

The existence of non-enrolled Indians complicates the sensitive national Indian problem in many facets. Non-enrolled Indians not only reside on reservation land, but they also often have blood ties with tribal Indians. Tribes often recognize them as Indians. The United States is obligated to recognize reservation records of their Indian heritage. Refusal of State officials in some sections of the United States to provide welfare grants to indigent reservation Indians impels Federal officials to assist needy non-enrolled Indians.

It is doubtful whether any organization can compile a record showing the approximate number of non-enrolled Indians living in the United States. So many Indians have moved from reservations to integrate into the general population that accurate record keeping is an impossibility. Tribal rolls provide fairly accurate records of enrolled Indians. Reservation census records and Bureau of Census records contain valuable statistics concerning American Indians. The number of non-enrolled Indians is probably larger than records indicate.

A "non-member Indian" is an enrolled Indian who has moved away from his tribal group to live with another tribe. Non-member Indians are prevalent on most reservations. Inter-tribal marriages occur and constitute the major reason why Indians move from one tribe to another.

Traditional Federal non-reservation boarding schools have contributed noticeably to increasing the number of non-member Indians residing on foreign reservations. Students from as far east as New York and North Carolina and from as far west as Oregon and Alaska enroll in Government non-reservation boarding schools. During the school year 1959-60, Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas, enrolled Indian students from thirty states, representing eighty tribes of Indians.

Obviously, boarding schools provide opportunities for senior high school boys to meet girls. They fall in love, marry and often go to live either with the husband's or the wife's tribe. Most reservations have resident couples whose marriages originated from acquaintanceships made in boarding schools. Intertribal marriages also result when Indians meet other Indians at tribal ceremonies and Indian meetings.

Among non-reservation boarding schools currently operating are Haskell Institute in Kansas, Chillico in Oklahoma, Phoenix in Arizona and Chemawa in Oregon. Admission to any of these schools is limited to tribal members possessing one-fourth or more Indian blood. Carlisle Institute in Pennsylvania was the first non-reservation boarding school established for Indians. Carlisle closed in 1918, after operating for more than 30 years. Numerous other boarding schools were closed beginning about 1930 to enable Indians to attend schools on or near reservations.

A non-member Indian is not entitled to enjoy tribal rights of a tribe where he is not enrolled. His marriage to a tribal member does not qualify him to enjoy tribal rights on a foreign reservation. Such rights must be granted by appropriate action of the tribal governing body. As nepotism is often a

determining factor, non-members married into a tribe receive preferential treatment.

Federal services are available to a non-member Indian residing on a foreign reservation provided he can prove he is an enrolled Indian. Many tribes issue membership cards, containing personal data, to members. To be eligible for Federal services, a non-member must possess one-fourth or more Indian blood and be in need as an indigent Indian. A non-member Indian who returns to his native reservation, even after pro-longed absence, resumes his status as a tribal member, and is entitled to whatever tribal rights are available to tribal members.

A child born to non-member parents may be enrolled either with the father's or mother's tribe, if the child meets tribal enrollment requirements. Parents must file a written application for enrollment of a child. The governing body determines whether a child is to be enrolled, often after consulting with officials of the other tribes involved. In some cases a child is denied enrollment by both tribes. When this occurs, the child resumes the status of a non-enrolled Indian.

A White, Negro, Mexican or other spouse of an Indian is referred to as a "non-Indian." Government and religious workers, if they are not Indians, are called non-Indians. Farmers, traders and other people who live in the Indian community are also distinguished from Indians by use of this expression. So are homes and business establishments. Common use of the expression serves to emphasize prevailing social segregation of Indians and non-Indians in a reservation community.

A non-Indian wife of a tribal husband is eligible to receive Federal services available to enrolled Indians. So are her offspring. The explanation is that the wife and children assume the legal status of the husband. However, an Indian woman who acquired a non-Indian husband is not entitled to receive Federal services. Children born to a marriage in this latter category may or may not be approved for tribal enrollment.

