

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Part II: Discussion

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6929g06z>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 2(3-4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Heth, C., et. al

Publication Date

1978-06-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

PART II: DISCUSSION

C. Heth: The reason for this conference is to discuss a plan to develop an M.A. Program in American Indian Studies that is interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary. We thought that people of your expertise would have something to say about that. We wanted to have both negative and positive comments.

Our center is a research center. It is a little different from other university Indian Studies programs. We cannot offer courses. We are not a department. Any faculty we try to recruit or any courses we want to offer we have to convince a department first. In a way this is helpful because it upgrades department standards for all the courses and faculty members. But it also is detrimental in the fact that some of the departments are very hidebound and would not consider Indian Studies or hiring an Indian professor within the next twenty-five years.

One idea of the research center is to bring people together who have similar interests to work on various projects. We've had some success especially with our Faculty Advisory Committee working together on various projects. Our center is organized into six components: Research Development, Curriculum Development, Faculty Recruitment and Development, Publications, Student and Community Relations, and the Library. Some of these positions are volunteer positions and some are paid positions.

We are just embarking on this venture. As far as we know there is no M.A. program in American Indian Studies, and we think it is important enough that we get some of the right answers at the beginning.

Last spring we conducted a feasibility study for the M. A. program. We decided to go for an M. A. rather than a B. A. for several reasons. Probably some of you who are working where there are B. A. programs will have a lot to say about this. The other ethnic centers here at UCLA are operating within the same framework as we are—as organized research units. They have B. A. programs and their enrollment is almost nil. I believe Afro-American Studies has two undergraduate students and Chicano Studies has none, even though it has a B. A. program approved. So we thought we would encourage our students on the undergraduate level to major in one of the recognized aca-

demic disciplines, and then when they get ready to go to graduate school they could branch out into an M. A. in American Indian Studies.

In the context of a research unit we have found out that the scholars, the faculty members who would want to work with Indian Studies, would prefer to work with graduate students because they feel they have already made some sort of commitment to education beyond just getting a degree, just hanging around for several years and accumulating enough units to graduate. So we found that the faculty like to work with more serious students, and that our research projects succeed if there are some committed graduate students involved in the planning and carrying out of the projects. We also think there might be a better job market for people with M. A.'s than B. A.'s at this point.

Okay, we're open for discussion.

A. Ortiz: I'm not convinced there's a market for the kind of splendidly idealistic curriculum that you are talking about in turning out M. A.'s in Native American Studies. The market is out there, sure, but I'm not convinced we can utilize it. The Indian community colleges, of which there are twenty-six in existence, were mentioned as a possible kind of employment market for holders of these M. A.'s in Native American Studies. Yet the ones I know are looking for people with traditional backgrounds. That's the sad disparity. They want people who can teach their kids mathematics and how to read. Or they want instructors who can work specifically in the culture history and the language of the group in consideration. They say they would like to have inputs from other Indian traditions, but they're so big themselves that they wind up only congratulating themselves and teaching only Navajo language, history, etc.

The other grave danger that this kind of thing faces is possibly just becoming an "identity certification" kind of process for the over-aged—for Indian students whose identity crisis hit a little late, after they finished college. With most of us it usually hits around sixteen or seventeen.

C. S. Kidwell: You mentioned a series of seminars for community people. What would that be in the nature of its relationship to the master's program?

S. Guyette: The idea originally stemmed from the fact that we will be training students who will work with community organizations. But also there is a need and a responsibility to ed-

ucate people of community organizations in how to work with these students and also to inform them of the relationship that is possible with the research unit of the American Indian Studies Center.

C. S. Kidwell: I didn't understand if this was part of the M. A. program or part of the planning for the M. A. program.

S. Guyette: Part of the planning in the involvement of students in seminars would be an important informal aspect of a graduate program. The experience that they would gain from planning and actually assisting in the instruction would enable them to carry out this type of activity in community organizations and would also tend to reduce the dependency of the community organization on the research unit. I'm finding now that once this type of relationship is started with the community organization the demands build in relationship to community needs. People start envisioning many programs that they could branch into in their organization. But soon this mushrooms to the point where we are just completely overwhelmed. So what I like to work toward is sensitizing people to the steps that they can use to begin to improve their working relationship with the research unit here at UCLA.

R. Thornton: If I may just underscore one of the things and maybe extend it a bit. I'm certainly impressed by the magnitude of the undertaking in the sense that you're talking about an awful lot of different things under the rubric of a master's degree. I guess it's a reflection of the multipurposes of the modern university system, probably too many purposes. This is reflected in the proposal you suggest.

One of the things that's happened in a number of disciplines is that they've made too many promises in the applied areas. A good example of this is the involvement of sociology and education. Sociology became one of the latest fads in education and was seen as one of the means of solving the educational problems of our society. Given the state of knowledge of virtually any discipline today, few problems in the real world may be solved by them. So I think just a word of caution—be very careful in the promises you make.

Second, I think what's really needed, if any graduate program is really needed, is a doctoral program in Indian Studies. Master's degrees are really useful only in applied professional areas—Masters of Business Administration, Master of the Arts in Teaching, etc. I guess I'm very pessimistic about the extent to which you're

going to increase the research and scholarly activities in Indian Studies with a master's degree. I can see a master's degree needed in an applied area in Indian Studies, maybe in bringing education to bear on some of the problems organizations have. A master's training program would be useful in staffing a variety of Indian organizations. But research and the advancement of scholarship are also needed in Indian Studies, and that means a doctoral program. I'm a very firm believer in that. I had a doctoral program that I developed and ran at an Ivy League institution for about five years and a master's was something the students picked up along the way.

S. Guyette: We had envisioned that there would be students in this program that would continue to doctoral studies.

A. Ortiz: I started off with the negative and didn't get a chance to shift to the positive. I have a couple of comments to make.

I think Russ Thornton has a more professional overview. He sets the stage for looking at the program on this whole new basis, mainly as a doctoral program. I believe that there should be a doctoral program, and it should be in one, two, or three quality institutions. UCLA is definitely one of them. You have a number of people broadly learned who are interested and who care and who don't have a lot of ego involve in protecting their particular academic turf. You have historians, someone in literature, in anthropology, and in law. And when you have that you have the potential for a very exciting program.

But whereas a two-year master's program can be used as an excuse for some urban-born and -raised Indian students to use as a change to affirm their ties and find their ways back to their communities especially through the intern process, a Ph.D. program cannot. It is just too tough. You really have to have a serious commitment.

The quality of the institution is the other positive comment I have. To me it's the most important single thing. The academic disciplines and the goal academic disciplines have traditionally been concerned with in the study of Native American culture societies profit enormously by intensive specialization. We've come at it from the outside. It could be a mutually enriching experience. Those traditional disciplines that have concerned themselves with studying the Native American past and present would benefit tremendously by having people who would just zero in and get it all together,

so to speak. I foresee it as a very fruitful exchange coming on a whole new level. Those two things I think negate my earlier pessimism if we think in terms of a doctorate rather than an M. A. degree.

C. S. Kidwell: I'd like to comment that it does seem to be that there is room for M. A. programs but in very specific professional skills and in ways that grow on resources within many areas of the university besides just the Native American faculty. One model I have in mind is to get something started at the University of California at Berkeley in conservation of natural resources, a specific training program in resource management on Indian reservations. But that is a program with a very specific focus and a limited job market; one in which a small number of select graduate students who go through that training program can fill necessary slots on reservations. At that level the master's degree can strengthen the position of the Native American studies program in the university because the people who are conducting those training sessions are psyching themselves up to conduct research. I would say that if you were going to start a master's program, your focus really should be specifically professional. I certainly agree that the development of doctoral programs would be the ideal situation to broaden the general base of Native American studies in the university.

A. Ortiz: Another way to put it is that you're advocating generalization at a time when society is tightening up and demanding specialization, at least in the academic disciplines. On the M. A. level I sincerely believe that you're advocating marching off to a different tune. The tendency is to go in the other direction.

