the early settlers or borderers of the trans-Allegheny frontier, it became famous as the dress adopted by Daniel Boone. It was admirably adapted to the conditions of wilderness life. George Washington even recommended a modified form of this costume as uniform equipment for the Revolutionary soldier.

The American revolutionists took over the Indian method of fighting from ambush and camouflage. The British generals bitterly complained that the Americans did not fight fair when they hid behind stone fences and trees and fired at the exposed Redcoats marching in ranks along open roads. Most importantly, the example of eastern Indians, particularly the powerful Six Nation Haudenosaunee (Iroquois), to form political confederations was not lost upon the U.S. founding fathers in their efforts to craft a republic. (The Iroquois contribution is discussed in detail in Chapter 2.)

Other Native contributions include jewelry and adornment, and casting by the lost wax method. The Aztec and Incan rulers were richer in terms of gold and silver objects and art works than their counterparts in Europe. Tragically, the beautifully unique gold objects were melted down by the European invaders for gold bullion, and the mines where the Indigenous peoples were enslaved helped finance the birth of the Industrial Revolution in Europe.

Indian weaving is among the finest in the world. Incan weaving, including the sacred textiles of Bolivia, and the much prized blankets of the Navajos are examples. Decorated dress, with shell and bone, porcupine quills and feathers, is not merely a craft, it is an art form. The Mexican art muralists—Diego Rivera, Orosco, Siquieros, Cavarrubias—were heavily influenced by pre-Columbian art. The contemporary Indian art and architecture of the United States has likewise been heavily influenced. Contemporary performing Indian musicians and artists are now making an impact in the United States.

The Native peoples of North America lacked the horse initially for land travel, but the Indian birch bark canoe became essential for Europeans traveling the waterways of the Canadian interior, the Great Lakes region, and the Mississippi Valley. It was especially important for fur traders. The first recorded crossing of the continent by a White man, Alexander Mackenzie, was by canoe in 1793. The early explorers, traders, and settlers made great use of Indian trails and Native geographic knowledge. The forested areas east of the Mississippi River, and especially south of the Great Lakes, were honeycombed with Indian trails, connecting villages, and leading to rock quarries and salt licks. On the North American Plains the trails became wide roads beaten down by the passage of travois poles and large parties. These trails were later used by the Anglo and Spanish missionary, the hunter, the soldier, and the colonist. They evolved from Indian trail to pack trail, to wagon road, and eventually to the modern highway.

Trade was carried on in Native North America widely by barter. Some trade material has been found more than a thousand miles from its nearest possible source or origin. Trade was vital to the Native American economic system, especially for scarce items, including certain foods. Fishing sites on the Columbia River at The Dalles and Celilo Falls in the northwestern United States (now destroyed to make way for modern dams) are but two examples of the great gathering places where Native peoples traded. Standards of value (a sort of money system) included shell beads for both Atlantic and Pacific coast peoples, and animal pelts. The great Indian urban civilizations of Mexico and Central America carried on enormous trade systems, with quetzal feathers among highly prized trade items.

Early Whites utilized Native standards of value and frequently incorporated them as part of their own economies. An obvious example is the fur pelt, such as the beaver, much sought by traders. Beaver
pelts remained the standard of value on the North American frontier until the mid-nineteenth century, when the beaver was all but exterminated. In the southeast it was the deer skin; on the Pacific Coast, the sea otter; and on the Plains, the buffalo hide. Weatherford (1988) details many other unknown developments as a result of the European conquest of Native America.

**Hidden Heritage**

In most conventional historical accounts it is assumed that our modern economic system of capitalism was entirely the product of European ingenuity that ushered in the Industrial Revolution. When the economic system of capitalism arose in England during the eighteenth century, its first form was mercantile or trade capitalism. The English colonies in North America, including the religious pilgrims, were organized as joint stock companies. This stage was followed by industrial capitalism with its factory system of production, and finally in the twentieth century by monopoly capitalism. One may ask why did capitalism arise in Europe and not in some other continent or geographical place? After all, there were a number of civilizations in the world that had precapitalist conditions, such as the advanced urban civilizations in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Americas, where capitalism might have eventually arisen. Europe, after all, was backward both economically and culturally until the Crusades of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The Crusades opened up the Silk Road to China and the desire for goods and trade with other precapitalist centers in the world. Two factors that gave Europe the impetus to move ahead on the capitalist path were its sailing ships and navigation ability to sail out of sight of continental coasts across broad oceans to loot the New World. With the gold and silver stolen from the Americas, combined with armies and sailing ships, European nations were then able to dominate and destroy other precapitalist centers around the globe and quickly monopolize world trade. Such an immense amount of gold and silver bullion was looted from Central American and Andean civilizations that the European colonial powers, Spain in the first place, were able to bankrupt other non-European trade centers.