Treatment of non-Indian spouses by governing bodies of tribes varies with each tribe. Much depends on whether families maintain residence on the reservation. Much depends also on how well non-Indian spouses are accepted by Indians. An occasional non-Indian spouse assumes an important role in tribal affairs. Some may receive tribal benefits, others may be ignored. Adoption of non-Indians into tribes is possible but is rarely accomplished.

An Indian whose blood is unmixed with the blood of a non-Indian is a full-blood. The full-blood generally resides on a reservation. He is jealous of his full-blood status, often wary of the intentions of the Government personnel, scornful of mixed-bloods, and suspicious of non-Indians who accost him to inquire about reservation affairs. Generally, a full-blood speaks the tribal language fluently. He may not speak English very well and does so only when there is no other choice. A number of such are educated and may be successful farmers or ranchers.

Among a few tribes in the United States an occasional full-blood may still wear his hair in braids. His wife may prefer a blanket or shawl to a coat. She may wear buckskin moccasins in preference to shoes. Rarely will she don a *White* woman's hat. The full-blood often lives in abject poverty, but he is an exceedingly proud person. Tribalism predominates in his thinking habits. Continued existence under Federal paternalism is his life's objective.

It is the full-blood who keeps tribal culture and tribal ceremonies alive. In his group live the priest, medicine man, singer of tribal songs, drummer and dancer. The full-blood dresses for tribal dances in buckskin clothing, decorated with beads, fringes, jingling bells, shell-like ornaments and clusters of highly colored feather fastened to hips and back. He wears necklaces made of bones and animal skins. He may wear a roach fashioned from stiff deer hair. An elegant war bonnet topped with regal eagle feathers is his favorite headdress. His mien in the war dance is akin to that of a proud and honored warrior just returned from victory. If he performs religious rituals, the full-blood is sincere. He is full of fun if he participates in Indian games and social activities.

Full-bloods as a class are less educated than mixed-bloods. However, in many reservation communities, full-bloods dominate the political and social life of tribal members. A few accepted, bilingual, educated members of their group serve as powerful leaders. Full-bloods or followers of their philosophy often constitute the elected membership of tribal governing bodies. They are united because they are full-bloods. They frequently determine the pace a tribal group takes in the acculturation process.

The full-blood is inclined to ignore the wisdom of non-Indians that might motivate change. He is not apt to follow the leadership of mixed-blood members of his tribe toward new horizons. His group almost always constitutes one of several factions on the reservation. Factionalism is immediately created within a tribal group when mixed-blood leaders attempt to direct the tribal group toward hasty acculturation. The full-blood has a great ability to ignore movements and projects designed to change his Indian ways. He has unique ability to resist change with Indian silence. Mixed-bloods are inclined to let full-bloods alone, lest an avalanche of public ridicule be heaped upon them.

Both Federal and Tribal rolls are inclined to show a greater number of full-bloods than actually exist. A few tribes have practically no full-bloods, others have many.

A person who is part Indian and part non-Indian is a "mixed-blood" or "breed." A mixed-blood may possess only one-fourth Indian and three-fourths non-Indian blood and be classed as an enrolled Indian. In unusual cases, a mixed-blood with as little as one-sixteenth or even one thirty-second Indian blood may be a tribal member. The ridiculousness of standards for classifying tribal members is apparent. The United States and tribes often use separate standards.

310 | *Frell M. Owl*

Generally, the United States defines tribal degree of blood of a mixed-blood Indian in terms of fourths as a common denominator. Under this system a mixed-blood would possess one-fourth, one-half, or three-fourths tribal blood. The United States endeavors to restrict its guardianship services to enrolled Indians possessing one-fourth or more tribal blood. However, the rule is not hard and fast. Welfare, education, health and other services may be provided under certain circumstances to any qualified person of Indian heritage who resides on trust land within a reservation and who maintains tribal relations. Maintaining tribal relations covers an extensive area. It may consist merely of living in an Indian community, being a party to an inter-tribal marriage, participating in tribal affairs, or of being recognized by the general public as an Indian. Relaxation of the Federal rule provides most reservation persons of Indian heritage an opportunity to secure Federal

most reservation people assistance in times of need. Each Indian tribe has its own definition of a mixed-blood Indian. Tribes are not in agreement among themselves concerning the degree of tribal blood a mixed-blood should possess to qualify for tribal membership. Neither do tribal definitions coincide with the loose, flexible definition of a mixed-blood held by the United States. The reason for the difference of definitions among the several tribes and between tribes and the United States is that each Indian tribe is a distinct political entity, independent of other tribes and possessing powers of self-government.

extensive powers of self-government.