C. Heth: One thought that we had at the beginning of the M. A. proposal was where do all of those people you graduate from Native American Studies go? What do they do with that degree, and would the master's degree be of help to people like that?

J. Rouillard: I'd like to preface my remarks by assuming a role as a member of this feasibility study. I don't really want to be too negative or too positive in my comments and observations.

I've been at San Diego State University for the past six years and in on the plan for developing a Native American Studies department. We have gone through many shifts in terms of whether or not to develop a program with a major. It has taken six years to move a program into a department which is part of a

college. It won't be until next year when our department actually has courses listed in the catalog as American Indian Studies. The reason for that is our department's strategy. It has nothing to do with whether or not we were less active than Black Studies or Chicano Studies. They came in like a thunderbolt in 1969 and 1970 and had instant majors, faculties, and even student bodies that soon drifted away from the major. So I was in a position to be a quiet observer of the phenomenon of new departments, quasi-disciplines having a grandiose vision but limited resources.

If the master's program is going to rely on students coming from Indian studies programs with Indian majors you're not going to have very many. It's as simple as that. If you're looking for Indian students to go into graduate programs anywhere you're going to be looking for Indian students who have had the type of support that programs like ours have given them, whether it's been with a major or just in assisting them through other areas. My other general comment was this: We all know—those of us who have been in the higher education field for some time—that there is a vast difference between institutions and that prestige is usually in the eye of the beholder. However, in terms of its responsiveness to minority programs, I think most of the people in the UC system who are in minority programs know that Indian, Black, Chicano, and other students have had far more receptive, programmatic responses to the pressures of the recent social-educational turmoil on the undergraduate level by the state university and college system in California on the undergraduate level which emphasizes teaching.

What I've encountered is that the faculty of our system, in general, are very suspicious of interdisciplinary programs. I'm talking about San Diego State. That's why we chose to be a department at San Diego State. We felt that there was not the potential for a strong interdisciplinary linkage, even though there are other disciplines who have enjoyed reaping the benefits of Indian bits and pieces throughout history.

C. Heth: We don't have that option of being a department. We have to work on the interdisciplinary level.

C. S. Kidwell: This was one question I wanted to raise. If your faculty are all in the various departments, administratively there's a strong commitment to the development of the program. But I know that what the administration

necessarily favors, the faculty doesn't necessarily support. You're working with people in individual departments who have a commitment to the department as well as to Indian Studies. This can be a very hard thing to do—to balance those two demands. How strongly are the departments in which Indian faculty members are housed people with commitments to Indian Studies? Also, how much of the individual's time are they willing to release to the development of a master's program? What kind of commitments are they willing to let the individual faculty member make to graduate students in an interdisciplinary program?

C. Heth: This is a concern not only of our center but of the three other ethnic centers at UCLA who are banded together in an organization that's called the Institute of American Cultures. This is one of the strategies the Institute is trying to develop. In other words, some departments are very resistant to ethnic studies, either hiring a person who is Black, Asian, Chicano, Indian or offering courses in that area. I think the disciplines we keep wanting to infiltrate are political science and economics because nobody has ever succeeded in getting those people to talk to us.

R. Thornton: If you look at the work that's been done on American Indians, it's obviously concentrated in anthropology. I've just finished some bibliographic research and if you look at the whole history of sociology, only an average of one or one and a half journal articles a year have dealt with American Indians. And in the journals in political science and economics it's much less—only two or three dozen in their whole history. They simply do not have any tradition at all of considering Indian people.

It seems to me that the type of program that you're talking about is perhaps one way of stimulating and forcing these people to come to grips with alternative systems. It would be quite beneficial to some of the other disciplines that have shown no interest at all in Indian people.

D. Draper: I think that the ethnic centers are going to be more attractive to the departments here on campus now that we are getting institutional faculty lines. We can buy faculty positions for departments and enhance their programs. That would make the ethnic centers more attractive and would encourage more communication between the ethnic centers as a whole and specific departments on campus.

C. Heth: This has already happened. Some of the chairmen or spokesmen from various

departments have made appointments with all the directors of the ethnic centers and asked, "What kind of people are you looking for?" We have institutional FTEs [full-time equivalents] that we can hand out—one per year for x number of years. So, we have faculty positions but we have to convince the department that they need and want that person.

C. Meighan: Speaking from a departmental point of view, I think it's unrealistic to assume that the departments are going to automatically accept with joy what's given to them as an administration—as a free appointment—because they all know that there are no free appointments and that the gift that they take from the administration will be taken away from them in some other way four or five years down the road. So it's a question of priorities on the part of the departments in trying to hire twenty different people to do twenty different things. The problem is getting your particular need to the top of the list. Otherwise, they may be spiritually all in favor of it and think it's wonderful, but they need something else first. This is the problem: the fact that there are FTEs which the administration says are free, but that the departments know are not free and that they're going to pay for them.

Staff size goes with enrollments. So if your staff is a certain size and your enrollments are a certain size the FTE is going to go.

A. Ortiz: That's very sad because at that point the university abdicates its responsibility as the shaper of value, and it becomes a reactive institution that will drift with the currents, whatever they may be.

C. Meighan: I think departments want to feel, at least, that they have some control over their investments and that they are not merely doing what the administration wants them to do. There are at least six interdisciplinary programs that our faculty are closely involved in. Some of us actually are working with more students who are candidates for nonanthropology degrees than we are working for candidates for anthropology degrees. Someone raised the question "How much time will a department allow you to do this?" They'll allow you all the time that you need in addition to your regular duties.

C. S. Kidwell: What is the commitment of the administration to student recruitment and funding, teaching assistantships, research assistantships, waiving out-of-state tuition, and to graduate support for students who come into this program?

C. Heth: Okay, we have the GAP Program—Graduate Advancement Program—through the dean of the graduate school. It is a very good program in that they try to give you something that will pick up your out-of-state tuition whether it's a work-study or a grant. The way the program works is that the first year that you come in they try to give you a straight grant or a grant plus loan so you don't have to work at all except to concentrate on your graduate studies. After that, your second or third year, you may have to pick up work-study for part of it or something of that nature. But there is a problem with minority students in that in applying for teaching assistantships and research assistantships in departments, frequently they are overlooked because they say, "Well, you're going to get the money from GAP so you don't need this. We'll give it to somebody else." What happens is that the person graduates and they haven't been a TA, and they haven't had any experience in the classroom. It doesn't look as good on their resume as it does on somebody else's. Maybe they've had a little easier time because they're not working, but they haven't had that chance for experience.

Recently the Asian American Studies Center had a fellowship program which is terminating this year for their M. A. people. The administration has come up with four President's Pilot Work Study Grants at \$2500 each to keep these people next year. So there is some commitment. Again, the Institute of American Cultures is trying to get a fellowship program on an ethnic-wide basis for the four centers.

R. Thornton: I'd like to pick up another thing that was mentioned earlier. You felt that a Bachelor's Degree in Indian Studies would not be viable here. Why was that? Was this because of experiences in other ethnic minority programs?

C. Heth: Yes, other centers have programs and zero or one or two enrollments in their program.

R. Thornton: I'd be a little careful about how the track record of other minority programs may predict Indian studies. Indian studies at the University of Minnesota has been successful in attracting students in Indian studies. We now have a little over two dozen. We also had 1400 students who went through Indian Studies courses last year. The point is, Indian Studies is, in many ways, much more viable than either Afro-American Studies, Chicano Studies, or Asian-American studies.

C. S. Kidwell: When you talk about where

people go, several of our students have gone into law schools and medical schools. We have a pretty good record of placing people in graduate studies with American Indian Studies majors.

