

Native Sovereignty, Narrative Argument, and an International Shift: The 1974 Rhetoric of
George Manuel and Vine Deloria, Jr.

Charles W. Dyson, Jr.

Thesis submitted to the faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts, Communication

Dr. Beth M. Waggenpack
Dr. Samuel R. Cook
Dr. Robert E. Denton, Jr.

July 22, 2004
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Native Sovereignty, Narrative Theory, Vine Deloria, Jr., George Manuel

Copyright 2004, Charles Dyson

Native Sovereignty, Narrative Argument, and an International Shift: The 1974 Rhetoric of
George Manuel and Vine Deloria, Jr.

Charles W. Dyson, Jr.

Abstract

The modern era of globalization presents a situation where indigenous cultures are potentially being eroded away. As a result, leaders of these groups need to begin using effective rhetorical strategies in their efforts to defend their worldview against the dominating views of Western ideology. This thesis attempts to present a case study analysis of the work of two leaders in the Native American rights movement: George Manuel and Vine Deloria, Jr. Manuel's book *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality* and Deloria's *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence* are presented as examples for how modern indigenous leaders can use narrative argument, addressing the persuasive functions of social movements, to foster political action on a people-to-people, national, and transnational level.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to the legacy of George Manuel, to the continued work of Vine Deloria, Jr., and to the countless other indigenist activists who have struggled to preserve their traditional identities and cultural lifestyles.

Acknowledgements

I strongly want to thank my parents and family for providing their love and support in helping me through six years of college. I would also like to thank Dr. Beth Waggenpack for her honest and practical advice and for her dedication in serving as my committee chair. I want to express my appreciation to my committee members, Dr. Samuel Cook and Dr. Robert Denton, Jr., for their professional insights and guidance. Last, I would like to thank my many Blacksburg friends, fellow graduate students, and colleagues in the Department of Communication, whose encouragement and friendship have made the experience of graduate school at Virginia Tech so meaningful and memorable.

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	1
 <u>Chapter I: Key Issues and Background</u>	
<i>Key Issues in Native America</i>	5
<i>Historical Background</i>	12
<i>Key Issues in International Politics</i>	19
 <u>Chapter II: Narrative Theory, Six Persuasive Functions of Social Movement, and Methodology</u>	
<i>Narrative as Persuasion</i>	25
<i>Six Persuasive Functions of a Social Movement</i>	35
<i>Method of Analysis</i>	37
 <u>Chapter III: Narrative Analysis of <i>The Fourth World: An Indian Reality</i></u>	
<i>Background on Author and Artifact</i>	41
<i>“Does Indians have feelings?”</i>	42
<i>“Mutual Dependence”</i>	47
<i>“Strong Medicine”</i>	51
<i>“The Earth and My Grandmother”</i>	53
<i>“We honour Our Grandfathers Who Kept Us Alive”</i>	62
<i>“Scratching for a Start”</i>	66
<i>“Becoming a Fisher of Men”</i>	69
<i>“The Decade of Consultation”</i>	71
<i>“The Dailey Struggle Now”</i>	74
<i>“The Fourth World”</i>	76

Chapter IV: Narrative Analysis of *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence*

<i>Background on Author and Artifact</i>	79
“Preamble to the Present”	81
“ <i>The Emergence of Indian Activism</i> ”	83
“ <i>The Occupation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs</i> ”	89
“ <i>The Confrontation at Wounded Knee</i> ”	92
“ <i>The Doctrine of Discovery</i> ”	96
“ <i>Domestic Dependent Nations</i> ”	97
“ <i>The Plenary Power Doctrine</i> ”	98
“ <i>The Size and Status of Nations</i> ”	99
“ <i>The Indian Reorganization Act</i> ”	102
“ <i>Litigating Indian Claims</i> ”	104
“ <i>The International Arena</i> ”	108
“ <i>Reinstituting the Treaty Process</i> ”	111

Chapter V: Significance, Discussion and Implications

<i>Probability and Fidelity</i>	114
<i>The Narrative Elements</i>	115
<i>The Six Persuasive Functions of Social Movement</i>	121
<i>The Three Levels of Global Politics</i>	122
<i>Follow-Up on Artifacts</i>	124
<i>Future Implications</i>	127
References.....	129
Vita.....	135

Native Sovereignty, Narrative Argument, and an International Shift: The 1974 Rhetoric of
George Manuel and Vine Deloria, Jr.

In the sixteenth century, the expansion of European power and culture through the practice of colonization became a profoundly influential force for controlling the social, political and economic environments under which the populations of the world lived. Though the period of colonialism has since diminished, the tendency of powerful organizations to attempt to consolidate the world's wealth and resources into an empire has not. In the twenty first century, the essence of colonialism has been replaced by a globalization of business. With the spreading of corporate networks and growth of worldwide industries, the process of globalization has allowed Western values and ideas to begin dominating much of the world's processes for producing knowledge and modifying society. The result of these combined forces has been a fast closing of the distinctive gap of separation that different societies have traditionally held from one another.

Globalization is an inevitable result of our new interconnected world. It is also undeniable that this will only continue to cause the uniquely different societies of the world to become more alike. Many individuals in the corporate world defend this as a positive outcome that will only help to remove the limitations caused by cultural differences in business and social practices. However, it is also important to realize that alternative worldview perspectives are vital to maintaining multiple and alternative ways of living. Divergent worldviews are of value simply because they promote diversity in human existence and, as Socrates showed us over two thousand years ago, real truth is not achieved through the establishment of one method of thinking. Truth is derived from the discourse that is created when opposing ideas collide.

One such group of alternative worldviews that are potentially the most vulnerable to globalization and the most important for us to consider maintaining are those of indigenous cultures. As societies of people who have long been the victims of outside encroachment, indigenous groups hold an irreplaceable position in the world. They are the cultures that remain the most resilient and the least tainted by modern values and ideals, because they have resisted and fought to maintain the traditional ways and the world perspectives of their ancestors for hundreds of years.

The new concept of “Indigenism” as an inherent right for aboriginal people to practice an independent level of politics in order to maintain their distinct identity and rights as humans of a separate culture has only become a popular notion within the last thirty years (Niezen, 2003). Indigenism was created as a response to the increase in globalization of business. Formerly, many indigenous groups were capable of escaping the effects of modernity because they had occupied areas of the world that were the most difficult for others to inhabit; for example, the Kayapo tribe in the southern jungles of the Amazon or the Inuit in the frozen tundra of northern Canada. However, due to the increasing search for resources throughout the world and the globalization of businesses, cultures that had previously remained comparatively untouched are now suddenly being placed in situations where their entire way of life may change in a very short period of time. The subsequent result will be the loss of native traditions that have been preserved for centuries and have formerly insured the survival of these groups (Niezen, 2003).

As Smith, Burke, and Ward (2000) noted, the modern era of globalization presents a situation that is both a disadvantage and an advantage to indigenous people (p. 1-7). Globalization is a disadvantage because it has accelerated the process in which distinctive cultures become eroded by making it easier for outside messages to proliferate the daily lives of those living within these cultures. On the other hand, globalization can be seen as an advantage to alternative cultures because it presents a situation where the media are more easily available for promoting their cultural values to the outside world. Globalization has the added benefit of allowing these groups to connect with other cultures that share their common values. In the past, colonization had typically been a one-to-one situation between the colonizing society and the society of indigenous people who were being colonized. The new world of global culture has allowed colonized groups to foster relationships with other colonized groups in order to band together for greater support. Therefore, today is a time of grave importance for these groups. Their future existence as distinctive cultures depends on how they respond to globalization in their interactions with the rest of the world.

Though this thesis does not intend to assert that indigenous perspectives are the optimum worldview that should be held by everyone, it does assume that they represent an integral part of human life. Their continued existence as distinctive cultures is necessary for preserving the contradiction of diverse ideas that prevents civilization from becoming homogenized. If the

world's entire civilization were ever to become completely homogenized, then the human race would run the risk of all making the same mistakes.

It is in the spirit of examining ways to help maintain alternative perspectives among the cultures of the world that this thesis was written. More specifically, this thesis will look at identifiable examples of successful rhetoric that have been used by two indigenist activists in the past in their fight to maintain their distinctive cultures. By identifying certain aspects of rhetoric used in messages promoting indigenist rights, this thesis hopes to present a case study of positions and expressions that activists yet to come can use for designing future messages that rhetorically promote indigenous rights.

I have chosen to study two books written by native activists in North America. The rhetorical work of Native Americans was chosen for this analysis because they represent a unique set of cultures among indigenous groups that suffered the effects of colonization and globalization at a very early period in world history. Also, they were able to gain a higher level of influence in the twentieth century than most indigenous nations.

The purpose of this analysis was to study two key books by Native Americans that could be considered successful in their meeting most of their intended goals of persuasion and that were progressive in addressing and framing the trend toward globalization in a way that was beneficial to indigenist groups. Books were the chosen medium for this rhetorical analysis because, whether they are in printed or electronic format, they remain the medium that is well suited for disseminating vast amounts of information in a textual form.

The two books chosen for this analysis were 1974's *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality* by George Manuel and Michael Posluns and *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence* by Vine Deloria, Jr. These particular books were chosen because they represent two well-developed messages that were designed to address very similar issues involving colonization, cultural encroachment, and problems associated with the political status of indigenous groups in North America. As books that were both published thirty years ago, they represent acts of rhetoric that were equally ahead of their time in anticipating the trend of globalization. In addition, they both identified aspects of the international political scene in order to create a new framework for elevating the movement for indigenous rights to a higher

level. In this way, Manuel¹ and Deloria were forerunners in the philosophical ideology of Indigenism that has just recently become a worldwide phenomenon.

The significance of Manuel's and Deloria's work is that the Native Americans were one of the first major indigenous groups of those that still claim an indigenous status in the world to become the victims of modernization. Therefore, they have been dealing with these issues over a century and have also recently managed to establish themselves as a relatively powerful group in world politics. As spokesmen for the concept of indigenist rights who were at the forefront of the movement, Manuel's and Deloria's rhetoric provide an example of how other indigenist group leaders who are being negatively affected by the spread of globalization can begin using their own narrative arguments as a frame for promoting their rights on the world scene.

A narrative rhetorical approach was chosen to analyze the books, because it allowed for a deconstruction of the ideology that Manuel and Deloria were advocating through the experiences and events that they related in their texts. The decision to use this approach is justified by the fact that the authors of both books made open use of narrative structure in their rhetoric for promoting platforms of indigenous rights.

Indigenous narratives in any media format provide an opportunity for members of indigenous groups to present their experiences to the world in a way that asserts why it is so important for them to keep their identity and right to autonomy. Manuel's and Deloria's works represent two distinct approaches taken by two leaders of indigenous groups who were working with similar issues but presented two separate lines of narrative argument in uniquely different ways. In spite of their differences, both appear equally successful in helping to create and support the ideology of indigenism and the political right of expressing group identity.

¹Though *The Fourth World* was written by both George Manuel and Michael Posluns, it is written predominantly in the voice and from the perspective of Manuel. Therefore, for the purposes of this thesis, the analysis will only refer to Manuel when discussing the choices and strategies made by both the authors of the book.

Chapter I: Key Issues and Background

Key Issues in Native America: Sovereignty, Nationality, and Peoplehood

At the root of many issues relating to modern Native American rights and indigenous rights in general is the concept of sovereignty. “Sovereignty” is historically a complex political idea that has come to describe any situation where an individual or group holds a status of complete power. According to Thompson (1996), the term “sovereign” was originally a religious one used to refer to the omnipotent power of God over the universe. However, as a term for referring to an aspect of human existence, it has come to represent any person or organization that holds a level of absolute power over one particular area. In the past, the concept of sovereignty has been applied to the religious power of the Pope or the ruling power of the former crowned heads of Europe. In modern democracy, sovereignty is seen to reside in the hands of a nation’s chosen body of government. In essence, sovereignty is the right of that government to express and enforce its will in political affairs.²

The reason this issue is significant for Native Americans is because sovereignty, as it is understood, is a *right* that is inherent for any ruling body that has come to be representative of the interests of a group of people (i.e. it is the right for people to rule themselves). The question for Native America, then, is whether or not a government that is still in existence and still representative of its own group of people (who retain their own identity as a separate collectivity of individuals) can still claim a status of original sovereignty, despite the acquisition of control by a newer outside government (Asch, 1984). In other words, can indigenous groups who were conquered during the colonial period still claim the right to rule themselves?

When applied to Native North America, the issue of sovereignty becomes complex because both the constitutions of the United States and Canada have been interpreted to *allow* (but do not necessarily protect) the aboriginal right to self-government possessed by the indigenous nations of North America for ruling within their own territories. However, both countries also make the legal distinction between *independent* and *dependent* nations or states.

² According to *Black’s Law Dictionary (sixth edition)*, the generally held sense of the word “sovereignty,” in terms of government, refers to: “public authority which directs or orders what is to be done by each member associated in relation to the end of the association. It is the supreme power by which any citizen is governed and is the person or body of persons in the state to whom there is politically no superior. The necessary existence of the state and that right and power which necessarily follow is *sovereignty*. By *sovereignty* in its largest sense is meant supreme, absolute, uncontrollable power, the absolute right to govern. The word which by itself comes nearest to being the definition of *sovereignty* is will or volition as applied to political affairs” (Nolan, 1990).

Defining the indigenous nations as “dependent” entities has allowed for the North American governments to assume a higher level of sovereign power over the aboriginal peoples.³

Whenever the sovereign will of the indigenous nations has come into conflict with the interests of the American governments, the governments have claimed a higher sovereign power.

This is justified by the governments in different ways. In the federalist system of the United States, it is assumed that no one entity can carry full sovereignty over everything and remain just. Instead, various political entities carry sovereignty in various distinct areas to create a system of checks and balances. Therefore, although the federal government may allow indigenous nations the right to claim “sovereignty” in certain tribal affairs, it rejects the idea that full and uncontested power over their affairs can be placed in the hands of the native people (in much the same way that the Constitution rejects the right of any individual state or commonwealth within the union to hold full sovereignty over itself) (Flanagan, 2000, p.63-64).⁴

Canada was founded under the assumption that only the British crown held sovereignty over the domains of Canada. In the modern era, the Canadian Parliament has asserted this sovereignty symbolically on behalf of the crown. Therefore, unlike American officials in the U.S., Canadian officials have traditionally avoided the use of the term “sovereign” when referring to the status of aboriginal peoples, because it holds a slightly different legal meaning for them. Canadian Native Americans also tend to avoid the confrontational implications of claiming “sovereignty” and often claim a right to “self-government” instead (though, in essence, they are claiming the same thing that American Indians in the United States mean when they speak of sovereignty) (Flanagan, 2000, p64-65).

At any rate, despite their modern status it would be easy to see how the indigenous nations of North America can be considered to have been “sovereign” states at the time when Europeans first began settling on the North American continent. At that time, they lived on and possessed defined territorial lands, they had governmental structures for making decisions and settling disputes among their people, and they existed, for the most part, free from external

³For the purposes of this thesis, the term “aboriginal” is used interchangeably with the term “indigenous.”

⁴The most classic case of the legal interpretation of the limited nature of American Indian sovereignty is the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Cherokee Nation v Georgia*. In this case, Justice John Marshall first coined the term *domestic dependent nations* to describe the politically reliant state of the Native Americans and their necessary subordination to the collective of other political entities (that make up the United States Congress and the executive branch of the federal government). For Marshall, the tribal nations were like wards of the state and, therefore, subject to its rule.

influence. Today, the Native Americans hold a far more limited amount of their aboriginal rights to self-government.

However, traditional activists for Native American rights continue to claim a “right” to self-governing power. They assert that there is a need for them to hold and develop their own property with the same freedom that they practiced before the arrival of the colonial settlers in order to protect the traditions of their people, believing that full sovereignty could not have been “lost” to a nation of people who never consented to relinquish it. The debate that developed during the twentieth century centered on whether or not these indigenous groups, who once lived as independent nations, can still be considered independent “nations” in the modern sense. A further problem with this debate is the fact that the concept of what constitutes a “nation” is just as ambiguous as the concept of sovereignty. Many Native American tribes call themselves “nations” (like the “Navaho Nation” or the “Sioux Nation”), but others outside of the Native American communities have often questioned whether they can technically distinguish themselves as “nations.”

White (1985) determined that there are five criteria Americans normally use to determine whether or not an organization of people can be considered a “nation.” These five criteria he identified were (1) civilization, (2) significance, (3) territory, (4) solidarity, and (5) sovereignty (p.1-23). According to Flanagan (2000), who applied White’s criteria to the Native Americans, the Indians could not have always been “nations” because they were not really “civilized” prior to the European settlement of North America; they are not of a size large enough to be considered “significant;” they only hold territory that is held in trust by the North American governments (and could not financially support their territory by themselves); they lack a larger aggregate of solidarity to constitute a nation; and the other nations of the world do not recognize them as sovereign and independent from their colonial conquerors (p.84-87). As will be discussed later in this thesis, Native American scholars George Manuel and Vine Deloria, Jr., contested the perceived status of Native Americans on these five notions of nationality in the narratives of their two books.

To provide a further example of the concept of nationality, Benedict Anderson (1983) proposed the following definition:

it is an imagined political community- and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign... It is *imagined* because members will never know most of their fellow-members...yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion...[it is] *limited* because...[it] has finite, if elastic, boundaries beyond which lie other nations...[it is] *sovereign*...born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm...Finally, it is imagined as a *community*, because...the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship (p. 6-7).

Anderson's definition and conceptualization of what constitutes a nation helps put the political struggle of the indigenous "nations" into clearer perspective. Specifically, it was his assertion that "imagination" is a significant component in the creation of a "nation" that reveals a clue to how sovereignty might have been lost to the indigenous nations of North America. Basically, he contended that nations only function and exist within the minds of the members of society. Simply by expanding upon his definition, one can recognize that being a nation does not merely occur when members of the group "imagine" themselves to be a nation, but it is also dependant on what *other* political communities (that they must interact with as nations) "imagine" them to be. As a socially constructed entity, a nation is only a nation if the global society deems it so or, to be more correct, if society *imagines* it so. Hence, it was logical and necessary for Manuel and Deloria, in their rhetorical efforts for restoring sovereignty, to address the criteria White (1985) identified in order to convince others that indigenous groups held the ability to be sovereign nations.

If a nation is socially imagined as a political community that is both inherently limited and sovereign, then the European settlers also recognized the Native Americans as "nations" when they first came to the New World. This is reflected by the way that they interacted with them. The settlers signed treaties with the leaders of Native American governments and generally respected their claims to territorial lands.⁵ At that point in time, the settlers culturally recognized them in a similar way to how the natives imagined themselves.

⁵ Article I, Section 10 of the United States Constitution prohibits the federal government from entering into treaty relationships with entities other than fully sovereign nations. Therefore, a treaty agreement that has been ratified by the Senate is a formal recognition of the other party's formal sovereign status as a nation. During the period between 1778 and 1881, the U.S. Senate ratified 371 treaties with various Native American tribes (Robbins 1992, p.113).

As the colonists' needs for expansion grew, they stopped respecting the status of the indigenous people as being members of separate nations. At that point in time, with the need for more land to support the growing interests and population of the American people, it became more profitable for the colonists to redefine the status of the Native Americans. So, they *imagined* the natives to be something else.