Indian tribes use various common denominators to define mixed-blood members. Common denominators in use include fourths, eighths, sixteenths and thirty-seconds. Minimum degree of tribal blood required for membership varies from one thirty-second to a high of one-half.

ship generally ranges from a minute one thirty second to a full blood. Obviously, full-bloods predominate in a reservation community where the minimum requirement for membership is as high as one-half tribal blood, just as mixed-bloods predominate where the requirement is as low as one-sixteenth or one thirty-second. The number of non-enrolled Indians is larger in the former system than in the latter. Full-bloods are inclined to encourage marriage within the full-blood group because they desire to perpetuate full-bloods. Mixed-bloods are more apt to secure mates from the mixed-blood or non-Indian group. Mixed-bloods are less concerned with preserving Indian culture than full-bloods.

A concept prevails generally among non-Indians that American Indians living within the United States are "wards of the United States." The concept is largely false legally, even though "ward Indian" has been used many times in Indian treaties and in Federal statutes. The United States recognizes its responsibility as guardian of trust property owned by individual tribal members and by Indian tribes, but the Government does not currently claim Indians as its wards. Rather, the Government recognizes Indians as National and State citizens, by virtue of a Congressional law enacted on June 2, 1924. The Government is quick to point out in its argument that Indians are free to

come and go from reservations. Indians may acquire and dispose of property both on and off reservations. They may vote and hold public office. They pay many taxes. They do not receive monthly cash grants from the United States because of their status as Indians. The United States contends that Indians are citizens, entitled to all responsibilities, privileges and prerogatives pertaining to American citizenship.

It is not uncommon for local State officials, responsible for administering County government, to disagree with the United States concerning the status of Indians as wards. Many County officials regard and treat Indians as wards of the United States. County officials are inclined to shift community service responsibility for both on- and off-reservation Indian to the Federal Government. Indians are well aware of these differences of opinion between Counties and the Government. Rarely do they argue their rights with County commissioners. Indians have been trained to look to the United States as their benefactor, just as they have learned to regard the Indian reservation as a refuge when their rights are questioned or when they encounter trouble in non-Indian communities.

Attitudes possessed by local officials are based on several factors. Many officials have grown up in the community with Indians and are familiar with their problems. Officials are aware of a longstanding court decision which describes an Indian tribe as "a domestic, independent community under the guardianship and protection of the Federal Government." County officials are aware more than other American citizens that State laws have no force against tribal Indians while they remain on reservations. Local officials are aware that Government officials in charge of Indian affairs have Federal funds at their disposal to provide health and welfare services to needy reservation Indians. In the minds of many local State officials, Indians are the responsibility of the United States. They treat them accordingly as wards.

Indian opinions concerning their status as wards of the United States vary. Particularly, the older, uneducated reservation Indians consider themselves to be wards. They often insist that they are wards. The Government's policy of doing for them what they should do for themselves has fostered a feeling of wardship. Many Indians recall feeding systems the Government instituted for reservation Indians; they recall how Government workers collected and handled money due them from rental of their land; how money was held in the disbursing officer's account; how money was parcelled out in monthly allotments—all because Indians were deemed incapable of handling their own money. Through procedures of this nature, many Indians have acquired the feeling that they are wards of the United States.