Weatherford (1988, 1–20) argues that the rise of money capitalism is linked to the silver looted from the Andes Mountains of South America. Cerro Rico (“Rich Hill”) is a mountain of silver over 2,000 feet high that has been continuously mined since 1545. In fact, 85 percent of the silver mined in the Andes Mountains of South America came from Cerro Rico. As a consequence, Potosi became the largest city in the New World, with 160,000 inhabitants by 1650. Prior to Columbus’s so-called discovery of America, most of Europe’s gold came from the Gold Coast of West Africa. After the invasion of the Americas, the Spanish conquistadors did not neglect seizing gold and slaughtering tens of thousands of Native peoples in the process. Spanish conquistador Hernando Cortes demanded gold from the Aztecs, torturing and killing many for it, including the last Aztec leader, Cuauhtemoc. And Francisco Pizarro demanded the greatest ransom ever paid in history from Atahualpa, the Inca emperor, who was then killed. The Inca peoples used gold esthetically, or in a religious sense; there was no gold coin. The Incas decorated the great Temple of the Sun in Cuzco with beaten gold. The emperor had gardens with statues of almost every known animal and plant sculpted in gold and silver. The Spaniards cut up these golden treasures and melted them down into gold bars. The amount of gold looted is estimated at $2.8 billion at contemporary values.

Silver was more suitable than gold for coin to Europeans because of its durability. It became a primary medium of exchange in the developing capitalist world. With so much new money pouring into Europe, the old system mutated into a true money economy. Instead of barter and exchange at European trade fairs under the old feudal system, silver coin became the economic medium of exchange. This hastened the development of a money economy and the ushering in of true capitalism. Soon, the circulation of gold and silver from the Americas trebled in Europe, with the annual output from America ten times the combined output of the rest of the world.

In another chapter Weatherford (1988, 21–38) links the birth of corporations to piracy and slavery. Spain used conquistadors to loot the Americas; the British used pirates and private trading companies. In their quest for gold, the commodity most in demand by the Spaniards soon became slaves. This was because Spain had already killed most of the Indians of the Caribbean and other coastal areas of Spanish America. The British, especially, turned to piracy. Unable to find a Cerro Rico and other mines in North America, they raided Spanish ships carrying gold and silver bullion. In 1562 John Hawkins, with the patronage of Queen Elizabeth I, became the first English slaver. Hawkins’ logo on the bow of his ship was a bust of an African slave in chains.
Working for Hawkins was the young Francis Drake, in command of the slave ship Judith. Drake assembled a syndicate of investors in 1577 to finance a series of raids on Spanish colonies in South America. He plundered sixteenth century Spanish settlements of present-day Chile, Peru, Central America, and Mexico. It is estimated that his financial backers, who probably included the queen herself, reaped profits as high as 1,000 percent on their investment. The queen gave Drake ten thousand British pounds as his reward and knighted him. Capitalism was born on the twin supports of the African slave trade and the piracy of American silver.

Trade eventually replaced piracy for the British when the flow of gold and silver played out a century later. Fur in North America became a commodity. Hudson’s Bay Company, the oldest trading company in the world, was chartered by King Charles II in 1670. Another early trading company was the Northwest Company, founded in 1797 by Scots fleeing the U.S. Revolutionary War. In 1821 it merged with Hudson’s Bay and thereafter dominated all of the trading posts in northwestern North America. In these fur factories, as they were called, there existed a triple caste system: Scots, French Canadians, and mixed race persons who were united through common-law marriage to Indian women.

Other colonizing joint stock companies at the beginning of the seventeenth century (the forerunner of the modern business corporation) included the New France Company, founded in Montreal, the Virginian Company of London, founded in Jamestown, and later, the Dutch West Indies Company, founded in both New Amsterdam and Albany, New York, and the Massachusetts Bay Company. These companies were all founded for profit. As Weatherford explains, eventually these colonizing joint-stock companies founded different kinds of plantations throughout the Caribbean and along the North American coast “to grow sugar cane, tobacco, indigo, rice, maize corn, and some cotton… By 1670 all of the important parts of Anglo North America and the Caribbean had been allotted to one company or another to explore, control, and to exploit” (Weatherford 1988, 33).