Originally, the settlers had viewed some of the Indian tribes as philosophically progressive. For example, certain aspects of the United States Constitution were actually framed after the system of government that was held by the Iroquois Nation. (Cohen, 1970, p.321). This view changed when the European Americans redefined the natives as being inhumanely cruel and savage through the creation of a grand myth.⁶ Generally speaking, the myth was the assumption that Native Americans represented a society that was without the structure or culture of a civilized race of people. This view merely exploited the differences that the natives exhibited in their manners and methods of living from the Europeans. Justifying their assumptions by pointing to the Indians' exotic lifestyle, Europeans viewed the Native Americans as creatures that were physically human but living in the ways of animals. They began to see Native Americans as a dysfunctional and pre-human group of beings that needed to be assimilated into civilized society and "saved" by being brought into the Christian faith (Dickason, 1997).

The reason this assumption was a myth (i.e. a false social construction) can be explained by the writings of Dickason (1997), who studied changes in the early relations between the French colonists and the American Indians in North America. Dickason concluded,

The European approach was doomed to failure because it assumed a cultural dichotomy between "savage" (lack of order) and "civilized" (order) that did not, in fact, exist. Whatever the differences may be between "tribal" societies and "civilizations," the presence or lack of order is not one of them. The people of the New World all led highly

⁶ The use of the term "myth," as it is used here, is similar to the definition used by Barthes (1972). Barthes wrote, "Myth has the task of giving a historical intention a natural justification...Myth does not deny things, on the contrary, its function is to talk about them; simply, it purifies them, it makes them innocent, it gives them a natural and eternal justification, it gives them a clarity which is not that of an explanation but that of a statement of fact" (p. 142).

Said (1978) identified a trend among European and American cultures (that he coined "Orientalism") for creating myths about foreign cultures as being "uncivilized" in order to justify their forced subordination to Euro-American interests and values.

structured lives, with or without agriculture and whatever their degree of nomadism (p. 273).

The unfortunate consequent of this type of racial and culturally false stereotyping was that the myth fostered a sense that the colonists were somehow just in their conquest and violence against the Indians. In contrast, the Indians who retaliated against their oppressors were viewed as merely “savages” deserving of white hatred and the genocidal practices taken against them were justified in the name of progress.⁷ This myth was passed down through several centuries in the stories and legends of the American West, ever-reinforcing a loose justification for the destruction of the Native American people.

Hence, as the colonists stopped respecting the indigenous people and their status as nations, different aspects of what constitutes a nation (as defined by Anderson) were taken from the Native Americans. First, the colonists stopped respecting their national boundaries and territorial claims. Then, as the natives responded with hostility to this, the colonists stopped respecting their rights as independent nations to self-governance and began acting toward the Native Americans in ways that disregarded their forms of government (by breaking treaties and making false promises to Indian leaders, etc).

The subsequent result was that Native Americans were left in a state of being that is somehow *less than* individuals who were members of recognized nations. For Manuel and Deloria, both writing in an effort to stimulate a re-conceptualization of indigenous nationality, it was important to deconstruct the false myth and replace it with their own version of the “story.” This is why narrative argument was so important in Manuel’s and Deloria’s work.

Native traditionalists like Manuel and Deloria continue to conceptualize themselves in terms of “imagined communities” with a shared sense of comradeship and likeness of culture

⁷ An example of the myth of the hostile savage can be found in the following quotation from President Theodore Roosevelt:

“Border warfare... was a war waged by savages against armed settlers, whose families followed them into the wilderness. Such a war is inevitably bloody and cruel; but the inhuman love of cruelty for cruelty’s sake, which marks the red Indian above all other savages, rendered these wars more terrible than any others. For the hideous, unnamable, unthinking tortures practiced by the red men on their captured foes, and on their foes’ tender women and helpless children, were such as we read of in no other struggle... It was *inevitable*- indeed it was in many instances *proper*- that such deeds should awake in the breasts of the whites the grimmest, wildest spirit of revenge and hatred...

“Mere outrages could be atoned for or settled; the question which lay at the root of our difficulties was that of the occupation of the land itself, and to this there could be no solution save war. The Indians had no ownership of the land in the way in which *we* understand the term... The White settler has merely moved into an uninhabited waste; he does not feel that he is committing a wrong, for he knows perfectly well that the land is owned by no one... The truth is, the Indians never had any real title to the soil... The settler and pioneer have at bottom had justice on their side; this great continent could not have been kept as nothing but a game preserve for squalid savages... They cannot be severely blamed for trespassing upon what was called the Indian’s land; for let sentimentalists say what they will, the man who puts the soil to use must of right dispossess the man who does not, or the world will come to a standstill” (Dudley, 1998, p. 157-161).

like Anderson discussed. As Holm, Pearson, and Chavis (2003) have contended, indigenous people continue, in general, to think of themselves in terms of their “peoplehood.” Defined as the relationship between common language, sacred history, territory, and the ceremonies of a given group of people, “peoplehood” can explain why certain groups of people who are not defined as a “state,” still continue to hold their own common culture and political identity. Holm et al. (2003) explained the indigenous perspective as being that,

...peoplehood is self-contained and self-governing. Moreover, it predates and is a prerequisite for all other forms of socio-political organization. In fact, peoplehood, rather than the band or the tribe, is the basis of nationalism and the original organization of states. Conversely, states or nations might not necessarily be considered peoples. Equally, the model of peoplehood serves to explain and define codes of conduct, civility, behavior within a given environment, and relationships between people. What we term “law,” and the enforcement thereof, is unquestionably a part of peoplehood. Sovereignty, therefore, is inherent in being a distinct people (p. 17).

For Holm et al. (2003), because peoplehood is a prerequisite of nationality, it remains stronger than nationality. For example, they argued that peoplehood is a potential explanation for why the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was so quick in breaking back into its former grouping of national entities based on assemblies of people that shared similar cultures and identity. This would suggest that laws and governments work best when they are based on a public group with a sense of common peoplehood. Therefore, those with a longstanding claim to their own independent identity may also have a legitimate claim to sovereignty (p.17).

The right to sovereignty goes hand in hand with the human need to express group identity. As Macklem (2001) wrote,

A grant of recognition of some measure of sovereignty to a particular collectivity permits that collectivity to express its collective difference. Those who possess sovereignty are thus typically reluctant to relinquish any measure of it. A conquered people that yearns to rid itself of its colonial past seek sovereignty as a vehicle for and an expression of this desire; it seeks to be free to express its collective identity. Similarly, a

conquering nation values its sovereignty because it permits the domestic and international expression of its collective identity, as well as the continued projection on and enforcement of that identity against those it has conquered (p. 110-111).

As Schouls (2003) has also argued, the struggle for Native American sovereignty and self-government is really a struggle for the rights of aboriginal people to live and express their own identity without the oppressive outside influence of their colonial conquerors. Schouls supported this by identifying several recurrent themes from testimonies that were given by Native Americans to Canada's Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996). He found that the testimonies repeatedly reflected the feeling that Native Americans had continually been exploited or ignored by biases inherent in the federal government. Also, respondents felt that there was a cultural contradiction between their traditional culture and "white" society that made it impossible for them to fully function in "white" forms of social organization. In addition, they felt that their cultures deserved to be considered the equivalent of other "nations" and that the only form of healing for them would be a return to the level of self-government that they held prior to colonization (p.62-67).

The question that activists continue to pose is whether nations like the United States and Canada, with governments that were based on certain principles of justice, fairness, equality, and a basic respect for the equivalent institutions of other nations, can truly claim that the indigenous nations no longer have a right to sovereignty without making their own principles appear meaningless.

Historical Background: An Overview of Native North American History and Social Protest

The actual process that led to the waning status of Native American sovereignty was one that involved multiple factors. The first factor in the loss of sovereignty was the actual loss of entitlement to the land (i.e. the aboriginal peoples' territory). Global policy in the sixteenth century assumed that, as long as some form of compensation was made, the European powers were allowed to "buy" land from native groups and still be considered just in terms of international law. However, Europe decided on its own what was considered fair compensation. Vast amounts of land were lost to native people during the centuries that followed (Todorov, 1984, p.149-150).

Second, the populations of the nations drastically declined after the first contact between the whites and the natives. This was due to diseases that were introduced by the white settlers, wars that were waged between the natives and the settlers, and a drastic decline in the living conditions of the Indians as they were forcibly removed from their homes and lands. As the size of the native population dwindled from many millions in the sixteenth century to around 200,000 by the end of the nineteenth century, many of the once mighty indigenous nations lost their status as powerful political communities on the American continent (Stuart, 1987, p.51).

As the native communities lost their ability to assert their sovereignty to the more powerful colonial governments, the U.S. and Canadian governments created the system of reservations to both contain and protect the indigenous people from the encroachment of the settlers. Following their placement on reservations, Native Americans in Canada and the United States became the virtual “wards” of the North American governments, though not by their own volition. This led to the introduction of a more formal system of assimilation. As the United States and Canadian governments began securing their power over the Native people, many bureaucrats saw the need for political initiatives that would introduce the natives into the white Euro-American culture and society. As more powerful sovereigns, the governments saw the need for the European-American cultural identity to be imposed on the Native Americans in order for them to survive the continued encroachment of the colonial Americans (Washburn, 1971, p.145).

The late nineteenth century saw the beginnings of assimilation education. Programs were set up to teach the native adults the European methods of agriculture. The Indian boarding schools, a Federal Indian policy that called for the removal of Indian children from their native cultures in order to train them to act and function like white American citizens, were implemented throughout the countries starting in the late 1800s (Cohen, 1982, p.139-142).

In the twentieth century, the Truman presidency continued the federal government’s attempt to rid itself of the problematic issues associated with the Native American tribes. It began re-delegating the burden of funding education systems for Native Americans to the states and appointed Dillon S. Meyer (the man who had formerly been responsible for relocating Japanese Americans to detention camps during WWII) to head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Meyer, skilled in the practice of relocation, soon began a program to clear the reservations by granting subsidies to Native Americans who moved to urban areas. However, the subsidies

failed to help the Native Americans improve their standards of living. The majority of those who chose to leave the reservation only ended up on welfare once they settled in the urban areas they were unaccustomed to (Cohen, 1982, p. 153-159).

The Eisenhower administration cut much of the budget that had previously been given to the reservations. In what has come to be called the “termination policies” of the 1950s, native nations in several states were no longer provided federal supervision. In some states, civil and criminal jurisdiction was transferred from the federal government to the state. Many indigenous nations previously exempt from state taxes were forced to begin paying. Many trustee relationships with the federal government were ended and 109 native nations disbanded as a result of the policies of the 1950s (Churchill and Morris, 1992, p. 15).

Morris (2003) wrote of this time period in American Indian history that,

Through the operation of its termination and relocation policies of the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, the United States had fostered ideological, cultural, and political schisms across Indian country. Entire generations had been severed from their histories, their languages, their families, and their homelands...Incongruent identities, loyalties, experiences, and aspirations among American Indian people created complex social, political, and economic relations across Indian country that the United States was unable and unwilling to address (p. 98).

Up through this period, Native Americans in Canada had been suffering from similar problems in a more subdued manner. Canada had regularly imposed assimilationist policies for dealing with their aboriginal communities throughout the early twentieth century, but the native communities had responded with a relatively low level of protest. This changed when Canadian officials unleashed a full and direct termination policy on June 25, 1969. On that day, Canada’s Minister of Indian Affairs Jean Chretien issued a document titled, “Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy.” The document, often referred to as the “White Paper,” expressed the Canadian government’s decision (under the leadership of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau) to dissolve the special status of *all* Native American tribes and reserves (Schouls, 2003, p.42). Thompson (1996) wrote of the White Paper, “The Indian Act was to be repealed and the Indian affairs Ministry abolished. Reserves were to be broken up and their lands given to individual

Native people. The White Paper seemed to mimic- and repudiated... ‘termination’ policies of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations [in the United States]” (p. 71).

There are two significant outcomes of the termination and assimilation periods of Native American history. In Canada, where the termination policy of the White Paper was a very sudden attack on Native rights (and had not been a prolonged process like it was in the United States), the response was a fast mobilization by Canadian Native Americans. Reacting to Trudeau’s proposed assimilation of all indigenous people, tribal activists banded together in a way that they never had before in Canadian history. The quick mobilization of its people led to early success in their struggle. Due to the immediate response of native groups, Trudeau was forced to remove the intended policies outlined by the White Paper on March 17, 1971. Moreover, once the native groups got started, they did more than just reject the White Paper. They continued their response by vocalizing their complaints on *all* the many problems present throughout Canada’s indigenous community (Thompson, 1996, p.71-72).

In this way, the assimilation policies in Canada accomplished the opposite of their intended goals. The goal was to eliminate the special recognition that Native American tribes held in the government and to generally disperse the indigenous people. To the contrary, however, Canada’s White Paper directly led to the various tribes banding together in their common cause against it. People from both rural and urban areas began communicating more with one another. Reacting to the White Paper’s release, the National Indian Brotherhood was founded for researching the legal status of treaty and aboriginal rights and a common goal began to form among the Canadian Indians. That common goal, as Schouls (2003) remarked, was to create an ideology that could be used to support and defend the native people’s claim to nationalism. This ideology (that asserted how the enduring differences and distinct cultural identity of Native American peoples was equivalent to “nationality” and should be recognized as such) became a recurring theme in the public discourse of Native Americans in Canada (Schouls, 2003, p.66-67).

This ideology became more of an issue when, in 1973, the Canadian Supreme Court handed down its decision on the controversial “Calder case” (Calder et al v. Attorney General of British Columbia). Originally filed in 1969 at the same time as the release of the White Paper, the Calder case involved a claim by the Nishga tribe that their rights as an aboriginal sovereign had never been extinguished. Though the Nishga lost the case in a three to four split among the

justices, the case was still a partial win for Native American rights in Canada because it helped establish a precedent for the potential of fully restored sovereignty. This was because six of the seven justices still agreed that it was *possible* for aboriginal title to exist under Canadian law. In the years that followed, the Calder precedent helped to encourage more tribal governments to begin claiming aboriginal rights in court (Asch, 1984, p.64-68).

In the United States, the consequence of the relocation of Native Americans to urban areas was the catalyst for mobilizing the movement. As the result of many dispossessed people coming together, political actions groups arose in urban community centers to address issues of injustices suffered by American Indians. (Thompson, 1996, p.15). This phenomenon soon led to the modern Native American rights movement in the United States.

In contrast to Canadian activism (which was quickly mobilized to respond to one particular key event), the American Indian Movement rose more slowly out of the urban community centers of major cities in the United States during the 1960s. The late '60's saw a revival of Indian activism in urban centers that was part of the growing Native American desire to counteract the further degradation of Indian lands, resources, and culture. Stemming from a growing sense of frustration among members of the native community, a streetwise and tougher group of young leaders began forming various confrontational organizations for addressing their public grievances. First, there was the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) founded by Clyde Warrior. Then, in 1968, Dennis Banks and George Mitchell founded the American Indian Movement, which they loosely modeled after the militant Black Panther Party (Churchill, & Vander Wall, 2002, p.119).

Though it was originally formed to address the issue of police harassment of Native Americans, AIM soon moved from a local to a more national focus, addressing the greater issues of treaty rights and preserving traditional culture. Under this new direction, AIM began staging a series of protest events, beginning in 1969 and continuing through the mid-70s, which managed to garner national media attention for their cause. The more volatile nature of these organizations made the actions that they took and the responses they received from the U.S. government much different and more radically eventful than the course that the movement had taken in Canada.

The first major event under the new American Indian Movement occurred in November of 1969. A coalition of Indian organizations calling itself Indians of All Tribes (IAT) took up

residence at the abandoned prison of Alcatraz Island. Based on an 1882 federal statute that provided for the establishment of Indian schools in abandoned federal facilities, the IAT began demanding that Alcatraz be used to create a “Center for Native American Studies.” The occupation of Alcatraz Island lasted for nineteen months. When it became obvious that the IAT was serious about its demands and would refuse to end the occupation without a response, the government sent in a task force of U.S. marshals to arrest the occupiers (Churchill & Vander Wall, 2002, p.119).

In the following two years, Native American groups continued to occupy other abandoned government facilities in northern California. In addition, AIM staged an occupation of the Mayflower II on Thanksgiving Day 1970 and of Mt. Rushmore on July 4, 1971. This allowed the movement to keep Indian issues in the media and in the attention of the public (Churchill & Vander Wall, 2002, p.121-122).

The second major event came in January 1972, when an elderly Native American man named Raymond Yellow Thunder was beaten, stripped from the waist down, and left for dead by five white men near Gordon, Nebraska. When the local law enforcement did not take any action against those responsible for Yellow Thunder’s murder, a group of over 1,000 Native Americans took occupation of the town of Gordon. Due to the overwhelming presence of native people, the Gordon authorities were forced to charge and jail Yellow Thunder’s assailants, suspend a police officer for not meeting his duties in the investigation, and take an anti-discriminatory stand on behalf of the Indians (Churchill & Vander Wall, 2002, p.122).

Though this was a big step for AIM, it was still only a superficial acknowledgment of the racial problems that the Indians were facing. Still, it marked a significant moment where a Native American Rights organization had been successful at getting the results that the established tribal leaders could not.

The next major event staged by AIM was the “Trail of Broken Treaties,” which was a journey of caravans from reservations across the U.S. that began in San Francisco and ended in Washington D.C. during the fall of 1972. The event was designed to draw attention to a proposed list of federal actions that needed to be taken in order to redress past grievances to the Native American people (labeled the “Twenty Points”). Upon their arrival in Washington, the event soon unraveled and ended with the Indians forcefully taking over the national headquarters of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The occupation ended after several days when AIM agreed to

leave the building if no charges were pressed against the occupiers (Churchill & Vander Wall, 2002, p.123-126).

The final culminating event came when Oglala Sioux tribal president Richard Wilson, acting in disregard of the First Amendment, secured a court order to prohibit any AIM member from attending any public meeting. This resulted in several tragic events for the movement.

Following the brutal murder of Wesley Bad Heart Bull , a 20-year-old Oglala Indian, in which the white assailant was only charged with second degree manslaughter, members of AIM were denied access to the county meeting that was to consider upgrading the charges to murder. Denied access, AIM protestors were forced to stand outside the courthouse in a blizzard, while the prosecutor refused to upgrade the sentence, because it would be “unjust” to the assailant. When the crowd of AIM members refused to leave after the meeting was concluded, police attacked them with clubs and tear gas. This started a riot that ended with the Chamber of Commerce building being set on fire and many Native Americans beaten and arrested. Among the individuals beaten was Sarah Bad Heart Bull, the victim’s mother, who was later forced to serve five months in jail on charges of police assault (though her son’s murderer did not serve a single day) (Churchill & Vander Wall, 2002, p.136-137).

On February 27, 1973, 200 AIM members and 2,000 Indians from the surrounding area staged another sit-in at the site of the 1890 Wounded Knee massacre. Tensions between the local authorities and the protestors soon grew to an unprecedented height until finally 300 U.S. marshals and FBI agents surrounded the town, equipped with guns and armored personnel carriers. During this time, AIM made use of the media attention to declare the independence of the Sioux nation from the United States and made several appeals to the United Nations for recognition of their status as an independent nation. The siege ended on May 8, after both sides had begun firing on one another, leaving two Indian men dead and many more wounded (Churchill & Vander Wall, 2002, p. 141-170).