Acculturated Indians have a better understanding of the relationship the United States has with its Indian citizens. They do not consider themselves wards. To them the United States is a guardian who holds the land they own in trust. Under protection afforded by the United States, their land is free, as are mineral and other products derived from the land. Standards for

312 | *Review Article*

agricultural, range and forestry conservation practices are established and enforced by the Government. Acculturated Indians who hold jobs with the Government and in industry in off-reservation areas appreciate these services. In many instances, the trust land they own is a source of supplemental income. They are content with the paternalistic relationship they have with the United States. However, many have achieved a status as Indian Americans and need the protection of the United States.

Closely related to the "ward" and guardianship concept is the Indian opinion among some tribal groups that tribal Indians are belonging to a separate nation. Some Indians consider their tribe a sovereign entity, possessing powers of self-government and not subject to Federal or State laws. Indians base their opinions on treaties entered into between their tribe and the United States. The validity of this Indian opinion is borne out to some extent by the continued independence of Indian tribes in several areas of domestic relations, maintenance of law and order on reservations and freedom to hunt, fish and trap under rules promulgated by tribal governing bodies rather than by the United States or State governments. Both the United States and State governments have generally kept their legal hands out of these areas. Tribes are permitted to exercise self-government and to administer problems in these areas according to usages and customs of tribes involved. In a sense, Indian tribes are dependent nations, operating within the United States.

The position taken by the United States that Indians are not wards; the feeling by many local State officials that Indians are wards of the United States; and the varied opinions held by Indians concerning their status create attitudes and conditions in the Indian country that pose complicated and sensitive unsolved national human problems.

The United States has employed many devices in its centuries old effort to civilize Indians and place them in the mainstream of American citizens. One of these devices, currently in force, was intended to terminate Federal supervision over competent Indians. In the judgment of Government workers, a "competent Indian" is one who is able to manage his personal affairs without assistance from Government workers. He is skilled enough in business English to protect his real estate holdings from conniving non-Indians. A competent Indian maintains an average American home, pays his debts, is self-supporting and respected in the community where he lives. He no longer needs paternalistic control.

To achieve its objective, the United States devised a procedure of issuing a Certificate of Competency to any qualified Indian landowner who voluntarily filed an application for such a certificate. Upon receipt of a Certificate of Competency, issued by a high-ranking Government official, an Indian becomes free to manage his land without supervision from Government workers. It was the hope of Government officials that this device would remove from Federal supervision all Indian land-owners as they achieved

The terms "good Indian," the expression "bad Indian," the designation of "good Indians" and "bad Indians" are not only a reflection of the prevailing attitude toward the Indians, but also a reflection of the prevailing attitude toward the government. The terms "good Indian" and "bad Indian" are not only a reflection of the prevailing attitude toward the Indians, but also a reflection of the prevailing attitude toward the government.

The terms "good
long-haired Indian
away with his
of "Good Indian
a good citizen
Indian," the
pression "bad

competency status. The device has not worked effectively. Most competent Indians have preferred to remain under the supervision of the United States. Unfortunately, the procedure the Government devised was used effectively by "incompetent Indians." An incompetent Indian is one who is not capable of managing his personal affairs without assistance from Government workers. He may not read or write English. He may be utterly irresponsible in handling money and in caring for his family.

Perhaps because of pressures exerted on Federal officials by landowners, and pressures on Indians by prospective purchasers, Certificates of Competency were issued almost promiscuously to incompetents during the first quarter of the twentieth century. Certificates in hand, incompetents, relieved of Federal supervision, immediately sold land they owned to non-Indians. Thousands of acres of Indian owned land were alienated through this process. The process also reduced many Indians to a nomadic class often referred to as "landless Indians." Landless Indians currently live both on and off reservations. Many are currently reservation Indians, dependent on both their tribe and the United States for help and assistance in securing basic food and shelter needs. Discretion should be exercised in using the expression "incompetent Indian." Actually, the expression categorizes all tribal Indians who own trust land as "incompetent." No Indian, regardless of the extent of his education or how high a position he holds with the government or a business concern, is legally free to alienate trust land he owns or otherwise permit its use by others than its owner, without specific approval from an appropriate official of the United States. Vice President Charles Curtis,²³ a tribal Indian, appears to have been incompetent in this sense. Many living, prominent Indians are similarly incompetent.