A. Ortiz: It bothered me that you have two concerns, at the bottom and the upper. Let me take the upper end first.

If you have a graduate program in Native American Studies without an undergraduate correlate, maybe not the same but at least some kind of undergraduate counterpart, you run a serious risk of co-optation. If you expect to have to confer a degree in Native American Studies, you may have people from the traditional disciplines picking off your people. You'll start having lawyers turned out who are called generalists in Native American Studies but who are really conventional lawyers, conventional community health workers, conventional this, conventional that. But instead of you using the resources of the university, the individual departments will use you as an additional canopy beyond what the university allows them in terms of resources, FTEs, and so on, as an additional outlet to train their people in very conventional ways. There's a danger if you don't have the undergraduate counterpart.

If you have an undergraduate counterpart, Clara Sue, I can believe what you're saying about placing people in law schools and so on. It may be that your candidates are accepted because they're from Berkeley—University of California at Berkeley—rather than that they're from Native American Studies. I know where the reverse is true. There is active discrimination on the part of the professional schools against people who have undergraduate degrees in Native American Studies. They're regarded as "academic tricksters." We really feel badly about it. But at the same time, I think a compromise is possible. Say, a minor concentration? You've got to have people being sensitized to work with undergraduates under this rubric if you're going to have a viable doctoral program. And you have to infiltrate at all levels. It doesn't have to be to the same degree, but to some measure you have to be involved in all levels of the educational enterprise.

I believe you, too, Russ, about Native American Studies being a much more popular option than Afro-American or Chicano Studies because it does something that Afro-American and Chicano Studies don't do on any significant scale, namely attract white students to a much larger extent. Many of those will go into anthropol-

ogy, who are interested more in Indians than in anthropology but who will go into anthropology previously because of the absence of Native American Studies. As a matter of fact, it's anthropology that loses at the undergraduate level because of the existence of Native American Studies, and it shouldn't have to be both/and rather than either/or.

D. Risling: I want to mention several things. When you mentioned that UCLA is committed, I don't think so. I'm talking from a Native point of view. As a matter of fact, the University of California is not committed. Neither is the University at Davis where I'm working committed. That's the first thing you have to keep in mind. I've never run across a committed person in the system as yet. I would like to meet one someday who is really committed, if we took out the money, jobs, and all of these kinds of things.

When we're talking about interdisciplinary kinds of programs and not programs that are administered and controlled by you, you in fact put out people that I see in the general public, our own Indian people throughout the United States that get into high positions, who are "white-thinking university type of people," who are very destructive to self-determination, self-realization, and the kinds of things that we're trying to do ourselves. You have to keep that in mind because this is the feeling of the medicine men and traditional Indian people all the time. As a matter of fact, Indian people were very much against education when we started these Native American Studies programs. They said, "What are you trying to do? Take our best from us; brainwash them and make them white and then send them back to be servants of the white people? Or come back to our reservations and make fun of our people and try to brainwash us to make us something else?" Okay, that's what the old people were telling us.

Al was talking about traditional kinds of things. The Native American programs are trying to get traditional people in there who understand. With all due respect to the anthropologists, to your department, and to all the various disciplines, I have yet to talk to anyone who really knows anything about Indians. In my opinion most can't even talk to me on my own level, and I don't think I know too much about Indians. We've got people we may respect as great writers and authorities on Indians, but when I talk to them about Indians they're coming from a different point of view. They don't even understand what we're talking

about. So we have to keep those things in mind if you're going to develop an institution. Are we in fact going to develop an Indian institution that will further the tradition of "Indian-ness" or are we in fact going to take Indians and make them white? That's the question that you're talking about and that's the thing you have to get concerned with. Let me just tell you we have fought the administration. When the vice-chancellor or somebody says we're going to guarantee Indians something it usually turns out to be a bunch of baloney.

We are fighting at the University at Davis to develop our own discipline and to gain respect. That's not easy, but that's the route we've taken. We said, "We want to be Indians. We will not allow anybody to work in our department unless they're Indians." So that's who we have. We have created enemies within the anthropology department because people do not visit or seek information from them anymore. They come to us. The historians are all upset with us because we go in and challenge the historians with documents that come through the Legal Services, the Native American Rights Fund, and from various sources of information that have been proven in the courts. Other departments such as the Water Resources Department get upset with us because our students go there and start talking about Indian water rights, but the professors know nothing about Indian water rights and are embarrassed. We are accused of developing these people who have to fight all the time. We have to fight the administration. We have to fight departments. We have to fight for tenure. We become bad guys because we try to develop a department so that we will have some respect. But people don't like it when you force it down their throat. I'm not too popular. Nobody on our staff is too popular except with our students and the employers. I throw that out to you because those are things that you really have to consider.

A. Ortiz: I think that we forget that they label us all as "ethnic studies" and forget that the whole thrust of American education is ethnic studies. The kind of ethnicity that's celebrated is that of the Puritan forbears of only a miniscule minority that comprise the country today. And even that is not quite precisely relevant to the times. I mean American education is ethnic studies. Except the ethnicity is of a Puritan-based kind of New England vision. We're just calling for a different kind of ethnicity.

D. Risling: Some of the things you're talking about we teach in the lower division. A lot of

people are unaware of Native American Studies. It's one thing to train a person to get out and do the job. But our people have to be taught to learn about the things that're going to help them and the things that are destroying them. All the things that are destroying them have to be taught to them and how to survive those kinds of things. We have courses in politics, lobbying and a whole number of courses which answer the needs of these kinds of things in regular lower-division courses.

We feel that the courses were designed in the first place to meet the needs of the Indian people in California primarily. Our courses are designed to prepare a person to return to his people to help them, or, if he desires, to pursue a graduate program in some related field such as anthropology, community development, economics, or something else.

I see a need for people that have a discipline—sociology, anthropology, history or something else—if they want to work with the Indian community. I also see a need for a graduate program designed to bring these people in. I think that's the kind of program you might have in mind.

A. Ortiz: I'm thoroughly delighted that there's one place somewhere in this country where people are not compromising anything. They're just demanding that they use university resources to do traditional things, completely traditional things in traditional ways.

J. Rouillard: But on the other hand, too, if you haven't got that type of objective and basic mission in your educational goal, you're really asking yourself and your colleagues to do something which is much more extremely difficult than to develop an Indian Studies program and sort of fit it into existing disciplines. You're really backing up into something nobody ever envisioned as being institutionalized in the first place.

We have Indian communities—we've always had Indian communities—that can survive or function with or without so-called professionals. One of the things that I think we've all enjoyed in this educational business is seeing finally an opportunity to have some long-range impact on Indian communities that look forward to some Indian people as professionals. The obvious option is to bring in the non-Indian again as the professional. Indian communities have always been able to adjust, not to America's love affair with the credential process, but to the Indian community's certain knowledge of who does the job. And I think

that's one thing we'll always find—that every master's or Ph.D. or bachelor's degree is not going to be *carte blanche* for success in an Indian community in a professional sense. They still have a great deal of internal hoops to jump through before they're going to be accepted as professional. And I think that's the real dichotomy between the white man and the Indian: white economic America has never understood why the Indian hasn't seen this educational process, producing a credential or something that hangs on the wall, as being of great value.

A. Ortiz: That's a very profound truth, you know, that the communities will find their own needs, perceive their own needs, and find people who will fulfill those needs.

Let me come at it from the other end—the credential end. Obviously what you're saying is that the best possible kind of people would be those who come from communities, those who never lose their sense of where they belong, and those who use the credential-giving process as a means to fight on a higher level with more tools than they had or would have had if they'd never left those communities. That would make the additional point that I've been thinking about: those who have gone through and gotten the highest credentials in their particular trap that American society has to offer, look at their lives. They start from a particular disciplinary pigeonhole early in their career, but then they start expanding, spilling over. D'Arcy McNickle and I were talking about this because communities do need people who are more generalists, who come at this business of Indian needs from different directions. They start spilling over. I started doing so, too, about three years away from my doctorate. I started going off into literature, history, and so on. It happens at both ends is what I'm saying.