In the years that followed, the second tragedy at Wounded Knee would come to mark a turning point in Native American rights. It would be the last major militant action by American Indian protestors in the United States. The enthusiastic mobilization of staged take-overs and media events that had characterized Indian activism in the late sixties and early seventies came to a close. This phase was to be replaced by a period of reflection and a perceived need to further broaden the scope of native rights by members within the movement. This search to broaden the

movement's scope helped to foster the spread of the indigenist ideology that traditionalist Native American scholars began articulating in their rhetoric in order to continue the struggle over native sovereignty on a more global level.

Key Issues in International Politics: Opportunity and Transnational Movement

The end of 1973 was a particularly unstable time in the Native American rights movement. Following the siege at Wounded Knee, there was a relatively strong backlash against the Native Americans in the United States. In the aftermath of the Wounded Knee occupation, the FBI indicted 185 members of AIM. The main leaders were purposely tied up indefinitely.⁸ Between the years of 1973 and 1976, 342 AIM members were physically assaulted and sixty-nine were killed by tribal rangers under the direction of Richard Wilson (Churchill & Vander Wall, 2002, p.181-217).

It was a time when members of the movement needed to begin taking stock of the progress that had been made since the early sixties and to assess where the movement needed to go from there. For natives in Canada, it was a time when the success of defeating Trudeau's "White Paper" called for measures to insure that that the tribes became recognized by better defining themselves, their ideology, and their identity to the rest of the world in a way that would help prevent further threats of termination. The precedent from the Calder case opened new opportunities for arguing for sovereign rights in the court systems.

For natives in the United States, it was a time where members of the movement began realizing that they needed a new strategy for making their requests heard. Their hard efforts, like the "Trail of Broken Treaties," had not fully served their intended purpose. In addition, the Nixon administration, though earnest in its desire to work towards a better level of self-determination for the tribes, seemed unprepared to take the demands of the traditionalist movement seriously.

It was during this time that Manuel's *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality* and Deloria's *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence* were produced. Though written in different national political environments, both works were seminal in addressing a new transnational direction for Native American Rights. In order to understand the

⁸For example, activist Russell Means was charged with thirty-seven felonies and three misdemeanors (Churchill & Vander Wall, 2002, p.176).

significance of this period as the basis for the two books, it is important to understand why and how transnational movements come about.

As Sanchez and Stuckey (2000) have commented, the dilemma over the needed strategy that social movements must decide to take to further their interests centers on the question of whether the movement can best accomplish its goals for changing policy by working *within* the confines of the established government or by working *against* it (p.132-133).

Clearly Native Americans prior to 1974 had done both. Many unsung tribal leaders had spent their entire lives in the bureaucratic trenches trying to negotiate policies with government officials that would better suit their people. Traditionalist protest activists, like those in the American Indian Movement, had taken the more visible approach of publicly challenging the authority of the American government and often rejecting its validity.

The importance of the narratives of Manuel and Deloria, though, is that both authors extensively detailed the reasons and results of each of these approaches for their readers and concurrently instigated the use of another *third* strategy for attaining sovereignty that had not yet been fully explored by the movement: a transnational one. Concluding their reviews of the work done in their movements, both men explored aspects of international politics and its relation to the Native Americans' claim to sovereignty. The implication was that by completely bypassing the national government and going to the higher orders of world organizations, the movement could garner more outside legitimacy and influence national policy from the outside in.

Smith (1995) described the genesis of transnational movements, arguing that as power in the world is becoming more and more centralized, social movements are finding the need to become more internationally focused. Smith wrote, "The emergence of more centralized political structures significantly alters the nature of political processes...As the size of political jurisdictions increased, therefore, any challenger to this broader political unit had to grow comparably in its political resources if it was to effectively influence national politics" (p. 188).

For Leatherman, Pagnucco, and Smith (1994), global politics has three levels. The first, a people-to-people level, involves educational campaigns and information sharing to foster transnational solidarity. The second, a national level, involves the direct strategy of seeking to bring state policies in line with international standards. The last, a transnational level, involves indirectly attempting to change state policy by influencing the international standards that states

are expected to follow. It will later be shown that the narratives of Manuel and Deloria address all three of these levels.

In terms of opportunity, the potential for the transnational level of politics to become more politically influential has to do with the growing global market. Smith (1995) wrote,

As states' interests are increasingly dependent upon the behavior of other states, their freedom to make independent policy choices is constrained. The growth of interdependence in the modern international system means that a failure to cooperate with internationally accepted standards or norms brings greater costs to states (p. 190)

Smith (1995) identified several components that must be present in a political situation in order for a transnational movement to emerge. First, there must be what she called "political opportunity structures." These are the international organizations that hold the power to "both define and support international norms and standards." International organizations such as the United Nations would be an example of a political opportunity structure. One reason that organizations like these can be more favorable to the movement than national structures is that they are often more fluid and less firmly established and defended than the state structures are.

Second, there must be "mobilizing opportunities" in the social and cultural contexts for a transnational movement to emerge. Social mobilizing opportunities include the social structures that are present, the available technology, and the economic and political power of the society the movement is attempting to change. Prior to 1974, the popularity of both historical and fictional narrative depictions of native history and life (like Dee Brown's 1971 *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* and N. Scott Momaday's 1969 Pulitzer-Prize winning novel *House Made of Dawn*) had helped to make the general American public more receptive to native issues. Also, Deloria's prior work (like his 1969 *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*) had established writing books as a successful outlet for him and other native scholars to analyze the social conditions of modern Native America. The success of these works had even begun prompting major media coverage of native issues.⁹

By 1974, the Native American rights movement had also developed several social organizations (The National Indian Youth Council, the American Indian Movement, etc) devoted

⁹See "The Angry American Indians: Starting Down the Protest Trail," *Time*, 9 February 1970, 14-20.

to furthering its cause. The proliferation of media coverage of Indian protest events had allowed for the use of new emerging technology in international communication.

In addition to social contexts, movements are also constricted by the cultural contexts that they exist within. The creation of cultural mobilizing opportunities is necessary to further the interests of the movement. Smith (1995) wrote that, “[Movements] do this by introducing an alternative normative framework that may provide a transnational source of legitimacy ... in other words, transnational social movement organizations can identify international frames of interpretation in order to show the appropriateness of their claims in terms of global rather than national standards” (p. 195).

A movement like Native American rights, which had been framed and defined by white society for hundreds of years, had a great difficulty in furthering its own framework within the white-dominated society of 1970s America without undermining itself. Though the staged media events of occupying historic sites and engaging in militant activist behavior did much to gain media attention for the movement, it only re-enforced the negative stereotypes of the “hostile savage” that the movement was trying to rise above. This made it necessary for someone to re-tell the perspective of the activists. Hence, Deloria wrote *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties* to serve this purpose.

The international landscape, which was not as likely to be clouded by the mythical view of Indian savagery, provided a cultural context that was much more receptive and in line with what the activists wanted to argue. For example, (as will be discussed later) this adoption of international viewpoints is precisely what Deloria used in *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties* when he mentioned the creation of the state of Israel as a reparation for the genocide of the Jewish people in Europe and contended that the genocide of Native Americans at the hands of colonial settlers was of equal justification for the creation of a set of Native North American “states.”

The third factor affecting the potential for a transnational movement to emerge is the “strategic opportunities.” Smith (1995) identified four aspects of strategic opportunity that affect the strategies a movement must make. Those are (1) access to formal policy-making processes; (2) policy implementation capacities of international institutions; (3) movement alliance structures; and (4) movement conflict structures.

One aspect that has helped in allowing social movement organizations to gain access to the United Nations, an institution with formal policy-making capabilities, was the creation of Article 71 of the U.N. Charter in 1945. This article allowed for non-governmental organizations to apply for consultative status with the U.N.'s Economic and Social Council. This special status involves giving certain groups the right to submit written statements to the U.N. and to be heard by selected assemblies of members (Smith 1995). Subsequently, this article also provided the opportunity for Native American groups, as non-governmental entities, to gain consultative access to the United Nations and gave these groups a goal to aim for.

The problem in terms of how effective appealing to the United Nations is in influencing the national politics of Canada and the United States is that the U.N. lacks the resources for enforcing the standards that they set. Even if the indigenous groups are finally able to have the U.N. endorse their claim to sovereignty, it does not follow that the powerful North American governments will comply.

Still, as Smith (1995) explained, transnational movements have the added benefit of garnering outside support and creating alliance structures for a movement. This was obviously the intended goal for writers like Manuel, who made multiple outside references of similarities to the Maori tribe of New Zealand in his discussion of the indigenous issues affecting his own people. This aspect of transnational movements allows for multiple groups around the world to band together and express their similarities in a way that makes them a more convincing force to the rest of the world.

This inevitably leads to conflict structures (the last group affecting the abilities of a transnational movement to be effective). These are the groups or organizations that band together in opposition to the movement. Often this means the powerful governments that are involved in oppressing the movement (Smith, 1995, p. 207). In the case of Native American rights, Canada and the United States represent very powerful members of the United Nations with the strong potential for suppressing policies and actions that conflict with their interests.

Due to this obstacle, the international political scene had remained a relatively undeveloped but potential option for the Native American rights movement to take prior to 1974. Small attempts had been made by native groups to gain access to the United Nations in the past but had failed. Based on Smith's description of the factors affecting the ability of a transnational movement to be successful, it is possible to see why the year 1974 became an opportune

situation for Native Americans to begin focusing on the world scene. The United Nations had begun allowing access to non-governmental groups, other rhetorical works had gained some success in changing public sentiment toward Native Americans, and organizations had been established within the movement for effectively promoting its agenda. All that was left to initiate this new direction for the movement was for leaders to begin presenting rhetorically descriptive visions of future progress in Native rights that included the frame of using issues in international politics to their advantage. Consequently, Manuel's and Deloria's books were published during that time to respond to this need.

Chapter II: Narrative Theory, Six Persuasive Functions of Social Movement, and Methodology

The telling of stories has long been acknowledged as a universal phenomenon of human communication. It has also long been accepted that stories have the ability to both reflect and shape a society's culture. Walter Fisher is credited with developing a narrative-specific theory of communication that asserts the idea that all human communication represents a form of storytelling (Wood 2000). Fisher's theory of narrative is especially appropriate for studying the rhetoric of Native Americans. The cultures of indigenous peoples are often heavily reliant on oral tradition and the use of stories in defining the relationships that exist within the world. Traditionally, many of these cultures' main methods of engaging in knowledge formation and reasoning have been through narrative. According to Einhorn (2000), Native Americans in general have several basic tenets that are consistently present in much of their rhetoric. These principles are that the universe is one connected circle, everything changes, everything is interrelated, and everything is alive with its own spirit. Due to the holistic nature of Native American cultures, which tend to hold an inherent respect and value for differing worldviews, the rhetoric of Native Americans often avoids direct argument in the Western sense. Instead, Native American rhetoric often imbeds arguments and the guidance for solving problems in the context of stories and ceremony. Kamler (1983) has explained that unlike direct argument, which leaves the rhetor's reasoning open for debate, storytelling is less confrontational and more inclusive, because it tends to encourage its listeners to agree in order to participate in the story.

Narrative as Persuasion

In developing his theory of narrative reasoning, Fisher (1987) began by asserting that the traditional view of human communication is that humans are rational creatures that engage in reasoning through communication and decision-making that is based on argument. This view is what he terms the "rational-world" paradigm. According to Fisher, this paradigm is based on five assumptions. First, "humans are essentially rational beings," which means that people learn about the world by reasoning, exploring and discovering the relationships that things hold to one another. Second, "the paradigmatic mode of human decision making and communications is argument." In other words, people learn those relationships through inductive and deductive reasoning. Third, "argument is ruled by the dictates of situations," meaning that different

situations require different methods of argument (scientific, legislative, public, etc). Fourth, the rationality of someone is determined by “subject-matter knowledge, argumentative ability, and skill in employing the rules of advocacy in a given field.” From a rational-world paradigm, a person is seen as being credible if he/she exhibits an ability to reason in a way that reveals his expertise in the area of inquiry. Last, that “the world is a set of logical puzzles that can be solved through appropriate analysis and application of reason conceived as an argumentative construct” (p. 59). Everything that humans are able to know comes from argument. However, Fisher believed that this paradigm for looking at human communication ignored the importance of values in how people think. Therefore, Fisher started with the assumption that humans are creatures that engage in both valuing as well as reasoning. He wanted to create a new paradigm that combined the traditional views of rhetoric as being both argumentative (or persuasive) *and* aesthetic.

This led to the development of Fisher’s “narrative paradigm,” which asserts that narratives, or stories, have their own form of logic that they are judged by (in the same way that arguments have their logic). The logic of narratives consists of two basic principles: probability and fidelity. “Probability” refers to how well the story “hangs together” or coheres. Three aspects determine this: how well the story has structural/argumentative coherence and consistency, how well the material in the story coheres/compares to other stories, and by its characterological coherence or how well the story’s characters engage in behavior that “makes sense” and adheres to the values held by the audience (p. 47).

“Fidelity” refers to how truthful the story appears to be. Fisher argued that fidelity is determined when the listener applies what he called the “logic of good reasons.” He defined “good reasons” as being “elements that provide warrants for accepting or adhering to the advice fostered by any form of communication that can be considered rhetorical.” Therefore, good reasons in narratives will attempt to authorize, sanction, or justify beliefs, attitudes, or actions (p. 107).

According to Fisher, people analyze the reasons of a message to first determine its logic, or what he called the message’s “logic of reasons.” They do this by asking five questions. First, they ask whether the facts of the message are indeed “facts.” People judge if the messages are true with evidence to support their truth. Second, they consider whether there are distorted or

omitted facts. Based on their own knowledge, people decide whether or not the message is missing anything or is making unjustified leaps in logic. Third, they ask what patterns of reasoning are used. People decide the type of argument, either inductive or deductive, that is being used. Fourth, they determine which reasons are relevant to the issue at hand. People decide if there are unrelated parts of the message that detract from the claim being made. Last, they establish whether the message deals with the “real” issues in the case. In other words, people consider whether or not the message pertains to the underlying question(s) that the matter is centered on. If the message is able to resolve each of these aspects, then the message has a “logic of reasons” (p. 108).

Fisher then stated that the “logic of reasons” can be transformed into a “logic of *good* reasons” (which reveals the values of the message) by looking at five components. First, he discussed how the notion of what is accepted as being a “fact” in the message will reveal the “implicit and explicit values imbedded in the message.” For Fisher, all messages assume that certain things are true and those assumptions are based on what the rhetor privileges as being right or wrong, good or bad, etc. These assumptions can either be stated or implied by the message (p.109).

Second, Fisher stated that “relevance” deals with how appropriate the imbedded values are to the decision that the message “bears upon.” The values embedded in the message can only be considered appropriate if they actually privilege the decision that the rhetor is calling for (p.109).

Third was the component Fisher called “consequence,” which deals with what the effects would be for adhering to those values. People judge the validity of a message by considering what it means to ascribe to the values embedded in the message. For example, a white-supremacist’s message might have values embedded in it that would privilege a racist perspective that many people would find incompatible with their concept of themselves and, consequently, the types of relationships they wished to maintain with others in society (p.109).

Fourth was “consistency,” which deals with whether or not the values are “confirmed or validated in one’s personal experience.” People consider if the values in the message adhere to the standards that they already hold in life (p.109).

Last was the component called the “transcendent issue,” which deals with whether or not the values in the message comprise the “ideal basis for human conduct,” as determined by the critic. In other words, people ultimately judge the values embedded in messages based on whether or not they promote decisions that will maintain the quality and standards of behavior needed for continuing human existence (p.109).

According to Fisher, we engage in the “logic of reasons” when we are using traditional forms of logic. However, we “fill the space left open by technical logic” by engaging in the “logic of good reasons” to subjectively understand the value relationships in the message (p. 110).

Similar to the rational-world paradigm, Fisher included his own list of five underlying assumptions of the narrative paradigm. First, “humans are essentially storytellers.” Second, “the paradigmatic mode of human decision making and communication is “good reasons,” which vary in form among situations, genres, and media of communication.” Third, “the production and practice of good reasons are ruled by matters of history, biography, culture, and character.” Fourth, “rationality is determined by the nature of persons as narrative beings- their inherent awareness of *narrative probability*, what constitutes a coherent story, and their constant habit of testing *narrative fidelity*, whether or not the stories they experience ring true with the stories they know to be true in their lives.” Last, “the world as we know it is a set of stories that must be chosen among in order for us to live life in a process of continual re-creation” (p. 64-65). In other words, Fisher was arguing that humans make reasoning and valuing judgments about the things that they hear, based on how well those things provide convincing “good reasons” that adhere to what they already know to be true.

Fisher stated that the rational-world paradigm is one that permeates our consciousness, because “we have been educated to it.” However, the narrative paradigm is also an inherent part of how we think, because we have been *socialized* to use it. This is because the narrative is a basic feature of human communication that “crosses time and culture” (p. 65). Human beings organize how they think about their own lives and the lives of others through narration. In this way, we remember the experiences and events of our lives in the form of stories. When we communicate about our lives to others, we engage in what we call telling them our story. Also, we think about other people’s lives in terms of how their stories overlap and connect with our

own. Fisher borrowed from the ideas of Kenneth Burke, by saying that, “one’s life is a story that participates in the stories of those who have lived, who live now, and who will live in the future” (p. 63).

Fisher defined narration as “symbolic actions- words and/or deeds- that have sequence and meaning for those who live, create, or interpret them” (p. 58). Using this broad definition, he was able to make the claim that all human communication can be considered a form of narration and can therefore be judged according to the standards of the narrative paradigm.

The epistemology of narrative theory is that human beings create multiple realities for themselves. The narrative paradigm assumes that there are multiple stories in the world that are competing against each other. People accept a story as long as they perceive it to have good reasoning, based on fidelity and probability. Therefore, people can, at any time, reject one story and replace it with one that seems better suited for describing their experience of the world. In communicating with one another, Fisher argued that people engage in “recounting” (or, restating their own version of a series of events) and “accounting for” (or, providing their own interpretation for why those events occurred). History, biography, and autobiography are all forms of “recounting.” Theoretical explanation and argument are forms of “accounting for.” Using “recounting” and “accounting for,” humans engage in the process of creating their own reality. Fisher says, “Regardless of the form they are given, *recounting* and *accounting for* constitute stories we tell ourselves and each other to establish a meaningful life-world. The character of narrator(s), the conflicts, the resolutions, and the style will vary, but each mode of recounting and accounting for is but a way of relating a ‘truth’ about the human condition” (p. 62-63). In the context of the Native American rights movement, Manuel and Deloria engaged in recounting various aspects of the native experience in order to encourage others to adopt their version of the “story” of what the world in 1974 was like and, more importantly, what it should become.

The ontology of narrative theory is that free will is voluntary and that human beings are actors. This aspect of the theory makes it especially useful for studying the public discourse used in social movements directed at the general public. This is because of narrative theory’s assumption that everyone innately has the ability to make judgments on the rationality of a story. The rational world paradigm assumes that rationality only belongs to those who are most

knowledgeable about an issue, are aware of the forms and functions of argumentation, and are capable of deliberately weighing the strength of all arguments. In contrast, narrative theory posits the idea that everyone has the capability to be rational. Through basic common sense, which is a characteristic that everyone possesses, everyone has the ability to make judgments about a story's fidelity and probability. In this way, people can easily resist and reject the stories that do not "ring true" with them. Therefore, people do not simply react to narratives. Instead, they actively choose which ones they wish to accept as true.