Indians who live on a reservation are frequently referred to as "reservation Indians." In many cases, manner of dress, conduct, habits, speech and other personal characteristics serve to distinguish reservation from more acculturated off-reservation Indians.

Acculturated Indians often give a meaningful interpretation to "reservation Indian." The following incident illustrates. When an acculturated Indian commits a *faux pas* or otherwise shows his ignorance of how to act or what to do in a typical non-Indian situation, he is apt to pass off the chiding of his fellow-Indian friends by saying, "How me know? Me reservation Indian!"

The terms "good Indian" and "bad Indian" also carry certain implications. A trader who had served an aged, non-English speaking full-blood, long-haired Indian commented to a non-Indian friend as the old man ambled away with his sack of groceries, "Subub is a good Indian." The trader's use of "good Indian" meant that Subub was honest, reliable, industrious and a good citizen. Had the trader dubiously shaken his head and used "bad Indian," the characterization would have been just the opposite. The expression "bad Indian" was used in Indian treaties to identify recalcitrants,

thieves and troublemakers. Both expressions are used quite commonly in the Indian country.

In a reservation community, a "Christian Indian" is one who has been converted to Christianity. A "pagan" or "heathen" adheres to native religious ceremonies. Both classes of Indians exist on most reservations.

The majority of Christian Indians attend reservation churches established primarily for Indians. Mission churches of various denominations are often located on tribal land. Tribal members occasionally serve as ministers and leaders in reservation Christian churches. Services may be conducted in the Indian language. The degree to which Indians have accepted Christianity varies with each tribal group. A limited number of reservation Indians attend non-Indian churches in towns or cities.

Pagan Indians participate in native religious ceremonials. The nature of native religious ceremonies varies from tribe to tribe. All native religions recognize the existence of a Supreme Being. The Native American Church, sometimes called the Peyote religion, is prevalent among numerous tribes. Social and political activities are often connected with native ceremonials. It is not unusual for Christian Indians to attend and participate in pagan ceremonies. In rare cases pagans may attend a service in a Christian church.

Prior to 1924, an Indian who acquired American citizenship status through one method or another was distinguished from other Indians by the expression "citizen Indian." A tribal member who received a Certificate of Competency was presumably an American citizen; an Indian woman who married a White man achieved citizenship status; an Indian who served honorably in the military forces of the United States and who filed an appropriate application was recognized as a citizen. Groups of tribal Indians became citizens through specific acts of Congress. Other tribal groups were citizens by virtue of provisions contained in Indian treaties. Indians who were not citizens were either wards, persons under the guardianship of the United States, or subjects of an Indian nation within a nation. Actually, being a citizen Indian did not mean much to Indians or non-Indians. The confusion was clarified to some extent by the Act of June 2, 1924, making all Indians born within the territorial limits of the United States citizens.

The "Great White Father" in Indian terminology is the President of the United States. The expression is used also to identify lesser dignitaries in many sections of the Indian country. "Great White Father" is often applied to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Indian agents in charge of reservations are frequently called "White father." The expression is said to have been originated by George Washington.

The expression "White Indian" originated among full-bloods. "White Indian" identifies a tribal member whose physical characteristics are predominantly those of the Whites. Skin is white, eyes are not brown, hair is light colored, speech is English, dress, customs and mannerisms follows the pattern of typical non-Indians. Though White in physical characteristics, the

White Indian "qualifies with the full-bloods adopted with the full-bloods of a reservation. A fuller foreground when the sovereign parent as the sovereign group, such as for Indian on trust for reservation created on reservation domiciled on reservation to civilize Indians, on continued living on who, and what special of the United States The need for a claim United States claim other values, a statement with administration currently received clarified. Undoubtedly concerned War cries from both and plains of the distinguish Indian furor, a definition Congress has abrogate solemn Federal legislative can Indian could The "moccasins" definition, having a star definition will Indian heritages

"White Indian" qualifies as a tribal member. He has identical tribal rights with the full-blood.