It is rarely mentioned in mainstream literature that the thirteen English colonies along the Atlantic seaboard of North America were, in fact, joint stock companies. The Virginia Company first settled Jamestown in the search for gold. The Plymouth Company was a joint stock company in which the merchants and other investors of Plymouth, England, subsidized the Pilgrims to produce commodities for profit. The Pilgrim Fathers first left England to settle in Holland where they found religious freedom but little in the way of economic opportunity. They consequently decided to emigrate to America in search of the profits that had eluded them in the Netherlands. Their first shipment back to Europe contained furs and lumber to sell. “By the start of the 18th century, the financial institutions of the modern capitalist world operated with well-established joint stock companies, extensive banking networks, and even stock exchanges. The entire economic transformation of the world had taken approximately two centuries from Columbus’s discovery of America” (Weatherford 1988, 37).

More than one hundred and fifty years ago, Karl Marx wrote the following assessment of capitalism: “The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalized the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production” (quoted in Huberman 1963, 165). In the Americas, capitalist development was marked by the genocide of tens of millions of Indigenous peoples and the destruction of their societies and cultures.

**AMERICA’S FIRST ECOLOGISTS?**

Generically speaking, ecology is the science devoted to the interrelationships between organisms and their environments. Also included in the definition of ecology is the human activity undertaken to restore or maintain the balance of nature, and an ecologist is an activist in ecological matters. Overwhelming evidence confirms that the nation’s first ecologists were the Indigenous peoples. Wilbur R. Jacobs, professor of history at the University of California, Santa Barbara, writes: “Through their burning practices, their patterns of subsistence (by growing, for instance, corn and beans together to preserve the richness of the soil), by creating various hunting preserves for beaver and other animals, and by developing special religious attitudes, Indians preserved a wilderness ecological balance wheel. Even the intensive farming of the Iroquois, without chemical fertilizers and pesticides, protected the ecology of the northern forests” (Jacobs 1980, 49).

In recent decades, Native Americans have been justly concerned about the harmful impact of capitalist
development on their remaining reservation lands and resources. Winona LaDuke (Anishinaabeg) is a well-known Native environmental activist. Two-times vice-presidential nominee of the Green Party, she has given many lectures and written many articles and two books on the question of the degradation of the Native American environment. In *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life* (1999) she documents the current environmental struggles of nine Native American nations. In a second book, *Recovering the Sacred: The Power of Naming and Claiming* (2005), she examines the Indigenous concept of “the Sacred” that puts into historical context the contemporary struggles of Native American nations to preserve the ecological integrity of their land base and the remains of their ancestors.

Native American concern with the environment is not a new development. In *Ecocide of Native America* (1995), Donald Grinde and Bruce E. Johansen, like historian Jacobs, contend that Native Americans were the country’s first ecologists. Like LaDuke, they document the environmental crisis in Native America, but tellingly note in their introductory chapter: “To appreciate the impact of the environmental crisis on Native Americans, it is necessary to understand the earth from a Native American perspective—as a sacred space, as provider for the living, and as shrine for the dead. Ecology and land are intimately connected with Native American spirituality, which entails that land is not regarded merely as real estate, a commodity to be bought, sold, or exploited for financial gain” (Grinde and Johansen 1995, 3–4). In tracing the differences in Indigenous and Euro-American environmental concepts they write that to understand the European concept of the environment one must go back to the Christian Bible with its command to subdue the earth and the idea of progress. The idea of progress, however, is foreign to Native American cultures, which adopt a cyclical view of reality.