The axiology of narrative theory is both value conscious and value laden. Fisher specifically stated his belief that the rationality of a story is not just based on reasoning but also on how well that story represents our own values. Therefore, when criticizing a narrative based on this theory, a rhetorical critic will closely examine his or her own values (or the values of the culture in which the message was given) to determine how well the story represents those values. In this way, the theory can be considered emancipatory, because it provides the criteria (fidelity and probability) people use to determine whether or not a story presented to them by those who are in power is truly representative of the values they hold and the world that they live in. However, the theory only goes so far as to say that people have the *capability* to make judgments about the stories that they hear. An audience can still accept a story that is completely false and unrepresentative of reality, if it is *perceived* to have high fidelity and probability. As Fisher says, "the narrative paradigm does not deny that people can be wrong." Instead, they have the power to judge the narratives they are told, because people have the "natural tendency to prefer what they perceive as the true and the just" (p. 67).

Recent applications of narrative theory have furthered Fisher's paradigm to develop more specialized methods for examining narratives. Foss (1996), discussing different methods of rhetorical criticism, listed several components of narrative that are essential parts in forming and structuring the worldview espoused by the narrative. Those components included setting, characters, the narrator, events, temporal relationships, causal relationships, audience, and theme.¹⁰

Other recent applications of narrative theory include looking at how narratives are used to motivate members of a culture. For example, Kashima (1997) also argued that narratives serve

¹⁰The relationship of the components identified by Foss (1996) to the formation of worldview in narrative will be discussed in greater detail in the *Method of Analysis* section beginning on page 36.

to construct a meaningful world of human existence. He claimed that the telling of a story from one person to another is part of the process in which conventional meanings are conveyed and new meanings are created. He contended that narratives are designed to motivate people to behave a certain way by presenting them with either positively or negatively sanctioned goals and/or goal-directed activities. In defining the subject's (or main character's) goal, as well as the ways in which the subject attains (or fails to attain) that goal, a story presents its reader/listener with a set of information about how he/she can also achieve (or not achieve) a similar goal. Therefore, a story has the potential to influence the future behavior of its listeners, if they internalize the goals and behaviors sanctioned by the story.

Schwartz (1997) claimed that narratives also motivate people by embodying certain cultural values. Schwartz described values as being the beliefs people hold of what is good or bad, what should or should not be done, or what they hold to be desirable or undesirable. Cultural values are those ideas of what is good, right, and desirable that are shared by members of the culture.

Values serve several roles in a culture. One role that they serve is to refer to desirable goals and the modes of conduct that promote these goals. Consequently, another aspect of values is that they guide the selection or evaluation of behavior, people, and events, by providing a standard with which to judge things. In providing a culture with a shared idea of what is good or bad, values influence the behavior of the members of that culture by making alternative behaviors appear more or less attractive. In this way, values can account for both the initiation and direction of some individual's decision-making and action. Therefore, the values imbedded in narratives can also serve to influence the future behaviors and modes of thought of the listeners. Due to the fact that people determine the rationality of a story based on how it adheres to their values, then a story may have the capability of influencing how the listener judges its rationality by advocating the very values that it will be judged by (Schwartz 1997). Therefore, narratives are influenced by, but also influence, the social institutions in which they are created.

As already discussed, transnational movements have three basic levels that they work within: the people-to-people level, the national level, and the transnational level (Leatherman et al., 1994). These three levels appear to be reflected in the narratives of social movements as well. Yates and Hunter (2002) explained that movements have three general types of narratives

that they use for mobilizing resources and recruiting potential members. One is the “participant narrative” where members of a movement share stories with others about their participation within the movement in an attempt to inspire others to similar action. The second is the “movement narrative” where members of the movement tell stories to others about the collectivity of the movement in a way that attempts to bridge the gaps of distance between different people’s values. Third are the “world-historical” narratives, where members of the movement provide stories of “far reaching significance that situate movements not simply in local contexts, but in a global context as well” (p. 128).

Stone-Mediatore (2003) discussed the uses of narratives by marginalized groups in furthering their causes within global politics. She explained that narration is an inherent part of colonization. Colonizing societies, in order to justify and maintain their control over a marginalized group, consistently use dominant narratives (like the myth of the hostile savage) to rationalize social practices and perpetuate their dominant conceptual paradigms. Narratives accomplish this in several ways.

First, narratives tend to single out certain “actors” in a way that gives a limited interpretation of people’s identity. The actors’ identities in stories generally tend to be oversimplified in binary oppositions (like good versus bad, men versus women, or one race against another). These oversimplifications devalue and ignore underlying roots of these oppositions and devalue the complexities that are inherent in human identities and social groups (Stone-Mediatore, 2003, p.135-138).

Second, narratives identify specific “actions” taken by the specific actors in the story. These actions are usually presented as being attributed to one individual who engages in the action for one specific reason. Once again, this oversimplifies the fact that public actions often involve many people contributing in many methods. Moreover, the reasons for why people choose to take certain actions often involves multiple reasons that interact in complex ways (Stone-Mediatore, 2003, p.138-140).

Third, narratives define historical “events” in ways that often ignore the historical contributions of marginalized groups. Events in history that tend to become a part of the general consciousness are specific sets of actions, taken by recognizable actors, within a generally short period of time, and that have a recognizable outcome. The long-standing struggles of marginal

groups through time are often absent from the narratives of the general public (Stone-Mediatore, 2003, p.140-142).

However, Stone-Mediatore recognized several ways that marginalized groups could reclaim the use of narratives for themselves. First, she cited examples of individuals (like Third World writers Gloria Anzaldúa and Domitila Barrios de Chungara) who had “re-narrated identity” by writing about specific experiences without affirming the dominant devaluing of their groups. She wrote,

Instead of simply asserting the value of a pre-given identity, they each use their writing to explore the forces that condition their experiences and to re-narrate their identities in ways that help them to confront those forces more effectively. In the process, they also recast ‘identity’ as a historically rooted yet also strategic category (p. 144).

Second, marginalized groups can use narration to “re-narrate agency.” Stone-Mediatore explained that narration has the ability to empower storytellers by allowing them to, “claim epistemic authority as well as to counter the objectified, dehumanized representations of them circulated by others.” Also, narration has the ability to reveal that struggle itself and the preconditions that went into creating the struggle of the marginalized groups. This further helps to empower the movement by showing the collective action taken by members as a unified group (p. 150).

Third, strategic narrations by marginalized groups can also engage in “re-narrating action.” In doing this, their narratives continue to empower and affirm the resistant activities of marginalized groups by showing their importance in an understandable way. In other words, the narratives can show the ability of these groups to accomplish things and this counters the dominant assumption that such groups are powerless. Also, the new narrative can provide the underlying reasons for why the action was taken (Stone-Mediatore, 2003, p. 152-155).

Last, narratives can “re-narrate events.” In this way, the narratives of marginalized groups can relate the events of the public world to the private and daily life that people exist within and that necessarily underlies those events. Due to the fact that narrative recounts and accounts for certain events (as Fisher explained), it is possible for marginalized groups to recount

and account for events in their own counter-narrative that describes the event in a way that joins it with the lives of the individuals involved in it. This, of course, does not replace political analysis with personal stories but relates the two to one another (Stone-Mediatore, 2003, p.155-158).

The end result, as Stone-Mediatore (2003) explained, is that

When storytellers use writing creatively to grapple with obscure or contradictory experiences and when they situate these experiences historically, they bring into public view the social pressures and social alternatives that have shaped many people's daily lives but that have been systematically omitted from ruling narratives. Moreover, when marginal experience narratives bring into our language and historical memory the muted tensions and ambiguities of daily experience, they initiate new ways of constructing the categories by which we interpret historical life...Narration of historical experience is, in fact, crucial to a meaningful rethinking of these categories, for only close attention to the nuances and contradictions of historical life can recast such categories in a way that resonates in our daily lives, moves us to engage in political projects, and enables us to do so with attention to the complex contours of our world...Finally, when writers use narration strategically to publicize obscured experiences, they enrich not only language practices but experience itself, for they provide a new lens through which we can organize our everyday experience and historical world...Beyond this, however, narratives that probe ways to articulate and situate unspoken tensions in everyday life can transform experience, helping those of us who have been reduced to 'victim' or 'cheap labor' to claim agency and helping all of us to identify with cross-border, cross-culture democratic struggle (p. 158-159).

The use of narratives serves multiple functions in society that make it useful for looking at the rhetoric of social movement. It provides a description of the world from the rhetor's perspective and encourages the audience to accept that perspective. It provides protagonists and antagonists that the audience is expected to favor and identify with or to consider illegitimate. It can sanction certain goals and behaviors while discounting others. Also, it advocates certain values that its audience should hold. Most importantly, though, narratives used by marginalized

groups can combat and attempt to change the dominant conceptual framework that symbolically helps hold them in their oppressed position.

Six Persuasive Functions of a Social Movement

Though the narratives used by Manuel and Deloria in their two books are the focus of this paper and the analysis provided is not what would be considered a movement study, the intent of this analysis is to judge aspects of the rhetorical effectiveness of the works in accomplishing their intended goals. Consequently, the fact that the two works were written within the context of a social movement cannot be ignored. In an effort to create an analytical approach that would address both the narratives and their basic persuasive goals within the movement, the methodology of this analysis was designed to combine narrative theory with a perspective of social movement. The following section will briefly outline the perspective of social movement that was chosen for this purpose.

Stewart, Smith, and Denton (2001) outlined six persuasive functions that social movements perform to enable them “to come into existence, to satisfy requirements, to meet oppositions, and, perhaps, to succeed in bringing about or resisting change.” Those six functions are (1) transforming perceptions of reality, (2) altering self-perceptions of protestors, (3) legitimizing the social movement, (4) prescribing courses of action, (5) mobilizing for action, and (6) sustaining the social movement (p. 51-79).

As Gamson (1992) has pointed out, rhetoric in social movement is essentially intended to propose a definition and construction of reality. Stewart et al. (2001) made the assertion that, “Every social movement must make a significant number of people aware that the generally accepted view of reality fostered by political, social, religious, educational, legal, literary, and mass media institutions is false and that something must be done about it” (p. 52). Stewart et al. continued by explaining that even if people are aware of a situation existing in reality, they may not be aware that it is a problem. It is the rhetor’s challenge to change people’s perspectives of reality, in the past, present, and future, in order to make the exigence (or unjust situation) apparent to the audience.

Also, rhetoric within a social movement must alter the self-perceptions of those who are involved in the movement. Stewart et al. remarked that, “protestors must have strong, healthy egos when they take on powerful institutions and entrenched cultural norms and values. They

must see themselves as substantive human beings with the power to change the world” (p.59). When the movement is self-directed (or, led by members of the disenfranchised group), the ego function is generally used to identify the members of the movement as “innocent, blameless victims of oppression,” addresses issues of “self esteem and self worth,” and attempts to provide members of the movement with “new self identities and self definitions” (p. 59-60).

Stewart et al. also explained that one of the principal goals of a movement is to create a sense of legitimacy¹¹ in the eyes of the establishment, the public, and its own members. Stewart et al. also pointed out that there are multiple ways that *establishments* retain legitimacy with the general public. “The power to reward” is the legitimizing characteristic of establishments that hold the power to reward individuals who obey them and to punish those who do not. “The power of control” is the characteristic of establishments that have the ability to manage and direct the transfer of information to members in the general public. “The power of identification” is the characteristic that makes people perceive establishments to be the “keepers” of sacred symbols and values of the society. “The power of terministic control” is the characteristic that “allows institutions to control language” and the meanings or symbolic representations of things through language. “The power of moral suasion” is conferred to an institution when people “come to see obedience or deference to legitimate authority as a moral obligation. Thus, institutions persuade people that they have a duty to honor institutional decisions even when those decisions have unpleasant consequences” (p. 63).

One way that a movement can create its own legitimacy is by showing how the actions of the movement are representative of values and norms that are culturally held by the society of the establishment (these strategies are called *coactive* or *common ground* strategies). Stewart et al. explained that one of these strategies is for the movement to “alter perceptions of social reality and show the social movement is more legitimate than institutions because it alone is telling it like it really is” (p. 64-65). Using this strategy, the movement is able to imply that it deserves the powers that accompany and maintain legitimacy listed above. When a rhetorical act in a social movement challenges societal values or the right of the establishment to expect obedience from the general public, the rhetorical strategy is a *confrontational* one.

Another function of rhetoric is for it to “prescribe courses of action.” In other words, a rhetor fulfilling this function attempts to “sell” the movement’s ideology by providing the

¹¹Defined by Simons (1976) as “the right to exercise authoritative influence in a given area” (p.234).

movement's opinion on what must be done about the exigence, who should do it, and how it must be done.

For a movement to be effective, it must also fill the function of "mobilizing for action." As Smith and Windes (1976) stated, "The rhetorical situation of a movement requires discourse to organize support for united action to reach a shared goal of social change" (p. 73). Under this function, rhetoric may attempt to "organize and unite the discontented" people the movement is fighting for, it may "pressure the opposition" in a way that engages the opposition in "symbolic combat," or it may attempt to "gain sympathy and support of legitimizers" (or individuals outside of the movement that hold a high level of credibility with the general public).

The last function that an act of rhetoric in a social movement may attempt to accomplish is to "sustain the movement." In order to keep the members of the movement dedicated to their cause, leaders often need to "justify setbacks and delays" by explaining why the movement has been unable to accomplish all that it set out to do. It may also need to "maintain viability of the movement" by assuring the members that the movement is increasingly growing stronger. Finally, it may need to "maintain visibility of the movement" by keeping it in the eye of the general public and media in order to prevent it from becoming obscure. Any rhetorical act in a social movement must engage in one (or multiple) of these functions in order to be rhetorically effective in serving the movement that generated it.

Method of Analysis

The primary objective for analyzing the narratives in *The Fourth World* and *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties* was to determine how the stories of Manuel and Deloria were capable of addressing these functions that must be met in order for a social movement to remain successful. Namely, the narratives were analyzed to explore the described perceptions of reality, the attempts to alter the self-perceptions of members of the movement, the attempts to legitimize the movement, the prescribed courses of action created by the sanctioning of character actions, the goals reinforced by the story that attempted to motivate further action in the audience, and the use of the story in sustaining the momentum of the movement (all through the practical reasoning that Fisher and his contemporaries described as being characteristic of narratives).

The definition of narrative used as the basis for the methodology applied to Manuel and Deloria's books was any presentation or ordering of a sequence of events or states of being that

created a particular view of the world “through the description of a situation involving characters, actions, and setting.” This definition was taken from Foss (1996, p.400), who designed a general method of rhetorical criticism for studying narratives that was based on Fisher’s original theory.

Drawing from the suggested list of analytical elements compiled by Foss, a basic narrative approach was created in order to relate the theories and ideas of Fisher, Kashima, Schwartz, and Stone-Mediatore to the narratives discovered from applying the definition to Manuel’s and Deloria’s work. Designed to reveal information about the symbolic nature of each story, this approach looked at six of Foss’s narrative components: the events, characters, settings, temporal relationships, causal relationships, and main points.

Once it was determined which portions of the two books would be considered narratives by meeting this definition, an overview of the major events of each narrative was constructed. The overview was then examined to see if the events were characterized by a particular quality and if they expressed an *action* taken by a character or a *condition* of the character/society. For example, stories that only described a set of actions taken by an individual and the effects that resulted from those actions were considered as expressing *action*. However, stories that contained events where the actions taken by the characters described a characteristic of that character (in other words, the reason for describing the action was more to tell something about the personality or nature of the person/organization engaging in the action) were considered as expressing a *condition*. This is similar to what Prince (1982) called *active* and *stative* events (p. 62-63).

Second, the characters in the narratives were explored. Characters were looked at to see who/what were the main characters, who/what was a supporting or secondary character, and whether the characters engaged in the action were individuals or collective groups acting as one. They were then examined to see what traits they possessed and if they were flat (had only one or a few dominating traits) or round (possessing a variety of traits) (Foss, 1996, p. 402). If they had multiple traits, it was determined if any of their traits seemed conflicting and if the characters changed any through the course of the story. Most important, the goals of the characters (and whether or not the characters reached their goal) were identified. If the character reached his/her/its goal, then that character’s behavior was assumed to have been sanctioned by the rhetor

(and vice versa). If there was a main character in the story, it was noted if the other characters acted as supporters or opponents in the main character's efforts to reach his/her goal.

Third, the setting of each narrative was investigated. Here the narratives were studied to see if their setting was prominent or negligible. If setting was prominent in the story, how it contributed to the plot and/or mood of the story was then determined.

Fourth, the analysis inspected the temporal relationships of each narrative, or how the events in the story fit together in time. Specifically, the temporal relationships were checked to see if the events were told in natural order, what tense the story was told in, and if there was a special relationship between when the story took (or might take) place and when it was told. The order of the story (either natural or as a series of flashbacks/projections of the future) and the tense the story was told in was considered to indicate how involved or removed the narrator, and consequently the audience, was from the story. Reordering the story was considered a way that the narrator controlled how the story was presented to the audience. Also, the relationship between when the story was told and when the story took (or *will* take) place was considered significant because it clued the audience into whether the story should be considered representative of a situation or state of being in the past, present, or future.

Fifth, it was determined if any cause and effect relationships were established (or implied) by the narrative. This then identified what received the most emphasis in the story, the cause or the effect. Also, the relationships were looked at to see what kinds of causes (i.e. an intentional and controlled human action or an uncontrollable accident) were dominant in the narratives.

Last, an interpretation of the main point (i.e. the general idea, moral, or goal) of the narrative was determined. Due to the nature of these two books, as rhetorical artifacts meant to strategically persuade an audience on behalf of a particular perspective within a social movement, it was assumed that the main point of each of the stories would be to serve the purposes of the movement in terms of the six persuasive functions of social movement. Therefore, the analysis looked at the main theme of each story in terms of how it met, promoted, or fostered any of those six functions. From there, the theme was looked at to explore whether or not it was expressed through the events described or through the commentary Manuel or Deloria provided.

For the following analysis portion of this thesis, based on what was found through the narrative approach described, a summary of each of the major narratives in Manuel's and Deloria's books will be composed to describe their symbolic aspects of the narrative components placing special emphasis on the themes and six persuasive functions of social movement exhibited in the main points of the stories. Based on the summaries, the ultimate goal of this analysis is to reveal the aspects of Manuel and Deloria as narrators that allowed their works to become seminal in changing the direction of the Native American rights movement and to help create the opportunity for the movement to become transnational. The findings of this analysis are meant to add to the knowledge of how narratives can be effectively used by marginalized groups in transnational struggles of interest by providing the work of Manuel and Deloria as a case study. The conclusions will demonstrate how Manuel and Deloria were able to fit Fisher's original conception of a good narrative by meeting the criteria of narrative probability and fidelity, how they developed the components identified by Foss to structure their worldview, how they addressed and met the six persuasive functions of a social movement while fostering political action on Leatherman et al.'s three levels of global politics (people-to-people, national, and transnational).