Full-bloods also apply the expression "White Indian" to a member of their tribe who has adopted the culture of non-Indians and who has lost typical characteristics of a reservation Indian. A full-blood is not immune to being characterized as a "White Indian."

Obviously, the presence in a composite tribal family of such varied types of siblings as enrolled, non-enrolled, mixed-blood and full-blood Indians is *prima facie* evidence of the social and legal complexity of life within a tribal group. A fuller understanding of the complexity of Indian problems is apparent when the foregoing evidence is augmented by other important factors such as the sovereign nature of an Indian tribe, tax-free status of land held in trust for Indian owners by the United States, fractioned heirship problems created through land inheritance, lack of State authority over Indians domiciled on reservations, historic ambivalence of Federal policies designed to civilize Indians, and existence among many Indians of a strong desire for continued living on reservations under Federal paternalism. To determine who, and what specific American Indians, should be under the supervision of the United States is, indeed, a problem for Solomon to ponder.

The need for a clear-cut definition of an American Indian over whom the United States claims responsibility has prevailed for many years. Among other values, a standard definition would enable Government officials concerned with administration of Indian affairs to weed out questionable persons currently receiving Indian benefits. Rights of Indian citizens would be clarified. Undoubtedly, better public relations between units of local government concerned with Indians and the United States would be enhanced. War cries from both Indian and non-Indian camps would resound over hills and plains of the Indian country in opposition to a definition designed to distinguish Indian Americans from American Indians. Regardless of ensuing furor, a definition is needed.

Congress has plenary power over Indian affairs to the extent that it may abrogate solemn Indian treaties. Congress has responsibility for enacting Federal legislation concerning Indians. A standard of definition of an American Indian could be formulated by Congress.

The "moccasin trail," a well known Indian reservation means of communication, has reported that Congress is about to tackle the task of formulating a standard definition of an American Indian. The substance of the definition will be awaited with anticipation and concern by all persons of Indian heritage.

"Which One Are You? Five Types of Young Indians"

CLYDE WARRIOR, 1964

Clyde Warrior (1939-1968), Ponca, activist, and cofounder of the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC). After cofounding the NIYC in 1961 at Gallup, New Mexico, Warrior rose to become one of the leading idealists of the burgeoning Red Power movement, which had become disenchanted with institutionalism. Taking a much more confrontational approach to indigenous political issues, such as treaty rights, than many tribal leaders—including those in the National Congress of American Indians—were comfortable with, Warrior spawned an era of Indian nationalism that is still informing American Indian activism today. In reference to some early activist work that Warrior did on behalf of the Cherokee in Oklahoma, Stan Steiner referred to the Ponca leader as a "young Indian intellectual" who "was one of the angriest of the angry young men of the hills."²⁴ Warrior took this anger and used it to inspire a movement hitherto unseen in the Indian community, beginning with the Fish-Ins, which was an effort to get tribal fishing rights recognized by state and federal authorities who were exploiting the area at the expense of local Indian interests, in the Pacific Northwest, which motivated a generation of young Indians to take their destiny into their own hands. As a college-educated individual, Warrior was also capable of expressing his ideas and opinions in writing. The selected reading for this volume, "Which One Are You? Five Types of Young Indians" (ABC: Americans Before Columbus, 1964)—in contradistinction to Frell M. Owl's piece—focuses exclusively on young people in an attempt to get them to reflect on their own lives and question the authority that reigns over them.

Among American Indian youth today there exists a rather pathetic scene, in fact, a very sick, sad, sorry scene. This scene consists of the various types of Indian students found in various institutions of learning throughout American society. It is very sad that these institutions, and whatever conditioning takes place, creates these types. For these types are just what they are, types, and not full, real human beings, or people.