Native American religions have sometimes been described as religions of nature. The *Great Mystery* of the Plains Indians becomes an ecological metaphor for their reverence of the land and its creatures, and the remains of their ancestors buried in Mother Earth. “The Native view . . . derives from a belief that all things—human, animal, vegetable, even rocks—share life. There is no such thing as an ‘inanimate object’” (Grinde and Johansen 1995, 16). It was Luther Standing Bear who famously said: “We did not think of the great open plains, the beautiful rolling hills, and winding streams with tangled brush, as ‘wild.’ Only to the white man was nature ‘a wilderness’ and only to him was the land ‘infested’ with ‘wild’ animals and ‘savage’ people. To us it was tame. Earth was beautiful, and we are surrounded with the blessings of the Great Mystery” (quoted in Grinde and Johansen 1995, 25). Indians lacked a philosophy of *development* of the earth for profit since their ecological-based economies were not part of the capitalist mode of production. That is not to say, however, that they did not modify their natural resources at times in order to sustain their lives and societies.

Before European conquest, with the exception of the ancient urban-based centers of Cahokia in North America and the Mayan cities of Central America, the Indigenous population density was not great enough to overstress the natural environment. “Instead, early European observers marveled at the natural bounty of America—of Virginia sturgeon six to nine feet long, of Mississippi catfish that weighed more than one hundred pounds, of Massachusetts oysters that grew to nine inches across, as well as lobsters that weighed twenty pounds each . . . at flights of passenger pigeons that sometimes nearly darkened the sky and speculated that a squirrel could travel from Maine to New Orleans without touching the ground [and] bison ranged as far east as Virginia” (Grinde and Johansen 1995, 50–51).

Native American religious rituals reflect the Indigenous reverence for life in part because their lives depended on the bounty of nature. The Sun Dance ceremony of the Plains Indians “is associated with the return of green vegetation in the spring and early summer, as well as the increase in animal populations, especially the buffalo” (Grinde and Johansen 1995, 41). In eastern North America, among the Iroquois and other tribes practicing horticulture, the *three sisters*—corn, beans, and squash—were honored in ceremonies. “Native perspectives on the environment often were virtually the opposite of the views of many early settlers, who sought to ‘tame’ the ‘wilderness.’ Many Native people endowed all living things with spirit, even objects which Europeans regarded as nonliving, such as rocks. Most Native Americans saw themselves as enmeshed in a web of interdependent and mutually complementary life. As Black Elk said: ‘With all beings and all things, we shall be as relatives’” (Grinde and Johansen 1995, 36).

Animals are to be venerated and respected as well as plants and all of creation. Often American Indian spiritual communications are directed through the animal brothers, and the Creator often speaks to American Indian people
through visions and stories that involve animals. Through environmentally specific rites, Native Americans hand down to future generations the knowledge of their cultural realities. The environment is a mirror that reflects cultural values. The sweat lodge, the drum, thanksgiving ceremonies, pipe ceremonies, the Sun Dance, and many other rites reinforce the cyclical rhythms of creation and collective connectedness to the immediate environment. (Grinde and Johansen 1995, 263–64)

In the purification sweat lodge, prayers end with “All my relations!”

In April, 1979, Christopher Vecsey and Ruben W. Venables organized a symposium at Hobart and Williams Smith colleges in Geneva, New York, titled “American Indian Environments.” The proceedings were then published a year later by Syracuse University Press. The two editors explain at the outset that the “environments” referred to in the publication “are the nonhuman surroundings commonly called ‘nature,’ or more technically ‘ecosystems,’ the inhabitable biosphere of earth, air, and water upon which all humans depend for survival. . . . In the Indians’ sacred circle of creation, everything—even stone—is equally alive and equally integrated into the balance of life” (Vecsey and Venables 1980, ix). The source of the environmental conflict between the Indigenous nations and the invading Europeans was ideological: the former “saw their environments as the sacred interdependence of the Creator’s will,” but were confronted with “waves of post Renaissance Europeans who saw in the environment a natural resource ordained by God for their sole benefit” (Vecsey and Venables 1980, x).

Environment is usually defined as the nonhuman world, but the fact that Native peoples also endowed a life force or mana into things that non-Indians defined as inanimate, such as stones and Mother Earth itself, broadens the definition from an Indigenous perspective. “In saying that animals, plants, stones, clouds, celestial bodies, and other natural phenomena have life, Indians were declaring that their environment was a world of beings with souls” (Christopher Vecsey 1980, 19). The European scholar Edward Burnett Tyler termed this animism.