Chapter III: Narrative Analysis of *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*

Background on Author and Artifact

George Manuel's belief in the reality of a "Fourth World"¹² as a collection of the indigenous nations that still existed in the modern world was the product of his many years in working for the sovereignty of his people. Responding to Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau's "White Paper," Manuel ran for and won the Presidency of Canada's National Indian Brotherhood. After participating in the campaign that defeated the policies planned by the White Paper, Manuel was appointed to a delegation sent by the Canadian Government to Tanzania, where he met President Nyerere (Ryser, 2003).

Manuel assumed that Nyerere, who had helped lead the nation of Tanzania to its own independence in 1964, would be willing to aid him in his own political struggles for the sovereignty of the native people of Canada. However, Manuel was surprised to find that Nyerere, a man who was both a tribal leader and the President of a Third World state, was not willing to assist the natives of Canada (Ryser, 2003).

Following his trip to Tanzania, in another delegation expedition, Manuel received a very different response from the native Maori people of New Zealand. The experiences of the Maori were so analogous to his own that it was logical that both the Maori and the Indians of Canada could support each other in their common struggles (Ryser, 2003).

Rising from his experiences with the Canadian government and his discussions with Nyerere, Manuel concluded that the governments of the First World and the Third World would not help his people in their quest for sovereignty rights. For that reason, he sought to conceptualize an assembly of cultures that did not fall in the First, Second, and Third Worlds, in order to give them a unified identity that encompassed their commonalities and provided a unified voice in the international political scene.

Manuel (in collaboration with Michael Posluns) wrote *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality* following those trips. An autobiographical account of his life, related in a series of

¹²Mao Zedong was the first to remark that after World War II, the world divided itself into two main factions of power made up of nations that shared common interests. The Euro-American bloc of industrialized capitalist nations (that later included Japan) comprised what was to be called the First World. The communist-socialist states of the former USSR, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, etc. were what became known as the Second World. Those nations that were not completely sided with either of the two main factions of power were termed the "Third World" (which continues to predominantly be comprised of areas that were recently de-colonized, are in the process of industrializing, and are still economically dependent on the First and Second Worlds). The overlooked group of nations in human existence that generally do not fit any of these three divisions are the indigenous nations (Churchill, 2003, New Face).

narratives about various experiences he had lived through (either as a Native American or as a member of the movement for native rights), it was indirectly meant to outline the problems of Canada's Indian policy and his concept of the existence of a "Fourth World" made up of the original indigenous nations (Ryser, 2003).

As Marcus and Fischer (1986) showed, ethnographic study and personal descriptions of experiences in the postmodern world are capable of providing a cultural criticism that reveals the overall feeling, for some members in society, of the existence of a crisis. *The Fourth World*, as an ethnographic report of Manuel's life experiences rooted in Native American history, attempted to do just that. He provided descriptions of the past and related them to the overall narrative of his life and the experiences of his affiliated tribes in order to provide examples that are the foundation of his claims on the socio-political results of the colonization of native peoples. This is what Silverstein and Urban (1996) called "entextualization" or the use of texts to "create a seemingly shareable, transmittable culture" (p. 2).

The ultimate goal of this analysis is to reveal the characteristics of Manuel as a narrator in the context of the Native American rights movement, which allowed for his work to become seminal in changing the direction of the movement and to foster the motivation for the members in the movement to begin focusing on transnational efforts. For the sake of simplicity and the desire to remain true to the organization of the original work, the sections of this analysis are organized in accordance with the titles of the chapters in Manuel's book.

"Does Indians have feelings?"

Manuel's first objective in his text was to provide the setting (as the characteristic of narratives that expresses their relationship with time and place) for the narrative of the events of his life. The setting of his story was important for him to describe, because it included the social and political environment that he ultimately desired to change. In a debate, it is necessary to describe and explain the main issue at hand before one can begin to deconstruct it. In many ways, the same can be said for narrative argument.

As was already stated, the first major function of rhetoric in social movements is to change perceptions of reality. For Native Americans, one of the greatest hurdles in general society's ability to understand the issues affecting them has centered on the need for changing society's perceptions of the past. Due to centuries of biased and uninformed literary, historical,

and media representations of natives, the majority of white society in North America in the 1970s continued to have stereotypical and false perceptions of Native Americans. To change this, the “setting” of Manuel’s narrative had to be constructed in such a way as to reveal the falsehoods of the stereotypes.

Attempting to meet this function and addressing the political setting of his life, Manuel began by approaching the issue of the constructed myth that had come to be associated with Native Americans. Through a discussion of his experiences in life as a native and how those experiences differed from the general conception held by most white North Americans, Manuel was attempting to reveal the unfounded nature of the myth of Native Americans by imparting the story of his own life. In other words, he endeavored to dispel one story by presenting the example of an alternative. He wrote,

The gap between the myth of the Indian world as it has been generally represented to European North Americans and the reality I have known has not really closed very much in my lifetime...a cornerstone of the mythical structure that has stood in the way of the Indian reality has been a belief that the Indian way of life meant something barbaric and savage, frozen in time and incapable of meeting the test of changing social conditions brought about by new technology. This myth was created by confusing the particular forms in use at one time with the values and beliefs they helped to realize (p. 2).

As a traditionalist member in the Native American rights movement (or, an individual who remained loyal to his native culture instead of the government and culture of Canada), Manuel wanted to emphasize that the traditional values of Native Americans were as important in the modern era as they had been in the past. Moreover, he was concerned with showing why those values were not the same thing as the actions that they had translated into at any period of the past. He asserted (and used his own story to reinforce this assertion) that holding the traditional Indian values did not require a person to live exactly like Indians had in “1850” or any other earlier period. In other words, the “setting” of his narrative in modern times was not the same as that of his narratives of the past. His ability to establish this as a characteristic of setting also served the persuasive function of enhancing the self-perceptions of the members of the

movement. It contributed to the mood of the narrative by affirming that although the traditional values of Native Americans had not changed, they remained able to adapt to changing environments.

As Manuel extensively described in his book, the Europeans and the settler-state governments that formed following their arrival in North America presupposed that the situations were the same and Indians who held to traditional values in the present were placing themselves in the primitive past. The assumption of the United States and Canadian governments had always been that the natives could not advance into the modern world without being indoctrinated into the European value system and forgetting the past. Manuel showed early on in *The Fourth World* that his intention was to attack this false assumption of reality. For him, native people could survive if left to choose their own lifestyles. By telling the story of his own life, Manuel intended to present an argument by example that firmly rejected this ethnocentric mythic assumption. He wrote,

At this point in our struggle for survival, the Indian peoples of North America are entitled to declare a victory. We have survived. If others have also prospered on our land, let it stand as a sign between us that the Mother Earth can be good to all her children without confusing one with another. It is a myth of European warfare that one man's victory requires another's defeat (p. 4).

In his first story, Manuel gave a personal account of a co-worker that he had once known while working in a lumber mill in Canada. The man had sat down beside him on a coffee break and blatantly asked him if native people were capable of having emotions. After being assured by Manuel that Indians certainly *did* have feelings, the man disclosed that he had always thought that Indians were like “dogs,” with no feelings at all for others (p. 3).

A movement must not only transform perceptions of the past but also of the present in order to place its audience in a particular frame of reference where they will be able to “see” the claims being made by the movement (Stewart et al., 2001). The point of the story was to provide insight into a condition that was characteristic of society at that time. In this case, the man's question showed the underlying proliferation of the myth of the “savage” natives and how it had

clouded the views that some white people held of the Native Americans well into the modern era. The co-worker in the story was so socialized to believe in the myth that he was incapable of thinking about Indians in humanistic terms and thought of them as being more like animals. The situation was meant to shock the reader into wondering how anyone could still hold such views of others.

However, the character in the story did exhibit one point of complexity, which was his acknowledgement that he considered Manuel a “friend” and, therefore, he felt safe in asking the question. This symbolized an element of possibility in the story that the open acknowledgment of the myth by a white person to a native person in the form of a question was a chance for open dialogue that could bring about change.

Fundamentally, the story served the purpose of asserting the simple fact that Native Americans as human beings possess the same human emotions and personal sense of self that is characteristic of all people. The higher message that the story proposed was how illogical and ridiculous it was for white society to view Native Americans as objects of speculation or wonder, instead of the human beings they really were. This is a theme that was to return later on in Manuel’s book when he discussed the work of anthropologists studying Native America. Rhetorically, the narrative was effective at creating the mood for the rest of Manuel’s book, saying that although there was an underlying opposition between white society and Indian culture, there was still hope of it being solved if white Canadians were willing to begin thinking of the Native Americans in more humanistic terms.

Manuel followed this story with a second narrative in which he described an incident where his co-workers at the same lumber mill began laughing at a group of Indians who were going to church one Monday. The white men found it absurd that the Native Americans would go to church on a working day, despite the fact that it was one of only three days a month that the priest could come to the country church. Manuel was angered by this and confronted his co-workers by proclaiming that it was their fault that the Indians felt compelled to go to church, because their white ancestors had been the ones to coerce the Indians into adopting the Christian faith.

Manuel’s point with this story was to continue changing perceptions of present reality by revealing the prevailing hypocrisy of white society. Though devotion to the Christian faith is

traditionally a highly respected value in North America, the traditional protestant work ethic that sprang from Christian ideals places greater value on individuals who work hard during the week. In essence, the workers in the story were condemning the Indians for being *too* Christian by judging them on Christian ideals of hard work. In this way, the narrative exposed a conflicting set of traits in the white characters. The workers held inconsistent social values and lacked the ability to comprehend the clash of their own competing values. As a result, the narrative implied a causal relationship between white society's insistence on instilling their inconsistent values into the Native American community and the resulting confusion experienced by the Native Americans. Through this causal relationship, Manuel argued that white members of society are ethically responsible for the problematic outcomes of the social actions taken by their ancestors.

The setting of the situation, as a common and everyday ritual of people going to church, further revealed the underlying dilemma faced by Native Americans in everyday white society. They were taught to do one thing by the church and then expected to do another by everyone else. When they did what they thought was the moral and correct thing according to white society, they were only laughed at by that same white society. Manuel's presentation of the situation was able to make the men's laughter appear shallow in relation to the devotion shown by the Indians. Manuel's angered response was then justified by the inherent double standards portrayed by the white groups' behaviors.

This story also introduced another main theme of Manuel's book: white Canadians lacked the proper insight to understand the basic needs of the Native Americans. Rhetorically, Manuel would later use this theme to combat the power of government bureaucracy. According to Stewart et al. (2001), the main characteristic of narratives that allows for them to "argue" a certain point of view is their ability to provide "frameworks for interpreting reality" in order to help people "see the world" as the movement does. Also, every narrative "structures the past, projects a future, and prescribes a preferred course of conduct from a particular vantage point" (p. 249-250). Kamler (1983) argued that stories allow us to contextualize events that are ambiguous by allowing us to define the aspects of the event that are relevant. In turn, this allows us to protect our claims from counter-argument, because the audience feels compelled to agree in order to participate in the telling of the story. This is unlike a straight argument, which invites debate.

Concluding his first chapter, Manuel provided the third and predominant theme for his book by telling his readers a narrative of the “Two Row Wampum Belt.” This was a belt that was woven by the Iroquois tribe after they had signed the first recorded treaty between the English and the Native Americans. The purpose of the belt (woven with two rows like the course of two boats “traveling on parallel paths but neither interfering with the other”) was to show a “mutual acknowledgement” between two cultures (p. 8).

Manuel uses the metaphor of the “Two Row Wampum Belt” as a rhetorical visualization for what the relationship between Native American and white American society ought to have been and ought to become. Manuel wrote, “It is only through mutual acknowledgement of the other’s reality that it is possible to travel on parallel courses and avoid collision” (p. 8). Manuel used the Wampum Belt metaphor to explain his own difficult role as an activist trying to work between the two systems of the native traditions and the bureaucracy of white Canada. He wrote, “There is another secondary but important interpretation of the Two Row Wampum. What is the fate of the man who stands with one foot on the box plate of each of the two vessels when those boats hit rough water?” (p. 8).

Manuel’s use of narrative structure to define his argument of the need for the Canadian government to respect the Indian nations as equals was meant to encourage his readers to think in terms of the native perspective. The metaphor served to encourage his audience to imagine themselves in his position and to see it as an unfavorable one. As the metaphor implied, two ships necessarily must travel at parallel paths and not interfere with one another in order to avoid a potential catastrophe. When one imposes itself on the other, the bigger of the two will prevail and the smaller will go under.

“Mutual Dependence”

Stewart et al. (2001) claimed that an innovative movement must transform perceptions of the past if it is to succeed in moving beyond the “status quo” that is often perpetuated by the belief that past experiences were just. One strategy that the rhetoric of a movement can take (as Stone-Mediatore also explained) is to re-analyze past social interactions and history (p. 52-53). Manuel’s second chapter, “Mutual Dependence,” began by outlining a re-narration of North American history by providing a description for the development of two societies: European and

Native American. Once again creating a setting for the present by depicting the past in narrative terms, the two differing societies became the “main characters” of the chapter. Manuel characterizes them as two separate forces of human life that developed out of diverse conditions.

Establishing a causal relationship in the development of the two societies through the idea that necessity instigates invention, Manuel put forth the position that these two societies developed in reaction to different conditions of need. For Manuel, Europeans had the need to overcome poverty, while Native Americans had the need to survive in a climate of wilderness. Therefore, Native Americans developed methods of living that helped to insure a sustained survival of human, animal, and plant life (such as techniques of natural agriculture and land preservation, highly developed social structures involving the common sharing of goods, and a vast body of knowledge on the medicinal properties of herbs and other natural substances).

Conjointly, Europeans living in a heavily populated area of the world with a limited amount of resources strove to develop methods for obtaining material goods from others. Manuel wrote, “Europe’s most important contributions that are still of value today seem either to be means of transport or instruments of war: ships, wagons, steel-ware, certain breeds of horses, guns. Most of the other things that were brought to North America by Europeans came from other parts of the world: paper, print, gunpowder, glass, mathematics, and Christianity” (p. 15).

As a result of the two types of needs that each society had developed under and the subsequent types of inventions that were created to meet those needs, Manuel stressed that, “what matters is that two different paths were taken and two different bodies of knowledge and life-ways developed” (p. 15). These are the two paths of Manuel’s metaphorical Wampum Belt.

For Manuel, when the two societies first met in North America, it was a relationship of “mutual dependence,” where the trading of goods and ideas was mutually beneficial to both cultures. The original European colonies on the East Coast of North America would not have survived the winters without the help of the Indian nations living there. In addition, Manuel emphasized that hostilities would not have been avoided for as long as they were if the Indians did not also benefit from the sharing of ideas (p. 16-18). At that time, the two paths on the Wampum Belt ran parallel to one another and were mutually beneficial.

As Manuel recounted, this situation lasted for approximately five generations of people, until the introduction of diseases like small pox and the unavoidable wars between the European

powers and the later Revolutionary War began to break down the power and size of the eastern Indian nations. Once the nations were no longer useful to the colonial people, the alliances were no longer respected. Manuel stated, “Concepts of honor, tradition, law, and order could not prevail against the more purely economic motives of an acquisitive society religiously committed to possessive individualism” (p. 18). By the time that Manifest Destiny became a widespread belief among the colonists who were moving westward, the custom of deliberately facilitating Indian extermination had been incorporated into the system of white relations with the Indians.¹³

According to Manuel’s narration, as time passed the colonial governments progressed to outright lying. In Canada, the first Prime Minister of Indian Affairs James Mackenzie signed many treaties with the Indians at the same time that he was advising Queen Victoria to make Canada a “dominion” of the throne. This political maneuver using negotiated and abstract language allowed for Mackenzie’s treaties to become unenforceable. Canada had no courts of law at that time with the power or desire to force the government to adhere to its Indian treaties. Instead, any later decisions made by Mackenzie, as a representative of the throne, stood as law. Mackenzie could simply choose to ignore the treaties that he previously had made (p. 31).

Stewart et al. (2001) articulated that one of the ways that establishments (in this case, the North American governments) retain legitimacy with people is through the “power of moral suasion” (p. 63). This is legitimacy that is conferred to an institution when its people feel they are bound by a sense of duty and a moral obligation to defer to its authority. Of course, this sense of loyalty to the institution of government was something that Manuel needed to attack early on in order to make his audience more receptive to the seemingly unpatriotic arguments he would later make. Therefore, in a confrontational strategy to undermine the power of the establishment, Manuel’s main point in re-narrating colonial history was to use this concept of institutional legitimacy being based in moral character to actually *question* the legitimacy of the United States and Canadian governments.

Within the narrative context, the main characters of the two societies had traits that made them incompatible for mixing together. They had chosen two different paths in life and pursued

¹³Quoting Dee Brown’s (1970) *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*, Manuel provided evidence that U.S. General Phillip H. Sheridan advised the army to help hunters kill as many buffalo as possible in an effort to starve out the plains Indians and deplete their numbers to such an extent that their land could be taken by cowboys and new settlers.

different goals in maintaining their existence. However, the story showed that they were capable of existing beside one another as long as they were mutually respectful to each other. After the European society changed its approach to the New World and lost its original respect for the Native Americans, the ideal balance of the two cultures was lost and destruction followed. In this way, Manuel's story sanctioned the original relationship of mutual respect between the two cultures while condemning the loss of that respect.

Manuel's story went on to make reference to the intentionally genocidal practices of the United States Army in a way that juxtaposed their actions with the values of "law" and "honor" that they claimed to uphold. The implied conclusion was that, if they did not represent the values they ascribed to, they carried no claim to legitimacy as an institution. Additionally, due to that fact that James Mackenzie refused to keep his promises as the Prime Minister of Indian Affairs, Manuel was able to show how the Canadian government of the past had also become illegitimate by not honoring its own contracts. Thus, in the context of the story, the government became the antagonist or "villain."

The marking of this characteristic of the past was an important claim for Manuel to make in terms of institutional legitimacy. Manuel displayed to his readers that the governments in the United States and Canada had, at a given point in time, begun and continued to act in ways that were contrary to the values and promises they espoused. Accordingly, Manuel was able to claim that both the American and Canadian governments and their promises could be meaningless. Thus, Manuel worked to legitimize the Native Americans and their present movement by delegitimizing the North American governments of the past.

This also set the stage for Manuel to address the issues that followed in Indian policy. Manuel concluded this chapter by making the statement,

There is no single Trail of Tears that can be drawn on Canadian maps as it must be drawn for the Cherokee Nation. We were not banished from our land. It is as though the land was moved from under us. The struggle that was to come was for the mind and soul of the Indian people. We had lost our land. Now they would try to convince us it was for our own good (p. 32).

Manuel was referring to the period of assimilation engaged in by both the Canadian state and the Christian church following the creation of the reservations. Manuel's narrative assumed the same characteristic of society that was described by Foucault (1975), by discussing how institutions often maintain their power by normalizing the methods of thinking and behaving that are engaged in by members of society.

Following the incarceration of natives on reservations, the Euro-American white society saw the need to normalize the behavior of the North American natives to fit their own social practices in order to control them. To show his readers what was to be lost by the governmental policies of assimilation and termination, Manuel continued his next section with narratives championing the traditional values of his people.

“Strong Medicine”

The social memory, or collected narratives of the past that are shared by members of a group, is an important aspect of maintaining a movement. Members must be reminded of where they came from in order to continually focus on where they are going (Benford, 2002). According to Bellah et al. (1985), “In order not to forget that past, a community is involved in retelling its story, its constitutive narrative, and in doing so, it offers examples of men and women who have embodied and exemplified the meaning of the community” (p. 153).