R. Thornton: We get a lot of criticism from a lot of the traditional tribal people. We get accused of manipulation of the Indians. So I think it's a real problem. It's not a clean-cut dichotomy between the Indian way and the non-Indian way or between the Indian system and the white educational system. I'm not sure we should be doing "Indian" things in the educational system.

D. Risling: We've dealt with the question "What is traditional education and what is Indian education?" When we're talking about traditional learning—it's traditional. You go back home to do it or you get some traditional people to do it. When we're talking about Indian

education, Indian elders and educational leaders say that all the Indian's education is "white" education, with Indian flavor at different levels. Indian education started at the boarding schools, public schools, daytime schools, and finally got into Native American Studies and alternative schools. But they can never take the place of traditional learning.

W. Washburn: The "American Indian Studies: A Status Report," published a couple of years ago in the *American Quarterly* [no. 3, August 1975], was based on an earlier consideration of some Indian Studies programs. Essentially what I was trying to do in that article was to warn those concerned with Indian Studies about going the political route rather than the academic route. As long as Indian Studies was placed in the context of the university situation, I felt that ultimately it had to accept the requirements of an academic situation which were commitment to truth, advancement of knowledge, and so on. While one could always make forays into the political arena that could be relevant and could analyze contemporary political situations and so on, those forays had to be related to the basic intellectual mission of the university within which the Indian Studies programs were located. The honeymoon could not last forever if that intellectual commitment was ignored. The Indian Studies program emerged in the 60s in the period of political activism—Black activism, civil rights activism, women's rights activism and so on—and there were a lot of worthy political causes floating in that particular period. My fear was that, emerging in that climate, Indian Studies would mistake the temporary excitement and commitment to a particular political cause as the basic concern of the university, which is not to promote a particular political view but simply to allow all political views—intellectual views—to be thrown out, discussed, debated, and to let the truth emerge from this debate. Dialogue is the process by which truth emerges.

So, my particular point in this article was simply to caution some of those who were trying to take American Indian Studies along the activist political road not to cease and desist from that cause, but to cease and desist from that cause insofar as American Indian Studies constituted an academic discipline. It's all right as an individual citizen to belong to any particular organization, to belong to any particular cause. But as an academic intellectual, you have a large commitment, not to particular political cause, but to the truth whatever it may be

and however it may emerge in the debate process.

I also warned a little bit about the examples of Black Studies programs. I haven't studied the Black Studies programs very carefully, but I think there has been a decline in the commitment to Black Studies programs. There has been a flight of black scholars from Black Studies programs into traditional academic disciplines simply because Black scholars sensed that they could temporarily ride this wave of contemporary political commitment in the 1960s. The most logical approach for a Black Studies scholar was to move into traditional academic disciplines.

At Berkeley the Black Studies program is now part of the College of Letters and Science, whereas the Indian Studies, Chicano, and Asian programs are not. My view was always that isolation was dangerous in the university because the university is designed essentially as communication between different points of view. I was struck then—indeed, I am struck now—with the lack of communication between people in the Native American Studies group at Berkeley and those in the History or Anthropology Department. Communication is what a university is all about, the exchange of views and so on. So this isolation seemed to me a danger rather than an advantage, and I simply warned that the Indian Studies programs should try to incorporate themselves as part of the larger university—make those steps that were important to maintain the visibility of Indian Studies, but not in a separate, and particularly politically oriented, isolation. So, in a sense, this was a cautionary study.

It was also an attempt to throw out some ideas that might influence those who are concerned with them. I was warning against the exclusive concern with ethnic purity—the assumption that you had to be an Indian to study Indian history. In the academic world nobody is barred from studying anything. A Frenchman studies the United States. A German studies Russia. Nobody thinks for a moment that it's inappropriate for someone from one culture to study another culture. In fact it's a positive advantage to be able to look at a culture from outside, because its assumptions are more readily apparent than they are to someone brought up in the culture. The tendency to apply a test of ethnic purity to anybody who's going into Indian Studies bothered me a good deal. I felt that, again, that was one of the elements of isolation—self-isolation—that would

be ultimately harmful rather than supportive of Indian Studies.

Another one of the points I tried to make was that Indian Studies involves as many or more non-Indians on the receiving end as Indians. The Indians, representing a very small minority in this country as presently constituted, depend upon the majority interest, or goodwill or concern, for their continued survival and good health. The political reality is that the American Indian is dependent upon the larger community for support. That's what has to be considered. It cannot be ignored, and it's dangerous to flout it, to ignore it, or to attempt to reject it, particularly in the academic context. When deans look at enrollments, for example, that's always a warning sign that they may ask, "My God, maybe we shouldn't support this particular program as we have in the past." So there is a consumer relationship. There is a supply-and-demand factor, and Indian Studies programs are simply not going to continue to be supported no matter what happens. You are going to be supported or not supported on the basis of a number of factors including student interest and involvement, but particularly on the basis of your program's acceptance of the university's commitment to the scholarly ideal.

I was looking forward also to the production of good scholarship in the Indian Studies field, trying to cite a few examples of it, and cautioning against the extreme ethnic sensitivity represented in a work such as Allen Slickpoo's history of the Nez Perce. He tends to reject the scholarly requirement to document sources by saying, "We don't need to footnote this history because it's our history." That type of attitude, I try to say, simply can't be accepted in a university context. It may be an appropriate political stance to say that "We want to keep anybody from looking at us," but in terms of a scholarly consideration of anybody's history, it simply flies in the face of the first principle, which is to demonstrate that you are accurate in what you say and that you can prove the truth of the statement.

So, I'll leave it with that and merely say I'm still hopeful. I expect to see Indian Studies strong and vigorous. But I still see some of the same weaknesses that I observed several years ago when I wrote the status report—weaknesses based on the facts I just alluded to. I wish they, from my point of view, had been corrected—changed—more rapidly. So I'm still a little uncertain about the future.

D. Risling: I'd like to respond to that. In the

first place I think your analysis is great coming from the dominant society's point of view, from the university-educated point of view. But coming from the native point of view we don't buy that. Just because everything is footnoted, it may denote scholarship but it does not necessarily mean it is the truth. It wasn't until the ethnic minorities challenged the dominant society that we're now beginning to get some of the truth out. I have found that people who are doing doctoral programs find the easy way out and go along with the dominant society point of view instead of doing primary research. For the native point of view, you may have to go to Washington, D.C. to get it. It costs a lot of money and a lot of time. In my opinion, a lot of dissertations dealing with American Indians that have been done in the past have been very shallow. They have not been really documented. An example of poor documentation would be that taken from a book by Jones written in 1710, "Indians, probably of this tribe, moved into this area." The next person writes that Jones says that "Indians of this tribe moved into the area." By the time it gets to the 1970s it becomes a fact and you find it in the history books footnoted as a fact. So I think a lot of that research was very shallow research. Indian people have been challenging those people who do not consider oral statements such as "my grandfather told me those things," or "In my experience . . ." as valid. I'm not saying that the documentation shouldn't be there, but I'm saying that the real experience or oral documentation are in many cases as good as footnotes from some books that are not of primary research.

W. Washburn: Let me respond to that if I may. I don't think it's because the Native Americans have challenged past history or the dominant society that certain changes have taken place in the interpretation of Indian history. I think this is an ongoing process with a lot of influence coming from different directions. But the key thing is not that there is a native point of view or a white point of view. The key thing is to demonstrate that that particular fact is wrong or right. We have to get to specifics. All of the criticism of white historians tends to be very general. For instance, in Slickpoo's criticism of Josephy he says "That's his history, that's not our history." He doesn't give a single example of an error of Josephy. That's what's required. If you are going to say someone is wrong in his historical interpretation of an Indian group, you have to say where he was

wrong, why he was wrong, and what's your source for it. It may be oral history. Oral history can be questioned. It can be supported. Sometimes it can also be questioned by other evidence as to whether it's right or not. The point is you have to get down to specifics. That's why the historian uses footnotes, deals in specific evidence.