The early colonists severely altered their natural surroundings as they pushed the American frontier ever westward across the continent and set in motion physical and biological processes that had a negative if not disastrous effect on the Native environment. When Columbus landed on the island in the Bahamas which he called San Salvador, he encountered the Arawak Indians who welcomed him warmly. “They were a peaceful people who made pottery, wove cloth, and carried on a farming-fishing, handicraft lifestyle that held little immediate interest for the admiral because they mined no gold. . . . Within little more than a century . . . San Salvador had experienced an environmental transformation” (Jacobs 1980, 47). The Arawak were gone and were replaced by Spanish cotton plantations worked by African slaves. “By cutting down tropical vegetation and turning fertile land into one-crop agricultural fields, the Spanish planters reached the soil of its nutrients. . . . Eventually the island. . . became a desert . . . the island’s fertility and the large Native population of skillful farmers (estimated to have developed the most productive fields in the world—cassava, beans, maize, and other crops) had been destroyed by the 1580s” (Jacobs 1980, 47).

Wild plants were a staple food for many Indian peoples and an important supplement for yet other Indian nations. The Native gatherers were careful not to take all of a plant so that it would continue to grow and provide food for another time. Most plant gathering was done by Indian women who were skilled botanists. “They knew exactly which part of the plant to use, and which time of the year to gather them. Often, each part of the plant would be important for different purposes—roots, stalks, flowers and seeds each had their own use. Plants were not only food sources, they were also used as dyes, teas, medicines, even insect repellents, and for their fibers” (Zucker, Hammel, and Hogfoss 1983, 21). The Native respect for the wild animals they hunted has been widely noted. For example, all the various parts of the bison were used by the Plains Indians so that nothing was wasted. This is in contrast to the White hunters who later nearly eradicated the species in pursuit of buffalo robes, and later just the tongues of these animals which the Indians considered sacred. Native hunters of deer and other creatures killed their prey respectfully, giving a prayer and sometimes making a small offering. Traditional Indians carry on this practice today, “asking permission” before taking wild food needed to feed their families. In Indigenous cultures, “plants and animals had a special meaning beyond the economic . . . humans are privileged to be able to eat natural products and owe thanks to the natural world for this bounty. In ceremonies and religious stories Indians honored the spirits of fish, deer, and plants and passed on traditional knowledge about behavior and habitat” (Zucker, Hammel, and Hogfoss 1983, 15).
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

It is true that Native people sometimes modified the land to increase food sources, but they did so without ravaging the environment. In the Willamette Valley of western Oregon, for example, the inland peoples burned forests and prairies to encourage the growth of favored plant species such as berries and camas, the bulb of a wild lily. Later, with the arrival of White settlers, these wild plant resources were destroyed by herds of pioneer livestock.

Contemporary Native Americans still advocate for the environment. In April 2012, a conference was held at Haskell Indian Nation University in Lawrence, Kansas, on “The Rights of Mother Earth: Restoring Indigenous Life Ways of Responsibility and Respect.” The Rights of Mother Earth movement “traces its beginning to Evo Morales, Bolivia’s first Indigenist president. In April, 2009, a Bolivian delegation successfully proposed the recognition of International Mother Earth Day to the United Nations General Assembly, which subsequently recognized April 22 as International Mother Earth Day” (Pember 2012, 21).

In God Is Red (1973), the eminent American Indian scholar Vine Deloria, Jr., examined the current religious crisis in contemporary American life and concluded that Christianity had failed both in its theology and in its application to social issues. Rather than maintaining a hold on a religion imported from Europe, he recommended seeking a new religious commitment. He writes that we must seek god here in the North American landscape and among its first inhabitants, the Indians. We must throw out the Judeo-Christian concept of “linear time,” from creation to apocalypse through exploitation of people and nature, and think in terms of “space,” relating land, community, and religion into an integrated whole, in order to have a proper relationship with other living things. Only by returning to the land can we have an adequate idea of god (Deloria 1973).

THE INDIGENOUS RESEARCH PARADIGM

Given the unique Indigenous cultural heritage described above, it is therefore not surprising that the Indigenous research paradigm differs significantly from that of anthropology, the social sciences, and history.

This book, Native Nations of North America, reflects a different research methodology and theoretical approach to Indigenous peoples than that of history and the social sciences, especially anthropology.
In a 2002 journal article appearing in the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* we described several examples of innovative research by Indigenous scholars that represent the academic paradigm of Native Studies: “American Indian Studies (AIS), or Native American Studies (NAS), arose as a field in the late 1960s and 1970s as part of the ‘new Indian’ [Red Power] movement and the revitalization of Indian culture and identity. . . . Although multi-disciplinary in nature, and drawing from the humanities, history and the social sciences, AIS/NAS is informed by its own paradigm.” (Talbot 2002, 67).