In the next chapter of his book, Manuel commenced in reminiscing of his grandfather, who was a Shuswap spiritual leader. For Manuel, his grandfather exemplified the ideal qualities of a Native American leader. He was someone who lived by the traditional values of the people and who attempted to travel in a path that was parallel but separate to the white society of Canada. Manuel explained that his grandfather was a teacher whose basis of teaching rested in the use of stories to illustrate practical, theoretical, or even political instruction (p. 36). Following his grandfather's example, Manuel continued his use of narrative communication to instruct his readers.

The next portion of his narrative continued with descriptions of the past by illustrating how the economy of his people had been better when he was younger (during the time his

grandfather was alive). Though the people had been put on reservations, they were still able to hunt and farm in methods that coincided with the traditional methods of living that they had developed before the formation of the reservations. At that time, they were still free to make use of the land in the ways that best suited their traditional ways and in-grained abilities for supporting themselves.

Manuel explained that the Canadian Indians often engaged in a cultural tradition of holding ceremonies and feasts of giving that were commonly termed “potlatch.” According to Manuel’s story, through the practice of potlatch, members of his tribe were never left in poverty. Together, they shared in an equal distribution of resources so that no one person in the tribe ever went hungry. Culturally, socially, and economically, this was the system that worked best for them, because it fit their values and beliefs. Manuel stated, “There is only economic organization when those raw materials are brought together on the loom of social values toward which people choose to work. The foundation of our society- not just for the Shuswap, but for Indian societies generally- is summed up in one word: *giving*” (p. 41).

Manuel specified that this system did not assume that there was no hierarchy of status or power among tribal cultures. He explained that the Native American concept of economic wealth was determined not by what an individual had saved, but in what the individual had been able to give away to others. Those who were considered wealthy among their tribesmen did not own more material wealth than other people but had given more to their fellows in the past (p. 44).

However, at the encouragement of Christian missionaries in Canada, the government outlawed the practice of potlatch ceremonies during the mid-twentieth century. Manuel commented, “When the potlatch was outlawed and made a criminal offense, it was this way of life that the Parliament of Canada declared intolerable to the Christian conscience” (p. 46).

In concluding this chapter, Manuel contextualized the outlawing of the potlatch by relating it to the story of his grandfather’s life. He wrote of his grandfather,

His lifetime on the plateau had spanned the years from the first European settlement until the final collapse of our traditional economy. He had seen the trading

years when the settlers needed our manufactures at least as much as we needed theirs. The generations of Indian people who had tried to adapt European technology to traditional values had been his own and his children's generations. He saw those values and institutions undermined by the missionaries and the agents. He saw his people ravaged by disease like the children of Job. He challenged his Creator's will for permitting such plagues, but he did not surrender the way that the Creator had taught him to live.

So long as there is a single thread that links us to the ways of our grandfathers, our lives are strong. However thin and delicate that thread may be, it will support the weight of a stronger cord that will tie us securely to the land" (p. 47).

The main point of the story, presented through both the traditions of the Native American community and Manuel's commentary on them, was that the church and the state were illegitimate in their outlawing the ceremony of potlatch. In connecting the story of his grandfather and the outlawing of a native ceremony in Canada, Manuel presented his characterization of the movement as a group of people who were striving to maintain and continue the ways of their ancestors despite outside influence. The main trait exhibited by both the Native American community and his grandfather was the value of altruism (a value often also associated with the institutions of the church and the government). Repeating his theme of the prevalence of hypocrisy that existed in white society, Manuel's narrative of the potlatch law was designed to convey a contradictory condition of white society. He meant to instill a sense of guilt in white society by showing how it had broken from its own values.

His framing of the events of the story in terms of his grandfather's defiance to them added a dual purpose of encouraging the Native American readers of the book to continue holding to the traditional ways of their ancestors in defiance to the white society's illegitimate interference. This creatively added rhetorical power and emphasis to the final point of the story that maintaining tradition was a crucial goal for survival.

"The Earth and My Grandmother"

In establishing the legitimacy of a movement, rhetors engage in either coactive strategies (where they ascribe to values of the general public and try to show how they meet those values

better than the establishment does) or they employ confrontational strategies (where they attack the values held by the general public and the establishment by showing that they are either illogical, immoral, or both). Manuel's strategy for establishing legitimacy was decidedly confrontational. Like the example in the last chapter showed, he attempted to prove that the values of the establishment (at least in the methods that white North Americans expressed them) were detrimental to Native American people.

In this chapter, Manuel began by telling a story about the earliest time he could remember when white society began to infringe on the lifestyle of his people. For him, this was a time when he and his grandparents were on their annual trip to pick berries in the mountains but were suddenly obstructed by a fence built by a white property owner. In his narrative, Manuel detailed the emotional distress that the sudden appearance of the fence had caused his grandparents, who had always thought that the land had been provided by the Creator for the use of their people. The idea that another human could take the land from them was a foreign concept to their values. Once again, Manuel used the story in an emotional appeal that encouraged his audience to assume the perspective of the Indians (who were suddenly obstructed from a tradition that they had lived with their entire lives). However, this was an example of a superficial form of outside infringement compared to the more detrimental loss of cultural norms that Manuel then illustrated in his next story.

The second story in this chapter was of the first man in Manuel's tribe who dared to break their social norms of giving (the potlatch) by not sharing the meat from a deer he had hunted and killed. Of the incident, Manuel remarked,

What that man had done was worse than thieving; it was as if he had beaten an old woman or molested an infant girl. Even that comparison is uncertain, for those offenses were as unknown to our village as a refusal to share. But the power of the elders and the chief were declining. He could not be banished... That same man was the first person to own a car on our reserve. He had been disgraced and ridiculed throughout the Shuswap. But he was a pioneer in introducing European progress (p. 51).

His two stories, taken as a coherent narrative argument, had the common main point of confronting and disavowing the European notion of progress with an assumed reality of the regression and decadence that it caused for Native American society. Together, they were meant to provide a context in which the reader might judge the Indian policies Manuel would later discuss. For Manuel, the Indian policy in Canada (both with manipulative intentions and with the best of intentions) was the driving force that caused many Indians to “develop” into a culture of poverty. Using his own tribe as an example, Manuel insisted that state-directed programs and methods for developing the tribes into modern practices (which had consistently ignored the wisdom and traditional practices of the natives), eventually led the tribal people to a lower standard of living than the one they had held prior to the implementation of those programs.¹⁴

The connecting link in both stories was the issue of the discontent that was felt by his people after having food, a resource needed to live, withheld from them by some intervening aspect of white society. In this way, he meant to link the poverty and starvation of his people with the breakdown of their economic system of sharing. As more people began to assimilate with white society and think in terms of personal property instead of sharing, many other people who adhered to the traditional ways were forced into having to do without.

He continued the chapter by telling a story of how he and his grandfather had been traveling on an open road one day when their wagon was stopped and checked by authorities to see if they were breaking any of the hunting laws. His grandfather had been infuriated by the intrusion and had remarked, “When the new sicknesses were killing us they gave us blankets of death to warm ourselves [i.e. blankets infected with small pox], but at least they let us eat. Now they only want us to eat what we buy in their stores or grow with their tools” (p.52).

For Manuel, the establishment of Euro-American governments in North America and the implementation of their values of “progress” was not just a matter of cultural assimilation and domination, but also an indoctrination of forced development in a way that was meant to benefit capitalism and foster a native dependency on the government. He wrote,

The agents were armed with three laws that made them, for the moment, the stronger party in the contest for power. The new enforcement of provincial game laws

¹⁴This was the same argument that other writers like Escobar (1995) and Scott (1998) would later develop for describing the dire existence of the Third World nations.

was used to destroy the base of our traditional economy. We would no longer be permitted to use the skills we had developed in gathering the fruit of nature. If you were seen with a freshly killed animal- or even sometimes just carrying a rifle in the forest- you were liable to imprisonment.

You were not much freer in farming than in hunting. The agent had the authority to regulate all sales of farm produce by Indian people.

But what really made the agent more powerful than the chiefs was that he was now empowered to dispense welfare to anyone who could not make a living while their neck was within this noose woven by foreign laws (p. 54).

As Manuel explained, the regulation of hunting and fishing rights made it so that the Native Americans had to buy more of their food from stores. Farming regulation and welfare laws put the Indian people under a dependency. This gave government institutions power to further manipulate the lifestyles of the native people.

Manuel accounted how the old method of living off the land was one that had been sufficient for the Native Americans for many generations. His people had developed many skilled means of finding the food and necessities they needed for survival. Moreover, they had done this with a well-developed understanding of their natural environment and how it could best be utilized to meet their needs. Early in the twentieth century, his people had been capable of taking care of themselves.

However, after the Second World War, the Canadian government began enforcing a series of laws that regulated how his people could grow their crops, when they were allowed to hunt and fish, and how they were able to sell and obtain goods. In turn, Manuel causally linked the laws with the growing impossibility for his people to continue sustaining themselves by traditional methods. Accordingly, the Native Americans became more and more dependent on the government and its self-supporting methods of controlling capital and resources for the materials Indians needed to survive. Institutions like the church were used to make this creation of a scarcity of food and goods appear legitimate. However, Manuel's narrative account of the development of the supposed "progressive" policies toward Native Americans attempted to reverse the perception of legitimacy by linking the programs that claimed to promote higher standards of living with the much more selfish motivation of promoting white self-interests.

Manuel's narrative in this first part of the chapter was extensive and effective at chronicling the fact that the intrusion of the Canadian government had greatly affected the nature of the indigenous people's economy. However, his assertion of a conspiratorial plan by the government to take food sources away from the natives is not fully developed enough by the narrative to make it apparent to the audience. His account omits addressing whether or not there were potential explanations or justifications for the policies that were provided by the government (whereby he could have criticized the government's reasoning of policies to strengthen his own argument). Instead, he assumed that the reader would just accept that the policies were intentional attacks on Indian culture simply by his saying that it was so. Perhaps this made his argument stronger among native groups who would readily understand the assumptions he made without needing justification. However, white audiences may have dismissed his account of the development of Indian policy as mere speculation.

Still, this portion of Manuel's narrative was coherent with his previous narratives because it was able to continue his theme of mutual dependence. He claimed that the forced development of Indians into using European methods of farming had been detrimental to both Indian and white North Americans, not because the European methods were bad but because the denial of Indian methods had prevented a potentially positive mixing of the best of the two.

Burke and Griffin (1969) postulated that, "all social movements are essentially moral strivings for salvation, perfection, the good" (p. 456). As a result, social movements must establish their legitimacy in a way that shows how their beliefs represent the "good." However, they must also explain why the establishment is the "bad." Another way in which narratives used within movements can undermine the legitimacy of the establishment is to identify a conspiracy. According to Stewart et al. (2001), the identification of a conspiracy relies on several components. The rhetor will attempt to show "a coherent pattern," "proof," "motivation," and "evilness" (p. 308-313). This is the strategy that Manuel took in the previous narrative of the gaming laws and which he continued in the next portion of his book by providing a further description of the creation of the myth of the hostile savage. He wrote,

The land is ours, by every natural right and every principle of international law recognized in relations among European powers. The land that is ours by every natural

right was coveted by European powers. Seizure of our land for the use of their own people could not be justified by the law of nations or the principles of international law that regulate relations among European powers. So it became necessary to concoct a theory that would justify the theft of the land.

It was not easy to design such a theory. At one time or another the best minds of Europe and European America were summoned to contribute to the idea that crime had its proper place. The result of the collected work of these many minds was a series of racial and cultural myths: that we were savage and uncivilized; that we were war-like and had no respect for human life; that we are, therefore, unworthy of respect; that our lives are not European lives, and our property is not to be valued in the way that Europeans value property until it is firmly held in European hands” (p. 55-56).

For Manuel, the myth of the hostile savage was a conspiracy because it was a pattern applied as a coherent and indiscriminate account of all Indian tribes (including those that were highly developed and civilized societies) in a given set of collected works. Also, it was motivated by the desire to obtain land, which made its adoption useful to the Europeans. Last, it was evil because there was no real moral or legal justification for the taking of Indian lands.

Manuel explained how the Indians of North America were civilized in many of their methods of living. Also, he pointed out that most Indians engaged in very little war (in the sense that Europeans had come to engage in war) and rarely ever attempted to cause the complete destruction of an enemy when engaging in war-fare (the way that the Europeans appeared to do).

Adopting the same stance that would later be held by Said (1978) on the treatment of the Orient by the European nations through the conspiratorial creation of a myth, Manuel wrote:

It was the intent of the founding fathers of both great European American Empires, the United States and Canada, to make us guilty of something or other that would give them excuse to do what they desired to do. So whatever we might do that was different from their customs would be considered savage, evil, primitive, or otherwise unacceptable...Such an understanding of the world has been a far greater

plague upon our houses than all the diseases that have visited us. They have caused the diseases to be spread in the name of God, Christ, love, civilization, and humanity (p. 59).

Here Manuel was engaging in another strategy identified by Stewart et al. (2001) for polarizing the movement from the establishment. In the context of providing villains in his story, he was identifying the “devils” behind the conspiracy. Specifically, Manuel identified the founding fathers of the North American democracies as acting evilly in their dissemination of the idea that the natives were uncivilized. More importantly, however, the purpose of this statement was to turn the idea of one society possessing a savage and evil nature in the opposite direction. In making Indians out to be evil, the Euro-American governments made *themselves* the evil ones. They willfully spread “disease” in the name of good.

To illustrate this idea, Manuel recounted the story of a priest who had once gone to the people of his tribe and warned them not be medically treated by his grandfather (the spiritual and medicinal leader of the tribe). The priest told them that if they went to Manuel’s grandfather, then they would burn in hell. As a result, the priest inspired many people to stop going to his grandfather and deny themselves the treatment his grandfather was capable of providing. His grandfather, in reaction to the priest, refused to fight him or speak against him and simply remained available for those who still desired his services (p. 62-63).

The point of the story was literally to illustrate his accusation that the European Americans (namely the church) were involved in a conspiracy to spread disease in the name of good. Therefore, like most of Manuel’s characters, the priest in the story was flatly developed and only represented a general condition of bigotry in white society by embodying the narrow mentality of the Christian faith. Manuel’s grandfather, as a character, represented the holistic view of the Native Americans that all views are of equal importance in his refusal to question or criticize the priests feelings toward him.

The story was effective in illustrating the destructive nature of the European worldview by contrasting the reactions of the two characters to one another. The priest, like European-American society, assumed the superiority of his faith and expected the Native Americans to adhere to his methods of living by losing their own. Manuel’s grandfather, on the contrary, engaged in behavior that showed mutual respect of all worldviews and allowed for the possibility of “mutual dependence.”

However, as an example of a cultural “conspiracy,” this story falls somewhat short. It would be unfair to assume that the priest willfully intended for the Indians to suffer the spread of diseases by denying the ceremonial treatments of the medicine man. Instead, the man was probably just acting ignorantly in his assumption that the Indian forms of treatment would not have any real benefit. Also, his fear for the salvation of their souls may well have been genuine and not motivated by a conspiratorial interest in destroying their culture. There is, after all, a difference between the intentional destruction of the culture of a race of people and the blind actions of a callous and ethnocentric clergyman who assumed that Christianity was the only possible method of achieving salvation.

Manuel’s conceptualization of a European conspiracy was one that not only involved the proliferation of a racist idea among European Americans, but it also involved the indoctrination of self-doubt among the native people. He wrote,

For colonialism to be fully effective it is necessary that the leaders who propagate the myths about those whom they have conquered must not only convince themselves of what they say...they must also convince the conquered...Colonialism may deprive and oppress the people it colonizes through looting and pillage of their homes, starvation of their children, the spread of disease. It may go to the extremes of generosity in the promises it makes in return for what is taken. It may even fulfill some considerable part of those promises. However personally we may experience one course or another- and the particular course may indeed change our lives for generations to come-it is still a matter of detail within a common pattern. The colonial system is always a way of gaining control over another people for the sake of what the colonial power has determined to be ‘the common good.’ People can only become convinced of the common good when their own capacity to imagine ways in which they can govern themselves has been destroyed (p. 59-60).

Native Americans were led to this self-doubt through the Christian-based education system. Detailing this process, Manuel then used his personal experience to illustrate how the Indian Boarding Schools’ main purpose was to convince the *Native Americans* that they were savages. He explained,

Three things stand out in my mind from my years at school: hunger; speaking English; and being called a heathen because of my grandfather...Boys who came from families who were known to practice Indian religion were a special subject of ridicule by the brothers [priests]. They would teach the other boys that we were heathens and devils and instruct them in ways to belittle us (p. 64).

Manuel recounted another narrative from his childhood that involved a new boy who had just entered his boarding school. When the priests asked him his name, he answered that it was “Mosquito.” The priest then led the class in ridiculing the boy for not having a Christian name. The point of the story was to show that members of the Christian church had a sustained agenda of belittling even the smallest aspects of Native American culture (including the names given to their children). The character of the priest in this story is representative of another condition in society, which was that the goal of assimilation was not just a matter of making Indians capable of fitting into white society for their own good, but it was also meant to in-grain a belief in Native Americans that their traditional culture was inferior.

The “assimilation” approach of the Indian boarding schools, as they were described by Manuel, are an example of what Freire (1970) called the “banking” concept of education.¹⁵ This is an educational institution that is designed in such a way as to only perpetuate a marginalized group’s oppression. In using this example, Manuel was able to show that the assimilation approaches only perpetuated the problem by undermining the Native Americans ability to feel comfortable in either Indian or European culture. This continued to show the lack of legitimate solutions provided by the government for fostering a situation where Native Americans could succeed in life. Manuel continued by explaining the destructive result of the boarding Schools. He wrote,

¹⁵Freire wrote,

In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing. Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry. The teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary opposite; by considering their ignorance absolute, he justifies his own existence...the banking concept of education regards men as adaptable, manageable beings. The more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passive roles imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them (p. 72-74).

Nothing else contributed so much to the destruction of the Indian people as a nation as the school system run by the churches and supported by the government. It was the perfect instrument for undermining both our values and our economic base. The residential school was the perfect system for instilling a strong sense of inferiority.

When we came back home for summer holidays, or when we simply left school, we were equally unfit to live in an Indian world or a European world. We had lost time learning our own skills. The agricultural skills we were being taught were already obsolete (p. 66-67).

For Manuel, like the person stuck between the two vessels on the Wampum Belt, those who were forced into Indian boarding education were left without the ability to fully function, because they lived an existence influenced by both cultures (metaphorically with their feet in both “boats”). In terms of supporting his concept of a European conspiracy, the story of the boy named Mosquito was much more effective in achieving its intended goal. The priest in that story acted in an unquestionably cruel light without having the possible justification of wanting to ensure the safety of the student’s soul. For, after all, a name has no bearing on one’s eternal salvation. Instead, the priest’s motivation for ridiculing the boy could only have been characterized as a desire to suppress the Native American identity and culture of his students.

“We Honour Our Grandfathers Who Kept Us Alive”

As already discussed, a community involved in retelling its story, its constitutive narrative, offers examples of men and women who have embodied the meaning of the community (Bellah et al., 1985). Manuel initiated his next chapter with the story of a man from his tribe that exemplified his desire for leaders who were capable of reversing the dominant ideology that had been created by the European myth. He wrote,

Alex Thomas was not a latter-day Sitting Bull filled with prophecies and the magic to communicate them. He was not a man of many words. He was an honest man whose beliefs were embedded in his bones and were just as strong.