I welcome this change that you pointed out and the greater number of Indians entering colleges. That was the other thing I did mention in my article. I think I was looking forward to the emergence of Indian Ph.D.'s, particularly in history. But one of the things is that there seems to be a reluctance on the part of Indians to go the historical route. Many Indians go the anthropological route, the legal route, or the educational route. But very few get history Ph.D.'s. I tried to cite reasons why I thought that occurred.

I'm glad to hear your point that DQU is surviving and I hope to find out more about that. I don't know what the situation is there, but I would still assert that separatism is not the right way for Indian studies. When they say, for instance, that an Indian Studies program is co-opted by some larger department and you feel you lose influence, to some extent that may be true. But the dominant society is not trying to change Indian values—at least not in recent years. The different Indian attitudes are respected. Nobody's trying to force someone's civilization into some white Anglo-Saxon mold. One doesn't have to abandon one's culture when becoming part of the American academic system. This is one of the greater glories of the American university situation: that you aren't an employee told what to do and when to do it. The independent scholar who is in an academic department is free to say exactly what he thinks and to demonstrate it in his writing and his speech. There is, ideally, no coercion. The academic context is perhaps the ideal context in which to maintain one's racial and intellectual values, more so than any other part of society I can think of.

D. Risling: You know, ideally you are making some real beautiful statements. It's not that way. Unfortunately, before you get tenure, you do what that department tells you to do. If you rock the boat or say things that the department is not really pushing, you don't get tenure. We in the system know from experience.

J. Rouillard: Dr. Washburn, I chair an Indian Studies department at San Diego State University. Earlier, I read your paper. My first most

negative reaction hasn't substantially changed. The idea you projected in your paper seems to be that the Indian people and the body of Indian knowledge hasn't arrived at a degree of sophistication where it can be presented in an Indian Studies department to the point that it represents "truth." And that bothers me—the implication that most of what we had going has been politically motivated. I don't think it's been politically motivated. Other ethnic studies groups have been politically motivated because politics and power are two of the complementary pressures in this society. Indians have not been seen as a power group. A culture of people and a value system that is completely different from the dominant society have been the motivating forces supporting the move of Indian Studies into the academic field over the past decade. The point you make tends to perpetuate a stratification of academic society. I don't happen to agree that that is the way the university is structured. I think every discipline has developed with the strength that comes from creative forces within the discipline. Your whole paper tends to tell Indians to hold off until Indian Studies is ready to be a real discipline.

A. Ortiz: I categorically reject your contention, your assumption, that Native American values, without being destructive to others, can live and thrive and grow in the university better than any other place in contemporary American society. That is, we predicated a subtly erroneous premise: that the form of the university—the institutional structure of the university—is a good place for those values. What I'm saying is that some of the core values, the most important things about surviving Native American cultures, cannot be housed in the university. They don't have any meaning there—the institutional structure is wrong. They wither and die. Sure you can intellectually understand them, but the thing about values is that they have affective emotive aspects too. It's not enough to intellectually understand them. You have to understand them in the total cultural context of the people who lived the life you are trying to understand. You can never wholly ingest a native viewpoint. There are these two aspects. There is the actor's or the native's viewpoint, and there is the scientist's or the historian's viewpoint which explains and places things in a different kind of context. They represent two different kinds of explanation for two different kinds of understanding. I am being a bit outrageous here because

I am trying to inject that other kind of understanding which begins where the event was born.

R. Thornton: Let me give you a fourth comment to respond to if I may. It seems to me that the key to what you said earlier is that truth is something that is out there and open to everyone and it is more important than the particular point of view one has. I submit that it's probably the other way around. If there is anything that modern universities have learned is that there are very few real truths in the world. And probably the most important thing is that in the academic system, as well as in the Franklin Avenue Indian ghetto in Minnesota, it is where you "come from." I would make a very strong argument that what's needed is different points from which people in the academic system are coming from, rather than trusting Indian Studies or any other discipline to discover "truth." Truth changes from time to time as society changes. What is true in this world is very different today than tomorrow. Not, I think, only because we are uncovering any new facts, but also because of the different positions from which people look at the world.

J. Rouillard: I want to discuss the view of the university as a place to seek the truth. I think until the ethnic studies movements produced ethnic units within the universities, the universities had little claim to call themselves universities. The university, the culture of this continent, really came into academic flowering when these departments emerged.

There has been in the past two or three years a serious retrenching of forces to counter the successes of the ethnic studies groups. Now, things are being said in the name of academic honesty and things like that, but we're seeing a backlash nationally that is coming in the name of good academic standards. I don't know what's happened in some of the other universities that you people represent. At the undergraduate level in our system, and I know in other undergraduate state systems throughout the country, it's taken the method of redefining general education. Faculties are saying that all of these exploding colleges and or programs with grocery cart course selections for general education have diminished the potential of the basically trained scholar. Therefore, we're seeing people coming into graduate level work who don't know the basics. They're having too much of their basic education diluted. But what they're really saying is that the diluting forces are the ethnic studies. So the redefining faculty groups

who control curriculum—rightfully so, I suppose—are reacting and forcing the issue and programs like ours are being squeezed out at a point in time when they should be supported and made welcome into this general education block. I think that the university is *not* open to all values, all cultures. And that reaction is perhaps the trend of these past two years. I think it does say that the university is not open to a broad range of cultures and is not willing to accept that Indians, Blacks, and others have things of value in their histories, systems, and lifestyles to add and offer to the dominant society in America.

W. Washburn: When we talk of going from a narrow base to an incredibly broad base, of going from a narrow culture to as many cultures as you can possibly think of consistent with the monies available, etc., I don't think there's any system in the world which is better than the American in stretching out to different cultures. In other words, I would disagree when you say that various programs are being squeezed out. There is competition, let's say, between faculty. Is it more valuable to teach ancient Greek than maybe Lakota, or something, as a language? You know there's a limited amount of money and the pie *has* to be cut in a certain way. But no university system in the world has as much variety. It *has* become sort of a grocery cart thing and there are difficulties with that, but in terms of openness, in terms of a comparative value system rather than an ideal value system, I still cannot think of any better institution in our society than the university. True, we should study everything under the sun, and there should be enough money for everybody who's interested in anything, but that obviously cannot be. If you look at the expansion of the American university system and the great variety of cultures that it does deal with, it has expanded from a European-based curriculum to a worldwide curriculum. Sure there are more things to be done. But it's under constant change and so I feel it is a very viable institution.

D. Rislisling: It's very hard for somebody to convince us that the universities in fact are beautiful things. They're beautiful for the Europeans or for the other worlds, but for the Native Americans, the first Americans, the original Americans, it's not a very pretty picture. So it's very hard for you to sell me on that. No nation, no race of people, have really survived as a race of people without themselves doing all their own research, writing their own

books, and doing all these kinds of things. The institutions have never allowed that to happen. If the institutions are not going to allow these things, then we're going to have to do it ourselves. Why do you think Indian controlled colleges are springing up these days if the dominant society was meeting their needs?

The last thing I want to say is that I think a lot of the education that's out there is nothing more than myths. In a lot of universities when you work on your doctorate, and if you don't go along with the advisor that you're working with in that department, you might as well give up on your doctorate. Faculty advisors usually have to perpetuate *their* theory, and *their* philosophy. I have worked with graduate students from Alaska and other parts of the country who were not able to select their own subject or theory for their dissertation because it might counter their advisor's work. That is why we need our own institutions. As long as we can not control a department, as long as we're interspersed and assimilated into the other departments, there is no way we're going to be able to control our destiny.

W. Washburn: Let me challenge you on that if I may. First of all, you talk about people having to write their histories. Fine! That's exactly what the whites are calling for. Write your own histories. Slickpoo writes a Nez Perce history but it doesn't measure up to critical standards. Produce the history, and throw it into the arena of debate and discussion and criticism and so on. Just as you criticize white history, we can criticize Indian history.