The Indigenous paradigm (research model) has its own theoretical premises and methodological approaches as the chapters in this textbook will demonstrate. By theory we mean an explanation for which there is evidence that illuminates the question, problem, or topic addressed. By methodology we mean a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed, while a research method is simply a technique for gathering data or evidence, ethnohistory for example.

The topical chapters in this book explore some of the Indigenous research and conceptual thinking by Native scholars and elaborate what was presented in the 2002 journal article. Following this line of reasoning, thinking outside the box, we have included in this book theoretical constructs and concepts for research that could explain the chapter issue under discussion.


The basis for *Natives and Academics* was a Winter 1996 special issue of *American Indian Quarterly*, of which historian Mihesuah was the editor. In her introduction Mihesuah recommends using “the Indian voice” in historical research. She writes that “the problem with many books and articles about Indians is not which is included but with what is omitted,” and also notes that many non-Indian scholars write as if they have a monopoly on the truth. Among the contributions to the Mihesuah volume are articles and critiques by Duane Champagne (Chippewa), Vine Deloria, Jr. (Standing Rock Sioux), Donald L. Fixico (Shawnee, Sac and Fox; Seminole and Moscogee), and Elizabeth Cook Lynn (Crow Creek Sioux).

“In *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Tuhiwai Smith urges research that utilizes the Indigenous paradigm, which is defined as utilizing culturally appropriate research protocols and methodologies, and an Indigenous research agenda . . . She critically examines the historical and philosophical basis for Western mainstream research. She critiques the rise of social scientific research of Indigenous peoples that has historically occurred under the aegis of Western imperialism and colonialism” (Talbot 2002, 68).

Several years after the Mihesuah and Smith books, Clara Sue Kidwell and Alan Velie published a slim but comprehensive volume entitled simply *Native American Studies* (2005). In it the authors describe the canon or intellectual premises of the new field in terms of five topical components: land and identity, historical contact and conflict, tribal sovereignty, language, and Indian aesthetics (literature and art).

In Chapter One on “land and identity,” they contend that despite the fact that most Native peoples in the United States today live in urban areas, and many are Christianized, Indigenous identity remains tied to reservation communities and a land-based spirituality: “We argue, therefore, that knowledge and understanding of the association of one’s ancestors with a particular homeland is an essential part of a Native American Studies curriculum” (Kidwell and Velie 2005, 22).

The political importance of the land ethic is reflected in the history of Native American treaty rights and tribal sovereignty, which is the subject of Chapters Three and Four in the Kidwell and Velie volume. The authors contend that ethnohistory is an important part of the Indigenous methodology: “Indian ways of telling the past are essentially different from European ways of writing history, Indian voices must be heard, and their understandings of their interactions with Europeans must be part of historical accounts” (Kidwell and Velie 2005, 43). They give a useful historical summary of the U.S. legal decisions and governmental policies regarding Indian treaty sovereignty, which initially was recognized, but then underwent a steady legislative and judicial process of erosion. Thus, history courses dealing with this subject must include an Indigenous viewpoint on the diminishing of sovereignty (the *Indian voice*). Sovereignty is an important part of the Native American Studies curriculum. The authors also propose a new methodology when it comes to history, because Indian history is cyclical and oral rather than linear as in
the Western historical tradition. “The challenge to Native American/American Indian Studies, then, is to bring to the fore the perspectives of Native people, to establish the legitimacy of their way of telling their own histories” (Kidwell and Velie 2005, 55).

The importance of Indigenous languages is examined in Chapter Five of Native American Studies: “The fourth premise of Native American/American Indian Studies is that language is key to understanding Native World views. Accordingly most programs teach one or more Native language” (Kidwell and Velie 2005, 83).

Finally, in Chapters Six and Seven, the authors contend that Indian literature, art and expressive culture also define the new field. Again, the importance of Native languages is underscored.