One day, in the fall of my third and last year at school, we were packing wood up from the river where it had been floated down in a log boom, a mile and a half up to the school buildings. Alex Thomas came riding along on his horse.

Old Alex sat there in his saddle watching us nine-year-old kids carrying the big stacks of wood. He saw the school's horses grazing in the pasture having a fine feed while we worked. He saw the school disciplinarians standing along the trail with their rods to administer encouragement to us in our labor.

He got off his horse and walked down to the teacher supervising us. He never laid a finger on the teacher, but by the time he had finished telling that man how the scene looked to him, when horses played and children sweated, I think that man must have felt pretty small. A short time after his meeting with Alex Thomas, the students saw that teacher for the last time, walking across the field with his suitcase in his hand."

...Up to the time of Alex Thomas there had never been any sign of outward resistance...Now the student's confidence began to grow. A teacher would raise his yardstick to strike a student. The student would grab the stick from the teacher's hand and the rest of the class was instantly on top of the man. It was a crude and juvenile way of returning the violence to its source. But it was not submission.

...Alex Thomas did not plan to incite a series of rebellions. I am sure that he did not even plan the verbal attack he made on the teacher. He was a simple, honest man capable of an honest and direct gut-level reaction. He did not need profound thoughts and an elaborate plan of many words to distinguish workhorses from children. He participated in the human situation as he found it, and brought to the situation what it most lacked; call it what you will- honesty, directness, industrial training, human relations. We honor our grandfather Alex Thomas who brought us in touch with the silver thread to reality. With a single act, with words most of us had never heard, he reversed the cycle of colonialism that was being played out on that farm school.

You say I am making too much of a small thing? This is the way that the cycle so often works in the large as well as the small. Look beyond the Shuswap. Look beyond the Americas. The pattern is the same everywhere I have traveled among people whose souls have been in the shadow of colonialism (p. 70-71).

As already stated, Stewart et al. (2001) identified that the fourth persuasive function of a social movement is for the rhetor to prescribe courses of action. The story of Alex Thomas was another metaphor of Manuel's plan for both his own work and the work of others in the movement. Schwartz (1996) claimed that stories in social movements not only reflect the defining characteristics of the movement but also attempt to enlighten members of potential methods for behaving in the movement's best interests. Like Thomas in the schoolyard, Manuel wished to provide the world with insight into a method for reversing the cycle of colonialism. He believed that more individuals needed to take an active role in acknowledging and identifying the problems in Native American existence. Repeating the theme from his first story (of the co-worker who questioned him about Indians' ability to feel emotion), Manuel's tale illustrated a belief that positive change could only come through the open acknowledgement of conditions in society and the open dialogue between the two cultures (i.e. "mutual dependence").

On a very basic and simple level, his prescribed course of action is appropriate. Barthes (1972) stated that myths are created when they are simply stated and talked about in a way that assumes their truth. This prevents them from having to be justified. However, when people outside the establishment begin to provide new perspectives on reality and contradict the myth, then those who ascribe to the myth must find ways to justify that myth. If the myth has no logical justification, then people must begin to reject the myth and change their perspectives or risk being perceived as illogical and/or immoral.

In Manuel's story, this is exactly what happened to the teacher. He was unable to provide a just reason for why he was making the children do hard physical labor when there were work horses readily available who could be used to do the work for them. Consequently, he could not align his personal values of morality with his actions; he began to see his actions as immoral; and he became compelled to leave the school out of a sense of guilt and disgust of himself.

Elaborating upon this proposed method for reversing the process of colonization and continuing his previous themes of the importance of the giving ceremony and the hypocrisy of European values in the practice of law, Manuel described the response of the tribes at the passing of the law forbidding the potlatch ceremony. In petitioning members of the Canadian government and clergy to repeal the law, multiple tribal members had argued that ceremonial giving was also a Christian practice. Therefore, it was illogical for the government to outlaw it

as a heathen custom simply because it did not fit with European concepts of personal property. Though this was not successful at getting the law immediately repealed, it was the beginning of a mobilization against the law.

Continuing his story of the dispute against the potlatch law, Manuel described the work of a man named Andy Paull. Paull had been an intelligent man in the native community who had the ability to learn and understand Canadian law despite his lack of formal education. Making use of his talent during the 1930s and 1940s, he had devoted himself to traveling throughout Canada to help various tribal groups in their efforts to bring different cases before the courts. Manuel explained that it was the tradition of potlatch that allowed him to do this, because people were willing to share any money they could to help Paull travel and continue his work for the tribes.

In Manuel's recounting of that time, Paull became a main character in the fight to preserve Native rights. Though he and those who worked with him lost the most important land claim case they brought before Parliament, Paull's testimony still helped to produce a major victory in 1951 by leading to a repeal of the Act that had outlawed potlatch.

The main point of Manuel's discussion of Andy Paull and the potlatch law was to present an example of an individual who had dedicated his life to a cause and had eventually seen his work accomplish something great. This type of narrative is often used in social movement to encourage or inspire others to continue (or to begin) working for the cause of the movement in order to maintain the momentum of the movement. As Stewart et al. (2001) articulated, members of a movement will inevitably grow impatient and tired. Stories like this one, designed to show how a sustained and unconventional dedication can eventually lead to results, help to quell the dissatisfaction members of the movement feel when their efforts do not produce immediate results. The events in the story were not meant to represent a characteristic of society but a characteristic of the actions themselves. In essence, the story argued that though working against oppression was long and tedious, it still had the potential for great worth in the end.

Also, Manuel's commentary on how Paull's work would not have been possible without the potlatch tradition (which funded his need to travel while doing his work), allowed Manuel to connect the story to the entire Native American community. In this way, Paull's work became a symbol of the movement as a community supported effort. This moral of the story was reinforced by the ending because it was only when the people began to ignore the potlatch

tradition and stopped wanting to give to Paull to further his work that Paull lost his power as a crusader and was forced to stop.

Though this narrative was long and had several minor but complex plot developments (not necessary to mention for this brief analysis), the story still maintained narrative probability through the sustained coherence of its main theme. The description of Paull as a charismatic advocate against colonial oppression, along with the inherent message of the value of mutual dependence and the need for sharing resources, carried across the length of the chapter and made the story very effective at proving its point.

“Scratching for a Start”

In the introduction to this chapter, Manuel told the story of why (in his opinion) he had developed into a leader. In his third year of boarding school, he had developed an infection in his hip, which left him partially crippled. The result of the infection was that he had to be sent away from school to a hospital. In the hospital, the nurses continued his education by bringing him the types of games and books that had been unavailable to him at the boarding school. However, unlike the priests, they spent time teaching him to read properly and did not treat him as an inferior or attempt to indoctrinate him with ideas that his culture was savage.

Once again, this was meant to illustrate Manuel’s ideal notion of mutual dependence. Instead of attempting to keep him dependent upon them, the nurses helped him to learn and to walk again. More importantly, though, they encouraged him to think and act on his own. Of these nurses, he wrote, “The hundreds of simple acts of care and kindness which a nurse might do for any number of patients every day can be ‘just a job to be done.’ These same acts can also become the foundations on which two people learn to understand and to touch each other deeply” (p. 100).

The setting in this narrative is of prominent importance. For Manuel, the change in the setting of his childhood from the boarding school to the hospital is causally linked with his success in life. Unlike his peers in the Native American community, Manuel had escaped the harsh realities of the schools and their system of “banking” education. Instead of becoming a victim of the system, he learned in an environment that did not foster his dependence on that system and did not encourage him to think of himself as an inferior part of society.

Manuel's autobiographical self-narrative strategically attempted to dismiss the notion that Native Americans were unsuccessful due to some inherent characteristic of their race. Manuel's story stressed the fact that he had escaped the stifling environment of the boarding schools and had grown up to become a successful leader. The implied reasoning promoted by the story was that the true cause of the Native Americans' lack of success was due to the boarding school experience and similar suppressing institutions in Canadian society.

Once again, the narrative was effective as an illustration of Manuel's ideal of mutual dependence. However, as a specific example of one person's experience in life, it was less convincing at establishing that Manuel's success was due to his escape from the boarding school or that his peers' lack of success was due to their inability to escape that environment. Instead, it only provided one example. Still, as a continuation of the overall pattern established by Manuel's narratives, it did support the view that the boarding school experience was a great detriment to the welfare of the Native Americans and one potential cause of their problems.

Continuing his life narrative, Manuel told of how, when he grew up and his son needed his tonsils removed, Canada's Department of Indian Affairs began a new policy that required all Indians with a job to pay their own medical bills. Previously, the Indians had not been required to do so.

Manuel had every intention of paying the bill, because he knew he could afford to, until his doctor urged him not to. The doctor understood what Manuel had not. Once some of the Indians began paying their medical bills, the others who could not afford to would be compelled by the government to do so as well. Manuel listened to the doctor and decided to initiate a campaign for resisting the new policy, thus beginning his political career. He soon began traveling to community meetings throughout his area to speak out, which led him to develop his own theory on how to create a unified social movement among the Canadian Native Americans. He wrote,

As the resistance to the new regulations requiring us to pay for our own medical care spread throughout the reserves in the Kamloops district, I began to travel further and further through the interior [of Canada]... Out of these travels came the idea of bringing together representatives from all the tribes of the interior... Indian affairs had consulted with each group separately for all these years, and succeeded in keeping our people weak

and divided. If people were ever to gain control of their own affairs it would only be through coming together and making a common cause (p. 113).

Rhetoric in social movements attempt to organize and unify the discontented (Stewart et al., 2001, p. 73). Accordingly, the main point of this story was to represent how Manuel's traveling to various tribal groups helped to increase his wisdom of issues in a way that symbolized the importance of people banding together in order to learn more from one another and to create a unified front.

Following this conceptualization, Manuel continued describing his struggles with various issues and the resulting problems he had faced as a participating member of the movement. At the end of the chapter, Manuel described the events of 1969 and the creation of the Trudeau's White Paper by stating,

The government had brought down a statement on Indian policy that had all the markings of the U.S. policy of termination, dressed up with all the right talk of equality. Treaties were described as an 'anomaly.' The idea of aboriginal rights was rejected as too vague a concept on which to base government policy. 'Prove to me,' Mr. Trudeau was heard to say, 'that such a thing as aboriginal rights exists.' The whole history of British colonial rule, however great its faults, demands a recognition of such rights. And children starve or swarm into ghettos while he demands proof that we are human beings entitled to the same protection under law for our property and communities as anyone else (p. 126).

This passage is an example of the use of vilification as a polarizing strategy. Vilification, according to Vanderford (1989), is when the rhetoric "formulates a specific adversarial force" by presenting a "clear target for movement action" and placing that target in "an exclusively negative light" (p. 166).

In his narrative account of the White Paper, Manuel's main point was to set up the Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau as a villain by accusing him of heartlessness and ludicrousness in his need for Native Americans to prove themselves as a distinct group of people with their own

individualized rights and needs. In creating a villain, and a specific target that people could choose to act against in directing their emotions and contentions, Manuel also began the persuasive function of mobilizing members of the movement for action. As Stewart et al wrote, rhetors in social movements often “pressure the opposition” in order to compel people to take action (p. 74). By casting Trudeau in a negative light and presenting him as an opponent and target of criticism, Manuel was compelling people to take action against both Trudeau and the political ideology of termination and assimilation that he had come to represent.

Providing a name and a face to symbolize an enemy force is strategically very effective at mobilizing people to action and was a useful tactic in serving Manuel’s overall purpose. In his attempt to spread his own ideology by demoralizing the ideology of one of his opponents, Manuel’s approach was effective in reinforcing the mobilized efforts of members of the movement. However, this may not have been quite as effective at recruiting sympathizers from outside the movement. It is hard to attack the leader of a nation’s government, especially if he/she is popular, without risking a backlash from his supporters.

Still, it was worthwhile for Manuel to condemn the administration because it clearly drew the line of battle (so to speak) for the movement. Also, mobilization against Trudeau’s administration had already been proven as a successful strategy in the past, as evidenced by the fact that the White Paper had been recalled.

“Becoming a Fisher of Men”

In this chapter, Manuel opened by telling the narrative of his training as a reservation field worker. He told a narrative of how the teacher of his class, Farrel Toombs, refused to teach in the traditional sense of lecturing. Instead, he forced the various different members of the class, all administrators, academics, and Indians, to interact with one another in order to decide their own boundaries for what they wanted to get out of the class. In the story, Manuel claimed that Toombs saw his purpose in teaching as simply being a facilitator who made the resources available to the students. In contrast to the traditional view of a learning environment, Toombs wanted the students to decide on their own what they wanted to learn with the time they were given.

This kind of teaching style is diametrically opposite to the style of marginalizing education that Freire (1970) claimed was most common in colonial institutions, which is

probably why Manuel used it as an example. The story of Toombs's teaching style continued Manuel's coherent theme of the need to recognize a "mutual dependence." Only through depending on each other and recognizing each other as equals, each with his own individual contributions to make, did the class begin to accomplish something. Following Toombs's example, according to the narrative, Manuel learned to resist the temptation to give leadership when he became a field worker. Instead, he looked to find someone in the community that he could teach to lead in his place and who would continue to lead after he was gone.

Manuel illustrated this theme by relating how he used his field assignment working with the Cowichan tribe to single out a community member named Abraham Joe. Cultivating the leadership qualities inherent in Joe's personality, Manuel encouraged him to start a protest for better housing. As Manuel's story detailed, the fight for the housing program faced an extreme amount of opposition and was only successful when the entire community became willing to get involved in the protests. However, in the end the housing program became a great success for that community, not simply for providing people with slightly better houses but by teaching them the labor and building skills that they could then use to their benefit in the future. Manuel wrote,

It is this ability to act on your own problems that is the goal of community development. It is also a dictionary definition of power. The measure of success was not in the number of houses that came to be built...The measure of success was the extent of human development that took place- the development of skills of every sort from excavation and carpentry to management. The most important goal could not be measured. Throughout the housing fight people had crossed and re-crossed social and religious barriers that they had not crossed in generations. The community as a whole had come together and experienced its wholeness in life as it had so often done in death. The Cowichan people had found the strength of which they were capable (p. 148).

In many ways, this was an example of the type of mobilization that Manuel wished to accomplish with his rhetoric. Manuel's vision of the Native American rights movement (and the global Indigenist movement beyond) was for a grassroots campaign to begin at the level of individuals and communities, then working its way up to a national and international level (the three levels of international movement identified by Leatherman et al.). As Stewart et al. (2001)

explained, “Social movements expend great persuasive effort trying to educate audiences about the cause and to convince them of the urgency to join together to bring about or to resist change” (p. 73). In this chapter, Manuel’s main point was to provide an example to his readers of the reasons for why they should join together, struggle together, and learn together. For Manuel, the significance of native rights was not just for the immediate goals of the movement but for the implications of what could be accomplished in the future. This story also represented a narrative’s ability to effectively convey empowerment to a marginalized group. This is the essence of mobilization in social movements.

“The Decade of Consultation”

At the beginning of this chapter, Manuel told the story of three groups of “explorers” that visited the Indian world during the 1960s, who became secondary characters in his narrative. First were the youth, who were looking for answers to the problems of society and were seeking to find them in native spirituality. Manuel characterized them as disillusioned in a way that reflected the loss of faith that many young white Americans had felt in the 1960s. However, in his story, these explorers never attained their goal of finding answers in the Indian world, because their problems were caused by issues that had sprung from their own culture and consequently could only be addressed in their own culture. Though he saw their entrance as interfering in Native American life, Manuel still sanctioned their continued search as a positive goal because he believed that their generation’s search for answers was important in preventing the problems for future generations.

The second group he related in his story of the 1960s were the anthropologists. These he characterized as “vultures-pecking away at our minds, our clothes, our houses, and our graves” (p. 158). For Manuel, they represented the condition of a high level of greed in white society. They symbolized the tendency of whites to take things without giving anything in return. For Manuel, the anthropologists meant to take anything from the Indian world that they found useful, interesting, or profitable without sharing any of their gains with the people whose lives and existence provided those gains.

The last group of people discussed in Manuel’s narrative were the government consultants. In the context of his narrative, Manuel constructed them as being the greatest

villains in the Indian community who were “without equal” in terms of “taking without sharing” (p. 161). These were people who had been paid well by the government for gathering information about Native Americans but who did nothing to solve any of the problems they faced. Also according to Manuel, despite the overwhelming evidence from the United States that termination policies were extremely detrimental to the welfare of the Indian people, the incompetence of the government consultants of the 1960s had been instrumental in the decision by the administration to draft the White Paper policy.

For Manuel, the Indians became the guinea pigs of the government during this period. In relating the government’s stance in the 1969 White Paper, he wrote,

Aboriginal rights' was too vague a term to be used as a basis for discussion. 'Treaties' should be respected but were also regarded as an anomaly. Equality of opportunity was defined so that it was indistinguishable from assimilation. Multiculturalism for European immigrants. Bilingualism for French-English relations. And assimilation for Indian peoples. If the government would not adapt a policy for the needs of every people in this vast and diverse land, it would at least find a people on which every conceivable policy could be tried (p. 169).

Manuel made it clear to the reader that this was a time in Canadian history when the government neither wished to hear an Indian’s perspective on the problems and issues that Native Americans faced nor even believed that an “Indian perspective” existed beyond what they deemed important or worthy of attention.

He related how he was chosen to be a part of an advisory committee for selecting the design that would be used to build the aboriginal people’s pavilion for Canada’s Expo ‘67.¹⁶ It was an opportunity for the Indians to create something of their own to be representative of them to the rest of the world. In preparation for the selection, native artists throughout Canada were asked to present their designs to the committee for selection. However, when the meeting finally came for the committee to select its design, the Department of Indian Affairs disclosed the fact

¹⁶ Expo ‘67 was an international exposition intended to showcase Canada to the rest of the world in celebration of its 100th Anniversary of Confederation (Stanton, 1997).

that they had also commissioned their own design for the pavilion. In addition, they had had a model built of the design, which had already cost a quarter of a million dollars. The Department then presented their scale model for the pavilion to the committee at the same meeting as the designs of the Native Americans had been presented. As a result, when compared to the artists' drawings of their simpler designs, the model appeared far superior and it was impossible for the committee to choose anything other than the department's design after so much money had already been spent on it. Beside that fact, the native artists were already too insulted to still want their designs to be considered.

Then, the Department attempted to select a carver for a totem-pole to go with the pavilion without consulting the Native Americans leaders at all. In this case, Manuel was able to head off the decision and forced the department to allow time for carvers throughout Canada to be notified and for the decision to be made on who was able to offer the best bid for the project. As a result, someone other than who the government had originally wanted got the job.

The point of this narrative was to show the insulting level of manipulation that the Canadian government was willing to employ in order to control every aspect of the decisions made by tribal leaders, including an issue as superfluous to government policy as the design of a fair pavilion and the commission of a totem-pole. The creation of a selection committee made up of Indians had merely been a superficial attempt to make the decision seem like it had been in the hands of native people. However, in Manuel's account, the government appeared to have no real intention of sharing their control and only did for the minute decision of the selection of a totem-pole carver when they were forced to by Manuel.