R. Thornton: It seems to me that if North American Indian Studies is going to exist in the academic system it seems reasonable to expect it to assume the scholarly research activity of that system. I happen to believe very strongly in the importance of scholarship and research. One problem that American Indian Studies faces is simply a lack of understanding of disciplines in academia. If we buy the academic system, or at least operate on the assumption that we buy the academic system, we should look at American Indian Studies in terms of an academic system—what goes on in an academic system. Too often American Indian Studies is criticized in the ways that other areas of disciplines within the academic system are not criticized. To me it's a very blatant form of discrimination: criteria often apply to American Indian Studies programs that are not applied to other disciplines. What I do is examine four criticisms made against American Indian Stud-

ies—the lack of distinct methodology, unique concepts, separate area of concern, and intellectual traditions.

The main criticism that could be levied against American Indian Studies as an academic discipline is that it has not yet established what I consider to be intellectual traditions. I do not feel that the criticisms levied against American Indian Studies—that it does not have a distinct methodology or a set of unique concepts or a legitimate area or concern—are really valid when one looks at other disciplines in the larger academic system. It seems to me that American Indian Studies has neglected to develop a set of intellectual traditions. It has been concentrating, instead, on teaching and service activities, activities which I strongly support and feel are a very important part of the academic system. However, it has not "come to grips" with the research functions of the academic system.

I suggest a few possible areas in which American Indian Studies might develop intellectually. These areas considered best within the context of American Indian Studies are oral traditions, treaties and treaty rights, tribal government, what I call forms of organization, group persistence, American Indian epistemology, and contemporary issues. I do not claim definite work in this area, but American Indian Studies might contribute to knowledge by examining these areas from some unique perspectives. In many ways Dr. Washburn and I started out from the same position but ended up in different places.

It seems to me that the whole point of the academic system is to bring together different perspectives on, say, history. We all understand the English language—perhaps some understand it less well than others—but what's important is the interpretation we bring to bear on words. It seems to me to observe an event is one thing but to offer an interpretation of that event is quite another and that's what we are really talking about. It goes back to the most basic parts of the western academic system—position determines perspective. And what position one takes determines what one sees in the empirical real world. Empiricism is perceived, and events are perceived in different ways.

C. S. Kidwell: Part of the problem is that the university may take Indian truth and divide it along disciplinary lines, and what you do not accept as truth the university accepts as folklore at least and is willing to study that. Part of this

whole sense of the Native American perspective or interdisciplinary aspect is to pull those parts back together into some whole.

R. Thornton: This discussion is very germane to the kind of courses that you structure in trying to build an Indian Studies program. In a university, you're always compelled to structure the courses, define them, fill them up content-wise, and surround them methodologically in a very sanitized, strictly academic, white-oriented way. You almost have to remove the unique elements that Indian culture can bring toward extending our total conception of the world in order to get them through all the academic bodies that have the power to say no. That's a problem, but it's true and that's the way it is, and perhaps that's the way it should be. Students want to know certain things about Indian studies, and teachers will simply not talk about them. Do you see what I mean? There are certain things that I think the academic system can't deal with. At the University of Minnesota, in order to get these courses passed by the bodies, they simply build the courses and deal with cultures in certain ways. Other things they leave out. There're only certain points of interpenetration between Indian societies and Indian cultures. You can't deal with all Indian things in academics. You just can't do it. If you do it, you're not doing it with Indian things.

W. Washburn: I would point out, for instance, Oriental culture—Zen Buddhism. This is as different from white values and cultures as any Indian culture might be. Now that doesn't mean it cannot be incorporated into a university curriculum and taught. It may be taught in a very different way. But my point is that the university is broad enough to incorporate that type of teaching and that type of knowledge.

It's not something that you automatically get. There are a lot of obstructions, and the faculty and some people don't understand it, and the administration won't give you any money for this or that, but that doesn't seem to be necessarily an intellectual disagreement that it ought to be taught. It's merely one of these practical problems that you have in incorporating something new. As I said before, judged on an comparative basis, against any other country in the world, I think the American university has been more open-armed and inviting to different cultures and different approaches to the study of culture than any other university system.

I think one point of disagreement I would have is that Indian languages provide the basic foundation of Indian Studies as Russian is basic to Russian studies, Chinese to Chinese studies, and so on. When you're dealing with cultures which have documentation and written language over a long period of time, the importance of language study is obvious. But when you're dealing with any language which does not have this body of data accumulated over a long period of time, I'm not sure if it's that vital and that important to, say, the basic foundation. You can study and preserve Indian values and Indian cultures without necessarily depending upon the original Indian languages. There are not an awful lot of them, and there aren't many Indian speakers any more. So I would disagree that Indian languages are the basis of Indian Studies. Maybe a lot of people disagree with me.

C. Heth: This is something that we've been struggling with in trying to develop the M.A. program. We, in our original plan, sat down and said, "Okay, we're going to require that a student study an Indian language for a year and have some competence in that. Or if they come in already knowing an Indian language, we'll examine them in that particular language and that would fulfill the requirement."

But what if some person comes in and wants to go into Sioux territory? Are we helping him a lot to make him study Navajo for a year? Or would he be better off studying linguistics that would give him some insight into how Indian languages are put together? This is one of the problems we've been wrestling with and we have not resolved it.

A. Ortiz: Studying linguistics as it bears upon the structure, semantics, and taxonomies of North American languages, or using linguistics as a stepping stone to learn a language, will make us extremely careful as to the real complexities of those worlds we're attempting to translate into western terms.

W. Washburn: I think language is a step towards something else. You have to do more than say, "Okay, we've given this guy a smattering of conversational Navajo or something." If you could show how this leads into the Navajo world, for instance, through his knowledge, then it's significant. But I wouldn't make it a fetish.

It's not that you simply tell the academic senate, "We've got to have Navajo taught because language is important." But you try to show that so and so's book which uses this linguistic

evidence has thrown new insights in the Navajo world or whatever it might be. You can cite Al's Tewa work as an example of this new level of approaching a subject. I think that's what one should always keep in mind: not just following some rigorous or rigid requirements but producing the pieces of work that open the eyes of the outsiders.

A. Ortiz: The fact that the proposal proceeds on several levels simultaneously and that the study of language is absolutely respectable and canons western scholarship, there's nothing you can say against that.

R. Thornton: Its been a tremendous source of legitimization for us at Minnesota. Language is simply the people. It's quite a proper activity of the academic system. It provides all sorts of support.

The problem is that there are some kinds of administrative problems that we have with the language requirement. I was a firm believer that any kid majoring in Indian Studies should take one of the two Indian languages—Ojibwa or Dakota—as a means of meeting their language requirement at Minnesota. The problem is that we get a lot of majors that come in as juniors and seniors and they've already met their language requirement, say through Spanish. So we didn't require the Indian language requirement simply because of the administrative thing. They wouldn't have had to have gone back and taken five courses in an Indian language. As a matter of fact there are students outside of Indian Studies who'll choose one of the Indian languages to meet their language requirement.

C. Heth: I think that could happen to us too. If someone was working on the Southwest and was a serious scholar, he might want to make his Spanish top notch rather than an Indian language. I could see that happen. And then he might opt for the linguistic courses that study the structures of Indian languages. I don't know. That's just an idea that came to me when you said that.

C. S. Kidwell: I was interested in getting a language program started at Berkeley, and the practical concern of members of the faculty was "Well, how many people are you going to get to take your Indian language courses?" You build programs and faculty on student enrollments. At Berkeley I don't know whether we could get an Indian language to satisfy the language requirement in the College of Letters and Science since we are not part of that college. So the very practical aspect of how many people

you're going to get in the program is always there.