Many of you probably already know these types. Many of you probably know the reasons why these types exist. This writer does not pretend to know why. This writer can only offer an opinion as to names and types, define their characteristics, and offer a possible alternative; notice alternative—not a definite solution. All this writer is merely saying is he does not

like Indian youth being turned into something that is not real, and that somebody needs to offer a better alternative:

Type A—SLOB or HOOD. This is the individual who receives his definition of self from the dominant society, and unfortunately, sees this kind in his daily relationships and associations with his own kind. Thus, he becomes this type by dropping out of school, becomes a wino, steals, eventually becomes a court case, and is usually sent off. If lucky, he marries, mistreats his family, and becomes a real pain to his tribal community as he attempts to cram that definition [of himself] down the society's throat. In doing this, he becomes a Super Slob. Another Indian hits the dust through no fault of his own.

Type B—JOKER. This type has defined himself that to be an Indian is a joke. An Indian does stupid, funny things. After defining himself, from cues society gave him, he proceeds to act as such. Sometimes he accidentally goofs up, sometimes unconsciously on purpose, after which he laughs, and usually says, "Well, that's Indian." And he goes through life a bungling clown.

Type C—REDSKIN "WHITE-NOSER" or THE SELL-OUT. This type has accepted and sold out to the dominant society. He has accepted that definition that anything Indian is dumb, usually filthy, and immoral, and to avoid this is to become a "LITTLE BROWN AMERICAN" by associating with everything that is white. He may mingle with Indians, but only when it is to his advantage, and not a second longer than is necessary. Thus, society has created the fink of finks.

Type D—ULTRA-PSEUDO-INDIAN. This type is proud that he is Indian, but for some reason does not know how one acts. Therefore he takes his cues from non-Indian sources, books, shows, etc., and proceeds to act "Indian." With each action, which is phony, we have a person becoming unconsciously phonier and phonier. Hence, we have a proud, phony Indian.

Type E—ANGRY NATIONALIST. Although abstract and ideological, this type is generally closer to true Indianness than the other types, an IQ he resents the others for being ashamed of their own identity. Also, this type tends to dislike the older generation for being "Uncle Tomahawks" and "yes men" to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and whites in general. The "Angry Nationalist" wants to stop the current trend toward personality disappearance, and institute changes that will bring Indians into contemporary society as real human beings; but he views this, and other problems, with bitter abstract and ideological thinking. For thinking this [he] is termed radical, and [he] tends to alienate himself from the general masses of Indians, for speaking what appears, to him, to be truths.

None of these types is the ideal Indian . . .

It appears that what is needed is genuine contemporary creative thinking, democratic leadership to set guidelines, cues and goals for the average Indian. The guidelines and cues have to be based on true Indian philosophy geared to modern times. This will not come about without nationalistic pride in one's self and one's own kind.

This group can evolve only from today's college youth. Not from those who are ashamed, or those who have sold out, or those who do not understand true Indianism. Only from those with pride and love and understanding of the People and the People's ways from which they come can this evolve. And this appears to be the major task of the National Indian Youth Council—for without a people, how can one have a cause?

This writer says this because he is fed up with religious workers and educationalists incapable of understanding, and pseudo-social scientists who are consciously creating social and cultural genocide among American Indian youth.

I am fed up with bureaucrats who try to pass off "rules and regulations" for organizational programs that will bring progress.

I am sick and tired of seeing my elders stripped of dignity and low-rated in the eyes of their young.

I am disturbed to the point of screaming when I see American Indian youth accepting the horror of "American conformity," as being the only way for Indian progress. While those who do not join the great American mainstream of personalityless neurotics are regarded as "incompetents and problems."

The National Indian Youth Council must introduce to this sick room of stench and anonymity some fresh air of new Indian-ness. A fresh air of new honesty, and integrity, a fresh air of new Indian idealism, a fresh air of a new Greater Indian America.

How about it? Let's raise some hell!

Robert K.
many yea
research a
gaged in
such as t
lished an
maintain
of chan
talizatio
Indiani
Americ

Pan-
plex a
people
able d
nity, l
in so
odol
this
fleet
its p
T
cen
in
ha
In
in
m
A
I