The Kidwell and Velie volume is a useful guide to the course content for Native American/American Indian Studies programs and academic departments. A fuller discussion of Indigenous research methodology appears in an article by Métis scholar Adam J. P. Gaudry in the *Wicazo Sa Review*, titled “Insurgent Research” (2011). Writing in the tradition of Miheesah and Tuhiwai Smith, Gaudry criticizes research by the mainstream disciplines on Indigenous peoples as being extractive rather than insurgent. “Rarely are the people who participate in the research process as participants or ‘informants’ considered to be the primary audience when it comes time to disseminate the research. This type of research functions on an extraction methodology. Lost in this extraction process are the context, values, and on-the-ground struggles of the peoples and communities that provide information and insight to the researcher. . . . Research on Indigenous peoples tend to reproduce tired colonial narratives that justify occupation and oppression” (Gaudry 2011, 113–14).

Gaudry proposes to replace extraction methodology with an insurgent research paradigm. This is accomplished by refocusing research methodology dealing with Native peoples in four ways: (1) employing Indigenous worldviews, (2) orienting knowledge creation towards Indigenous peoples and their communities,” (3) “by seeing our responsibility as researchers as directed almost exclusively towards the [Indigenous] community and participants,” and (4) “promoting community-based action that targets the demise of colonial interference within our lives and communities” (2011, 114).

### Native Studies Departments and Programs

A subject of concern to Indigenous scholars is the current status of the Native American/American Indian Studies academic programs and departments in the United States and Canada. This subject was addressed in the introduction to Part One of *Native American Voices: A Reader*, and with a listing of current programs in an appendix (Lobo, Talbot, and Morris 2010, 2, 501–2):

Native American Studies (NAS), also known as American Indian Studies (AIS), arose as an academic field of study in the late 1960s during the “new Indian” movement. . . . As part of this development, 46 undergraduate programs in NAS were founded, 19 programs on college and university campuses in California alone. A 1999 survey by the Association of the Study of American Literatures found 13 programs and departments offering graduate degrees in NAS, at least 4 with Ph.D. programs, and more than 350 professors in more than 100 colleges and universities were identifying themselves as Native American or Alaska Native. The 2008 revised *A Guide to Native American Studies in the United States and Canada* found 130 institutions of higher learning with NAS programs, 26 offering related graduate degrees, 46 with majors, 81 offering minors, and 23 offering concentrations.

Kidwell and Velie (2005, 131–41) also devote a chapter in their book to the history and current status of Native American Studies. They point to the new field’s activist origins when Native students challenged university administrators about the lack of the *Native voice* in standard college courses, and the lack of an Indigenous curriculum. The first institutions of higher learning to offer a Master’s degree in Native Studies were the University of California at Los Angeles in 1982 and the University of Arizona in 1983. Earlier, in 1976, the University of California at Berkeley offered a Ph.D. in Ethnic Studies that included Native American Studies as one of its components. Other noteworthy developments followed.

In 1996 the University of Arizona established the first American Indian Studies Ph.D. program in the nation. In 1995 the University of Oklahoma, in a state that is currently home to thirty-nine federally recognized tribes, established an interdisciplinary bachelor’s degree program in Native Studies, and in 2003 the Native American Studies program gained approval for a Master’s degree. Montana State University established a new graduate program focused on education in 1997,
and the University of California at Davis established Master’s and doctoral degree programs in 2000. (Kidwell and Velie 2005, 132)

Unfortunately, this promising development experienced a decline during the 1990s, with the number of college and university NA/AI Studies programs shrinking, due principally to funding problems and lack of administrative support. Duane Champagne (Turtle Mountain Chippewa) examined this question in an article titled “The Rise and Fall of Native American Studies in the United States” that appeared in an edited volume, *American Indian Nations* (Horse Capture, Champagne, and Jackson, 2007, 129–47), and is reprinted in Part One of *Native American Voices: A Reader*. Despite the decline, which Champagne documents, he remains optimistic that “there is great promise for American Indian Studies in the twenty-first century as a new and substantial paradigm” (Champagne 2007, 129).

Like Kidwell and Velie, Champagne chronicles the activist origins of Native American Studies. “The programs reflected the social movement and social change trends of the 1960s and 1970s by efforts to bring more inclusion to members of historically excluded and disadvantaged groups,” such as African American, Asian American, Chicano/Latino, as well as American Indian (Champagne 2007, 131). He also notes the development of ethnohistory—“a synthesis of historical documentary and anthropological ethnographic approaches”—which became an important tool of the NAS/AIS paradigm.