J. Rouillard: The Indian languages taught at San Diego State began as experimental topics in linguistics and very shortly moved into another rubric called University Studies. Courses here have only a limited run potential. In two or three years you have to enter University Studies courses into the curriculum. We've had limited success in enrollment, but good success in curriculum development. We've never had a large number of students enrolled in Indian languages. The strongest number would be in the Sioux and Hopi classes for the last year and a half. Kumeyaay is the longest running language class—it is the language spoken in southern San Diego County.

The students can take our courses to fulfill their language requirement if a language requirement is part of their major.

D. Risling: Talking about methodology and research, I guess what we're really saying is that we have to design our curriculum, our discipline, so that it perpetuates our culture. The methodology that is used in the dominant society will work if used by us. We can use their materials but it's got to come from us and we've got to be in control. I'm one who will push for developing our own discipline and not making it an interdisciplinary discipline. We need to develop our own people to do this so that they will be able to make changes.

K. Lincoln: What you're bucking is the entire hundreds of years old western concept of pure research. You have to redefine that system to satisfy the non-Indian that you have legitimate concerns, community-related concerns, and improve that point.

C. Heth: I'd like to talk about the relationship of a research unit to curriculum development and perhaps talk about some of the values of research or what kind of research we should be conducting.

C. S. Kidwell: There's a lot that we're talking about, research and development of a graduate program. There are tremendous numbers of projects that candidates for master's or doctoral degrees could carry out to the benefit of Indian scholarship and for their own degrees. Sam Deloria suggested that the American Indian Policy Review Commission could be a good springboard for all sorts of research. Since they received only two years and two million dollars, however, that hasn't really happened. But the raw material is there for significant analysis of Indian community concerns. The develop-

ment of a graduate program would help to make those things accessible. A research unit such as you have is a prime facility for the channeling through of grant applications that graduate students would want to put in to get access to that kind of material. Maybe you can develop for faculty members an overall project which could serve as an umbrella for three or four graduate students working on various projects. It is no real problem to find out how the research unit fits in with the rest of the discipline.

W. Washburn: What's impressed me about UCLA is that you have these connections with the rest of the university that I usually don't see in other Native American Studies programs. The one exception seems to be in anthropology. You don't seem to have any anthropologists here. But you have people from English and law and so on. I think this program shows an openness that some of the others do not have. Ideas come from everywhere; they're not limited to any one ethnic group. It's helpful to get ideas out from any source and kick them around. Maybe that's one reason why you have better research projects.

C. Heth: Another component that we want at least to worry about and try to do something about is the community service in Los Angeles. Having the largest urban Indian community here, we feel some obligation. I know that there are all kinds of traps implicit in getting involved in community organizations. The biggest traps, of course, would be overcommitment of our resources to that kind of activity.

R. Thornton: First of all, it's not a problem with just Indian Studies. One has to be realistic in terms of what academia can do and the realities of using research. Let's face it, the western knowledge systems—that's what we're talking about now—are very limited in their ability to solve specific problems. All disciplines have faced it. It's not to say there are no benefits to the research. But first of all you have to communicate the realities of western research to the Indian community. It's not a panacea for all their problems. But at the same time I think that you have to be open and communicate to them what you see as the ultimate benefits of research and hopefully to communicate to them the importance of doing some of these things in the long run. In many ways the best service you can do to the Indian community is to develop a good strong program in American Indian Studies.

At Minnesota we have much more of a his-

tory of being defined as a resource place for the Indian community. It's not that that's not important, but there are other things. Many organizations face the same problems. Everybody wants to become a drop-in service center. There's that tendency. Hopefully there will be some kind of agreement between UCLA and the Indian community in Los Angeles that what you're about will be important to the community or to Indian people in general. There are ways you can begin to articulate things that you're doing that can assist Indian communities. There's a tremendous need out there for people to learn techniques to evaluate programs. One thing Washington, D.C., requires is some kind of data showing that kids have made educational progress. I think you can help the Indian community, say, in terms of communicating to them knowledge about experimental design, methodological development, and development of survey instruments, etc., to measure kids' progress.

C. S. Kidwell: There's one concrete example of the way in which the university and community organizations can work together. It's not an official relationship, but one of the faculty members at Berkeley wrote a proposal for a community group that resulted in the establishment of a Child Resource Center, which is not a child care facility, for people with crises in family situations. It's a place to seek counseling, family services, and such. She is now serving as a consultant to them in establishing evaluation procedures and is also carrying out her own research project on factors in parent/child interaction and stability in family life based on the records that have been accumulated in that facility. That is the kind of cooperative relationship in which the community can benefit through the activities of the Indian Studies program.

The program, too, can help in doing research on evaluation and testing procedures. It helps the accountability of the organization, and it helps them to develop some research papers. I think that's the kind of interaction to look for.

J. Rouillard: I should probably give some good examples from our own Indian Studies program. We've been very closely linked with community service although we don't look at ourselves as having a community linkage. It just turned out that way. But San Diego County has seventeen Indian reservations and our teacher training group, for instance, has had student tutors or student teachers or aides out into quite a few of those. Of the reservations

that they have not served, it's only because they had a reservation project such as Title IV or Johnson-O'Malley.

However, in an Indian Studies unit you might hear from one or two reservations that you never pay attention to. You never help them or whatever. This is the type of thing I think we've all encountered: we cannot provide a universal service with what limited resources we have in program needs. But if you let that bother you, you have to develop a strategy for answering it in a diplomatic way. You can't totally avoid some criticism because you're neglecting some aspect somebody else feels is very important.

We have a class we offer once a year. It's called a Community Organization and Development class and is open to community people to take as an extension class right along with the regular students. Many Indian professional people who are working in Indian Centers, in Title IV jobs, and in various social services, are very short on their academic, professional preparation to hold the jobs that they have. As a result we have this tendency for a lot of Indian programs to have a built-in self-destruct mechanism by having an unqualified person in a decision-making position. So we try to see if we can't at least effect some kind of information from that class to those people.

I think a research unit has potential just by having information available for people to come in and pick up even though they don't take a formal course. It's there. It's available for them. But our Indian communities in the cities are growing in terms of their impact and self-determination, and we're going to see more and more programs getting into trouble if we're not available to help wherever we can.

C. S. Kidwell: There's another practical problem I'd just like to comment on. We really have to be very much aware of the publication of the material that occurs as a result of research efforts and to make sure that it is disseminated not only to the community groups in the form that they can use but also to the scholarly audience of Indian Studies Departments.

W. Washburn: That's a good point you raised. It's another of those compromises life seems to be full of. If you want to reach the Indian community you do it in one form. But if you want to reach the people who are funding you or the colleagues who are evaluating you, then you have to reach another audience. That's why linkages seem to me to be so useful—linkages to the university press or to the people who are on the press boards from the

different departments who can say, "Let's see, maybe we can get that published by the university press under this or that series." It makes a big difference. In any profession you choose very carefully the journal that you want to submit something to. You're also used to refusals as well as acceptances. Just the fact that it's in the *American Anthropologist* or the *American Historical Review* means that it has a certain weight even before you open the journal. That helps in various ways—establishes you for certain status and prestige. So it's a very important fact to consider. You can publish your own series but people may not even know that it exists. They don't read it or they won't read it because they're used to going through the normal scholarly channels. It's something for you to consider.

S. Guyette: One of the problems I've seen with research not contributing or leading to community development—or sometimes being counter-productive—is the sequence of research and community development. What we have been trying to work on is the idea of research programs being integrated with community development programs. To quote an example, recently we worked with a community organization on a proposal to establish a quarter-million-dollar drug rehabilitation center. They have written into their proposal a research component for evaluation of instruments and other types of research. What will happen if they are funded is that they will contract with the research unit here. This means that UCLA faculty would work with the community organization to develop instruments and they'll actually be tested in the developing program.

D. Risling: The secret to me is to make sure that it's looked at by the UCLA Native American Studies program. That will guarantee to the people of the community that somebody is not designing an instrument or an evaluation form to meet the dominant society's criteria.