Champagne contends that main cause for the decline of Native American Studies programs is structural. “The great majority of the programs have not formed departments but are organized as interdisciplinary programs. American Indian Studies departments are rare; most notable are the University of California, Davis, and the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, which both have departments, and some of the Canadian universities have departments... The interdepartmental model, where the faculty have different home departments... is the most common form of organization” (Champagne 2007, 138).

A second model, therefore, is the academic department. Departmental status means tenured faculty with a good measure of administrative and academic protection. “A few universities have adopted departments, and often many Indian faculty see the department as an ideal arrangement for Indian Studies. Departments can hire a core of committed faculty... A third model might be called a mixed model, which is a combination of department and associated core faculty... [It] works best when it can explore the strengths of the departmental and interdisciplinary models” (Champagne 2007, 139). Champagne cites as an example the American Indian Studies program at the University of Arizona as one of the most successful examples of the mixed model approach. It has about a dozen core faculty, “and another ten faculty who have other disciplinary departments but are committed to teaching and participation in the Indian Studies Department” (Champagne 2007, 140). There is also a core curriculum in these arrangements, such as introductory courses in Native Studies, with other related courses cross-listed from those taught by the participating, noncore faculty from traditional departments, such as history, sociology, anthropology, and literature.

To summarize Champagne’s assessment: “While I have great faith that an internationally recognized paradigm will be worked out and gain broad acceptance, the university bureaucratic environment, weak resource support, the emphasis on race and ethnic paradigms, and the relegation of Indian Studies to serve general diversity interests for the university will continue to constrain, and often will prevent, full development of Indigenous Studies departments and programs at many universities” (Champagne 2007, 142).

A notable exception to the numerical decline in Native American Studies programs has been the rapid growth of tribally controlled Indian community colleges. At last count, there were thirty-eight tribal colleges and universities in the United States, including Alaska and Canada. (See the map on page 299 of *Native American Voices: A Reader*, and the listing of the tribal colleges in Appendix C.) “Because the colleges operate under tribal charters but are governed by independent boards, they have largely been able to protect their academic freedom while still responding to community needs” (Kidwell and Velie 2005, 135). “Reservation-based colleges are unique institutions that meet the needs of their own particular communities. Most offer some curriculum that addresses the specific language(s) and culture(s) of the reservation” (Champagne 2007, 134).

Despite the decline in Native Studies programs, Champagne believes there have been promising developments. He observes, for example, the establishment of creditable NAS/AIS journals, including the *American Indian Quarterly, American Indian Culture and Research Journal, Wicazo Sa Review, Red Ink*, and the *Journal of American Indian Education*. And more recently, the field has seen the creation of NAISA, the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association, with over five
that the future of the discipline in North America is inevitably tied to the world’s several hundred million Indigenous peoples (see Fagan 1998):

They do not share a common culture, race, or ethnicity, but they share common features, such as culturally holistic, institutionally non-differentiated, self-governing societies engaged in negotiations for preserving land, self-government and cultural integrity with a surrounding nation state. . . . Races, classes, ethnicities, especially in the United States, do not aspire to the territorial, political, and cultural claims that are at the forefront for American Indian communities. . . . The search for Native American Studies is a search for an Indigenous paradigm. (Champagne 2007, 143)

hundred members. An organizing meeting of Native American Studies took place at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, in May of 2007, followed by a second founding meeting by the Institute of Native American Studies at the University of Georgia in April 2008. NAISA was then incorporated in May 2009, with the first annual meeting of the association held in the same year at the University of Minnesota. Current plans of the Association include an academic journal, NAIS, to be published by the University of Minnesota Press twice a year.

Champagne ends his somewhat bleak assessment of the current state of Native American Studies in the United States on an optimistic note in the belief

CHAPTER REVIEW

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What is meant by the Native American cultural heritage to America? Give some examples.
2. What is meant by the hidden cultural heritage? Give an example.
3. Why can Native Americans be considered America’s first ecologists?
4. Explain the relationship or link between Indian spirituality (religion) and their respect and concern for the environment.
5. Explain the Indigenous (NAS/AIS) research paradigm.
6. What are the three models or types of Native American/American Indian Studies programs? Which one, according to Duane Champagne, has been the most successful?
7. Why has there been a decline in NAS/AIS programs in recent years? What has been the exception? Why is Champagne nevertheless optimistic about the future of the field?
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