C. Heth: I'd like to clarify the project that Susan was talking about. In this project the person who's developing the proposal, questionnaires, everything, is a Native American, an ex-offender, an ex-heroin addict. He's not a person who is looking at this from a point of view of an outsider. And what we're doing is trying to assist these people in getting this project funded, off the ground, the data collected, analyzed, evaluated, whatever they intend to do with it. That's what we're all about in that project.

J. Rouillard: We're looking at a real cart-before-the-horse situation with the graduate program at this point until we start to see some genuine motivation among Indian people toward what they're going to do with an M.A. degree and how in effect it can help them back in the community. Another phenomenon that we will deal with is that we don't have a typical age group of college students. The range goes up to the golden years.

C. Heth: We had envisioned having the core seminars originally planned in the master's program taught by a team of two, possibly more. And also in the mechanism of the oral examination at the end of the first year we had thought of bringing people from outside to examine these students as both a check on us and on the students—sort of building an evaluation system as we go along. The same thing could happen with the language requirement. We could bring in language teachers from somewhere else to examine the students if they came in speaking a native language and not one we were teaching. So we have been thinking in trying to bring in resources to this program.

R. Thornton: That's important. The other side of the coin is to develop an intellectual integrity for American Indian Studies as a discipline. We have to fight the scholarly research battle as well as the teaching and training battle.

J. Rouillard: What can we anticipate as the long-range grass-roots undergraduate Indian student interest in going on to work for a master's degree in Indian Studies? What do the students see that degree fulfilling in terms of career objectives? That's a hypothetical question.

Calvin Hill (student): One thing that any program like this that is going to be developed should provide for us later on, that we won't have normally in the white community, is jobs. We have teachers and instructors that have tenure in the Indian Studies programs that are already developed and they are not Indian. There won't be a place for us to go unless we have some sort of program. I truly feel that we need jobs and they're going to have to be spelled out specifically for us because we won't have the expertise.

Becky Bending (student): For myself, I didn't come in with really clear-cut ideas of going on to get a master's degree. But being here, I've enjoyed my studies and now that's what I want to do, and maybe it's too late to decide. I hear this debate about the Indian Studies master's. Is it a valid area of study? Is it going to be useful? From what I've observed here on the UCLA

campus, one that someone said was a prestigious university, I really have questions. Most Indian students that I know of have taken Indian Studies courses because it's an easy course. It's no challenge to get in there and do studies on Indians. So how can you do really serious graduate work when you're just passing along in that fashion?

D. Risling: What we have found from our students was that every one of our graduates last year either decided to go into a master's or some graduate program, or they were planning to but because of some big offer or something they chose to take a job. But they're still thinking about taking night school or trying to come back. So that kind of takes care of itself. There is a tendency to want to go on, especially if there are some graduate programs available.

The second thing is, I would like to stress that Indian studies is not an easy course. I have an introductory class and the majority are non-Indian students. I get criticized over and over because my beginning class is not a graduate class. You don't get A's because you're Indian in my class. If you are an Indian and had an A in my class you should be able to go back to your community and do the job that is supposed to be done. I might be softer on the bottom end and give you an opportunity to get through but nobody gets a break from me because he's Indian. That's a rip-off as far as I'm concerned. We gave our blood and guts for this program and we're not about to sell out the program.

Homer Stevens (student): I think that's a dead issue anyway about Indian classes where you get good grades. There is no Indian class on the campus right now where it's a cinch B, so to speak. And I don't think there's going to be any more either.

C. S. Kidwell: May I bring up another practical issue you face in starting a master's program? If you really go through the process, and even if the administration is behind you, one of the things you're going to be faced with in justifying the existence of the program is how many qualified students you are going to be able to bring in to go through this program. It's going to mean documenting from past graduates, from inquiries concerning the program, from getting a few people to put in test applications, or something like that. It's going to mean documenting both that the students want the program and that they're going to be qualified for the university standards to get in. It's not just that the Native American graduate pro-

gram can set its own limitations on grades or what qualifications students have to have to get in, but that the whole graduate school at UCLA will be in this process of admitting students. So that's a hurdle to look at from the administration of the program.

J. Young (student): The future isn't bright if you do that as an immediate concern. UCLA has not admitted that many Native American students in any department on campus.

C. S. Kidwell: Well, you're going to have to look at the nationwide pool of Indian students for potential. But it is something to look at especially if the students feel that their undergraduate preparation may not have been that strong.

J. Young: There has to be some sort of relaxation in the entry requirements. UCLA is so rigid in their requirements for graduate school it's ridiculous. I'm not saying it's ridiculous to have high standards. I'm saying it's ridiculous to have very few people apply here. They say, "Why should I apply there? The entrance requirements are too high."

J. Rouillard: That gives a good argument for establishing a master's program in Indian Studies. An Indian Studies department or committee can develop standards which don't necessarily have to be lower standards. They can have qualifying elements and they can be the committee that advises. I don't know what kind of system you have here at UCLA. At our college or university we have a graduate council that has members from every department that has a graduate program. If you have a graduate program I would presume you would have some kind of a voice in a graduate council which would become this department or committee's requirement to advocate for those potential Indian students if they are borderline in some GPA [grade point average] or other consideration.

D. Risling: I really believe that's hitting on some pretty important things. I don't agree with the university standards. If I put in standards most of the 4.0 GPA students couldn't make it. I think we have some standards that they can't meet. But we have to legitimize ourselves. We have to build up a reputation. We have to believe it and then build something on it that will actually test. That's a challenge to us in administration to try to figure out some way of legitimizing that kind of a standard.

C. Heth: In the beginning of the planning we also considered the idea of admitting both Indian and non-Indians in this program. We're

trying to get serious people, whether they be Indians or non-Indians, into this program.

D. Risling: If you had an entrance test that they had to take and somebody comes in and thinks he can walk in and then flunks, the reputation gets out that you don't get into the Native American Studies program until you really know and have some background. All you have to do is flunk a few of those people who think they can just walk into this kind of thing. Then you're legitimizing what we're talking about.

C. Heth: There are plenty of graduate programs on this campus that do have entrance exams so it would not be a new precedent for us to set.

J. Rouillard: The same type of comprehensive Indian cultural exam could be developed, you know, that could be complementary to this kind of a graduate program. And it could be complementary to the type of people that I think we're looking for.

C. Heth: Well, we're close to the end. Are there any final remarks, summations that anyone would like to make?

J. Rouillard: I came with a real open mind about looking at the feasibility of an M.A., knowing the types of struggles that I've gone through with my department just getting a basic curriculum for a minor through a big university. So it does seem like a mission but one that I think we should all have. We're to believe and have a mission in what we're doing, those of us who're in American Indian Studies as a discipline.

A. Ortiz: You've thrown together a bunch of very active Indians who operate on several levels at once. You get all kinds of things said in a day's time, let alone two days. You have to get back and mull over it for a week or two and sort out the good things from the transitory things and repeat those, or at least rethink them through.

J. Rouillard: One other thing. I am convinced that such a thing as the master's program is feasible. One of the big considerations has to be the availability of places like a research center, the physical availability of the campus that's responsible for the program. I definitely think that UCLA has that type of centrality in a large city with Indian communities nearby, available helping faculty, and all of those things, so that part of it is a definite plus in your consideration.

K. Lincoln: I'd like to ask Al one last question. Are you saying that Indian Studies, as tribes are defined, is in the position of "a do-

mestic dependent nation" at UCLA? Does an Indian define himself in an academic environment, to borrow from the Irish poet W. B. Yeats saying to the English, "We Indians do not hold that view"?

A. Ortiz: No, I go much further than that. We don't need a non-Indian definition of us in or-

der to exist. We have a completely distinct, sovereign way of defining ourselves—that's enough. We are freestanding. If you take European-American society away—if everybody went "back home"—Indian cultures would still be what they are now—freestanding.