For Manuel, this assumption that Native Americans were incapable of thinking for themselves was not only true of the government, but also of Canadian society in general. He continued, saying,

The belief that Indians do not really exist except as an appendage to the Department of Indian Affairs carries over from government circles into all aspects of non-Indian life in Canada. Most non-Indians rarely have the occasion to give the matter much thought. The lack of thought helps to perpetuate the stereotype the government communicates...About the time I began to do this book, I agreed to do an article for

Maclean's magazine about the goals and aspirations of the Indian people. The editors asked the Department to verify the facts as I had tried to describe them (p. 178).

Once again, Manuel was using a confrontational strategy to address the issue of who ought to hold legitimacy in society. It would be illogical for anyone to assume that a government agency was a greater authority on Native American issues than an actual Native American leader. However, in this example, Manuel showed that this truly *was* the reality of the 1960s. The Department of Indian Affairs had successfully (and illegitimately) silenced Native Americans from addressing their own issues and the general public assumed this was acceptable. However, by expressing this condition in narrative form (showing a direct example of how the reality of the Indian situation in the 1960s was something other than what it ought to be) Manuel once again revealed the absurdity of Canadian society in its views toward Native Americans.

“The Daily Struggle Now”

Following his many previous descriptions of the false perceptions that people presumed of Indian reality, Manuel provided his own description of the true present state of being that was being lived by Native Americans in his next chapter. Characterizing the detrimental force of the state and its intervention in native society, Manuel wrote:

There are other experts, few though they may be, who have taken the time to listen. Their studies have shown that the worst symptoms of the culture of poverty are in those Indian communities that are in the midst of having our own culture undermined. It is the Indian societies that have been forced into a transition through token consultation that have the highest rates of alcoholism, prostitution, welfarism, and suicide.

Indian people who continue to lead a traditional life in a community that clearly defines itself in traditional terms are not caught up in the culture of poverty. The cash they see in a year may be so small that they are poor in the most narrow and meaningless sense...

Indian people who for all intents and purposes have assimilated into the mainstream of urban European North American society also do not reflect the conflict of loyalties and values and the resulting crisis of identity that produce the symptoms of

poverty. They have made their choice. They know who they are. They set about fulfilling that identity in their daily lives (p. 183).

Manuel wished to make it clear in this passage that it was the Native Americans who were caught between the two cultures (i.e. those with both feet on the two separate vessels) who suffered the most due to their inability to reconcile their conflicting roles. This group consisted of the reservations that had experienced the implementation and consequences of the government intervention programs. These were the people who wished to retain their traditional culture but were forced into adopting certain Euro-American values and methods of lifestyle by those interventions.

Those who had fully retained the traditional ways of living and had somehow managed to avoid government intervention, continued to be capable of providing for themselves through traditional means. Though they did not have much by monetary economic standards, they were not poor because they did not need money to hunt, fish, and prosper living in the traditional way. On the opposite end, those who had completely assimilated into white culture were also capable of prospering but only by completely severing their ties to their native culture and making the decision to discard their traditional identity (a decision that worked for some but was not an option for everyone). As Manuel explained, this was a situation that only worked for the select few who were capable of abandoning their Native American heritage. He wrote,

The urban ghettos of North America are not filled with people whose choice was freely made. Many of our people have tried to become white Christian ladies and gentlemen. A few have made it, and though I would give my blessing, they do not need it. The thousands who have returned home or remained in the city slums are the ones for whom it has not worked.

It has not worked because few people of any race or nation can long endure to stand with one foot in one boat, and the other in a different boat. When there is a parting of the ways, it is the person who has one foot in either boat who suffers. The helmsmen, in either boat, is the one who is safe and can endure.

It has not worked because urban North America has not yet decided that it desires to build a bridge of lasting strength between communities of different cultural perspectives” (p. 184).

From this perspective, Manuel argued that the only solution to the dire situation of Native America is for the government to accept his model of mutual dependence. Therefore, he prescribed a course of action, directed at the government, for the development of “Home Rule within the framework of a partnership with our neighbors that encourages cooperation but does not foster the domination of the weak over the strong, and that allows each people to control its own resources within that partnership” (p. 203).

This re-telling of the present reality was useful in bringing Manuel’s narrative full circle. He had begun with the metaphor of the Two-row Wampum to explain the ideal situation for the European and native cultures to both exist under. However, his presentation of how reality stood in 1974 needed to represent how reality had become the opposite of his ideal. This was effective at providing coherence and closure to his narrative of his own life and the state of the Native American way of life in the twentieth century.

“The Fourth World”

As the title of the book suggests, *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality* was ultimately designed to present a way a viewing the world (i.e. a native view of reality) that allowed for social change to take place. If the reader accepts Manuel’s view of reality as correct, then s/he must also accept that his solution to the problem (being the two-way model of mutual benefit that he called “mutual dependence”) is the only answer. Manuel wrote, “There will be no significant change in the conditions of unilateral dependence that has characterized our history through the past century and more until Indian peoples are allowed to develop our own forms of responsible government” (p. 217).

As described in this paper, Manuel defined his “Fourth World” as both a physical reality that encompassed the existence of many indigenous nations worldwide. However, he also defined the Fourth World as a worldview that included the indigenous values of sharing and mutual dependence in order to insure the survival of all peoples. In this way, Manuel’s creation of a Fourth World perspective attempted to transform perceptions of reality, alter self-

perceptions of members of his movement, legitimize the movement, and prescribe courses of action.

Manuel's last narrative in his book was of how in 1972 the prime minister of Japan, on his first visit to China since World War II, said "We are sorry" as his first words to the Chinese official who greeted him. Manuel sanctioned the Japanese prime minister's words by remarking that they allowed the two countries to once again accept one another on a common ground. For him, this shows that people who are at great odds with one another can still learn to develop a mutually beneficial relationship if they are willing to "change the present reality and to make a new beginning" (p. 263).

By privileging a Fourth World "native" perspective, Manuel attempted to create a path of movement for the future. His call for accepting the Fourth World reality was meant to encourage the reader to accept mutual dependence as the answer to North America's problems. Manuel wrote,

The Indian peoples have a tradition and a culture to offer to the world. We have tried to take on other people's ways and found that they just did not work for us. Today, more and more European people in North America are finding that their own culture cannot meet all their own needs while they live on this land. It is not only young people who are trying to retribalize European society by building communes and developing other forms of extended family. They are trying to re-create a situation in which everyone says, for better or for worse, "These are my people" (p. 265).

In the end, the importance in the sharing of mutually beneficial resources from each culture for the common good of all people was the lasting message that Manuel wished to leave with his audience. He saw the Western World as being at risk of destroying itself through its mismanagement of technology and lack of respect for the land. In an effort to transform perceptions of the future, Manuel advocated that Western society learn to share the plentiful resources that technology had afforded it by adopting a Fourth World perspective of cooperation and mutual dependence.

Though Manuel never specifically called for a transnational political agenda, his ideas of the existence of a Fourth World were seminal in the creation of the transnational indigenous movement because they supplied indigenous peoples worldwide with an inspirational vision of an ideal and universal human existence based on tribal values.

As the formal declaration of intent at the beginning of his book stated,

The National Indian Brotherhood will celebrate the victory of Indian peoples by bringing together aboriginal peoples from every corner of the globe...Our celebration honors the emergence of the Fourth World: the utilization of technology and its life-enhancing potential within the framework of the values of the peoples of the Aboriginal World - a single messianic moment after which there will never be another raging storm, but the free use of power by natural human groupings, immediate communities, people who are in direct contact with one another, to harness the strength of the torrent for the growth of their own community. Neither apartheid nor assimilation can be allowed to discolour the community of man in the Fourth World. An integration of free communities and the free exchange of people between those communities according to their talents and temperaments is the only kind of confederation that is not an imperial domination (p. 11-12).

Chapter IV: Narrative Analysis of *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence*

Background on Author and Artifact

Prior to 1974, Vine Deloria, Jr. had already made a name for himself as a scholar of Native American history, law, and life. His 1969 work, *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, had made extensive use of narrative form in discussing Native American issues. Much like Manuel's later book (*The Fourth World* that was assessed in Chapter III), *Custer Died for Your Sins* described what it meant to live as an Indian in the American society of the twentieth century. Drawing from his time as the Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians, Deloria used personal experience to detail the major issues and problems faced by the American Indians. In doing this, he laid the ground work for the ideological basis that his later writings would build upon. In his own words, the goal of his writing was "to raise an entire group to a new conception of themselves" (Deloria, 1969, p. 270).

His 1974 book, *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence*, specifically attempted to provide future indigenous activists and scholars with a new conception of the semiotics of colonial discourse in order to reframe the situation of indigenous people in a way that was removed from the Euro-American view that had originally been prescribed to Native Americans (Morris, 2003). In 1974, the Native American community had found itself in a vastly complex and uncertain existence. The American government had promised them many things in the past that were never provided. Their status as Americans was still somewhat undefined. Their tribal government and the relationships they held with the state and federal governments were unclear to many of them (even those involved in the government). Last, the movement created to address and fix these problems had just faced a setback with the violent end of the 1973 occupation at Wounded Knee.

As both a Native American and a scholar who understood many things that others did not, Deloria sought to clarify those complexities for Native Americans and to rectify what he saw as the false assumptions of white members of American society. His method for organizing and explicating this vast amount of information was through the development of a historical narrative that provided a "recounting" and "accounting for" (as Fisher defined these terms) of the Native American rights movement and United States Indian policy.

As the title suggests, the central focal point of Deloria's narrative was the "Trail of Broken Treaties." As a campaign, the demonstration had been a near disaster for the Native American rights movement. The hostile takeover of the Bureau of Indian Affairs office had only reflected negatively on the Native Americans in a way that supported the "hostile savage" myth and stereotype that the movement was trying to rise above. Moreover, the dramatic nature of its conclusion seemed to overwhelm the real issues that had prompted it and may have even caused a postponement of the progressive proposals for pro-self-determination policy that the Nixon administration had been attempting to put forth (Cook, 1998). Therefore, Deloria saw a need to describe the state of affairs in Indian policy that had led to the frustration behind the drama, in order to show the legitimate mind-set that was behind the campaign. Also, Deloria wanted to refocus people's attention back to the "Twenty Points" petition that had been the original goal of the Trail of Broken Treaties.

As already discussed in Chapter II on narrative theory, narrative allows for information of events and states of being to be contextualized and interpreted. By retelling the history of Native Americans in the United States in his own way, actively choosing what to address and how to address it, Deloria was able to simplify the complex situation of Native America in way that his readers could easily understand. He could also strategically assign his own meaning to the different policies and issues. The strategy of creating an historical narrative had the added benefit of carrying the illusion that it represented reality as it actually existed. Barthes (1989) argued that narrative representations of real events often have the appearance of being free of rhetoric. This is because they enable the rhetor to avoid what Barthes called "shifters" or indications of the author, the audience, and the biases that the author has in his/her method of collecting and presenting historical information to that audience (p. 127-140). As a consequence, this characteristic of historical narrative helped to give Deloria's account the quality of being a scholarly document, despite the fact that it was also a strategically designed act of rhetoric.

Once again, the ultimate goal of this analysis is to reveal the aspects Deloria holds as narrator in the context of the Native American rights movement which allowed for his work to become seminal in changing the direction of the movement and to foster the opportunity for the movement to become transnational. For the sake of simplicity and the desire to remain true to

the organization of the original work, the sections of this analysis are also organized in accordance with the chapters of Deloria's book.

"Preamble to the Present"

In opening his book, Deloria intended to polarize, or rhetorically separate, the Native Americans from the rest of the American public. He began by telling the story of an instance where the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) wanted to give out an award. On the form that the members needed to sign, it requested the signature of the President. However, there was some confusion in the meeting over which "President" the form was referring to: the President of the NCAI or the President of the United States. As the discussion went on, the members began referring to the different presidents as "ours" and "theirs."

The main point of the narrative is revealed by the language used by the characters. As Holloway (1993) wrote, "The words people choose to express their perceptions betray and display their particular worldviews. They state what for them is reality and act on the basis of that reality" (p. 31). For Deloria, this use of language was an indication of the nature of Indian reality. The members not only did not know who had what authority, but it was also obvious that they were unable to consider the President of the United States as being "their" President. For Deloria, this is an indication that the "myth" of America being a "sanitized merging of diverse peoples to form a homogenous union" was a false belief (p. 2). As an example, this recounting of events illustrates the mindset of the Native Americans. The events are stative, thereby expressing a social condition that would become Deloria's main theme. This theme was that, regardless of how the rest of America viewed them, the Native Americans still had a hard time seeing *themselves* as Americans.

Next, Deloria continued polarizing Native Americans from other Americans by underlining the major difference between American Indian groups and the New Left. He explained that Indians were not interested in reforming the problems of American government, as the new protestors of the 1960s had been, but they were continuing a struggle that had gone on for hundreds of years in fighting the American government and its steady progression of forcing its power over native tribes. In Deloria's retelling of history, the 1960s did not represent a *new* movement for Native Americans but rather, the continuation of the colonial resistance by natives to remove the American government from its assumed sphere of power.

From there, Deloria made it a point to try to transform the perceptions his readers might have had of the past. For Deloria, the entire history of America was an instance where the original nations of people, with their own version of civilized societies that had already been established on the North American continent, were simply buried underneath the Europeans and all those who came later. It is a basic and easily understood point that Deloria is making but one that has been consistently downplayed and ignored in Euro-American versions of history. Deloria wrote, “most non-Indian readers had been led to believe that, following the Plains Wars, the Indians meekly marched off to their reservations and lived in peace. The whole implication of the traditional Indian stereotype was that the Indians had become the best of American citizens within a decade of [the first instance at] Wounded Knee” (p. 3-4). He continued by stating, “The tragic climax of formal fighting between the United States and the Indians...did not mark the end of the Indian struggle to preserve national identity. Although virtually unnoticed, the fighting continued through the twentieth century as surely as it had during the previous century of contact” (p. 4).

This first description of past history was meant to set the tone for the rest of Deloria’s book. Generally speaking, Native Americans and the Native American rights movement (as a collectivity of individuals) would become the main “character” in Deloria’s re-narration of history. As the main character in Deloria’s narrative, the Native Americans were characterized as being consistent in holding the traits of determination and resistance. The temporal relationship of events is important in this chapter of Deloria’s book, because his description of the Native Americans was meant to narrate their sustained cultural character throughout time.

Deloria’s writing constituted the “movement narrative” approach identified by Yates and Hunter (2002), where members of the movement tell stories to others about the collectivity of the movement in a way that attempts to bridge the gaps of distance between different people’s values. Yet, before he could begin to bridge the gap that existed between Indian and white society, Deloria needed to fully define what that “gap” was. Hence, he began by providing a narrative description to openly polarize the groups and reveal their differences.

For that reason, the rest of Deloria’s first chapter continued by documenting Native Americans’ continued struggle to hold their sovereignty from the 1860’s to the present. This assertion that the fighting never stopped was important in setting up Deloria’s further argument

that sovereignty was not something that American Indians had ever willingly given up, but it was lost only because the American government illegitimately took it from them.

His narration of the history of Native America prior to 1974 held a basic message for the American public. In its simplest form, the message was that Indian sovereignty and nationhood were *not* abstract political concepts that may or may not have the potential to become a reality. Instead, for Deloria, they were things that *were* and *continued to be* a reality, despite the denial of them by the American government. His narrative asserted the fact that native sovereignty and the gradual losses it had suffered were a part of the history that was actually *lived* through by the Native Americans, which made it an undeniable part of the “reality” of the American past.

In this way, his re-narration of the history of Native America was effective in its goal. Simply by describing and historically supporting the continued existence of a native struggle against colonization from the first contact with whites to the present, Deloria presented the Native Americans as a distinct group of people who were separate from the rest of the America, thereby combating the “myth” (as Barthes defined the term) of a unified American society.

“The Emergence of Indian Activism”

Continuing his narrative of the progression of the Native American rights movement, Deloria used his next chapter to address the issue of transforming his readers’ perceptions of the present. As already stated, for Deloria, the seeming “emergence” of a Native American rights movement in the sixties was an illusion. In reality, Natives had struggled for their rights since the beginning of colonialism. However, they had mostly worked under treaties and through bureaucratic institutions. According to Deloria, the influence of the social movements of the sixties on the native struggle was that it taught the Indians new avenues to try and get their issues heard. The American Indians began following the example set forth by the civil rights movement, not just because it seemed to be accomplishing something, but also because it showed that the social atmosphere had become safer for protestors. As Deloria stated, “The basic fact of American political life- that without money or force there is no change- impressed itself upon Indians as they watched the civil-rights movement, and the old fear of reprisal, which had plagued previous Indian efforts to change conditions, was partially dissipated” (p. 23).

However, for Deloria, it was important that the Native American rights movement not be seen as related to any of the other social movements of that time. This is mainly due to the fact

that the Indians were not fighting to become a part of the mainstream like the other movements were. They did not want “equality” under the government and were even suspicious of the idea. This was because, for them, “equality” had always equated to “assimilation.” Traditionalist Native Americans did not want to be just like everyone else. In direct contrast to the equality movements, they wanted the right to be distinctly separate.

The use of polarization in social movement rhetoric is generally a strategy for gaining legitimacy by showing the illegitimacy of the group that the movement is polarizing itself away from. However, this particular strategy of polarization taken by Deloria in his narrative description of the diversity of movements in the 1960s was not really meant to help gain legitimacy for the Native Americans. If that were the case, then Deloria would have attempted to *identify*, instead of *diversify*, with the other well-established social movements of that time. Also, Deloria never stated that the other movements were illegitimate. Instead, Deloria’s description of the differences between the Native American rights movement and the other movements was meant to bolster the Indians’ movement by stressing its markedly unique status. Unlike members of the civil rights movement, Native Americans had many longstanding and recorded legal claims (through treaty agreements) and an undeniable aboriginal status on the North American continent that differed from any other racial or ethnic group in America.

In this way, his re-telling of the development of the movements of the sixties was meant to present a counter-narrative to the one dominantly held by society. The dominant narrative metaphor assumed by members of the media and the general public was that the Native American rights movement was the child of the civil rights movement (in other words, that civil rights spawned native rights). In contrast, Deloria’s narrative characterized the Native American rights movement as being much older and unrelated to civil rights, thereby dispelling the myth that native rights was an off-shoot of civil rights. Instead of creating a causal relationship through the context of the story, Deloria meant to reject one. In Deloria’s counter-narrative, the civil rights movement thus acted as a “supporting” character (as opposed to the main character that it had been in the dominant narrative of the 1960s). For him, civil rights was merely a supporter of native rights that helped to foster an environment for the Native American rights movement to gain greater access in public discourse.

This re-characterization of civil rights was a necessary move for Deloria to make because the ideological stand that the Natives had developed (due, in part, to previous work by Deloria

himself) was that the Indians held an aboriginal right to sovereignty that was inherent and existed regardless of the claims of the colonial “settler” government that had assumed control over the pre-existing indigenous nations. In calling for independence from the United States government, the Native Americans could not afford to be associated with civil rights (a movement designed to work *within* the established legal avenues of the United States for gaining equality), for this would re-enforce the assumption made by the government that Native Americans were necessarily under United States law. Therefore, this aspect of Deloria’s re-telling of history was also useful and effective at providing a basis for the rhetorical moves he intended to make in his following accounts.

Unfortunately, this aspect of Deloria’s re-narration of history did nothing to fulfill the ultimate goal of all movement rhetoric, which is to enlist the support of others and to bridge the gap in values between groups in order to bring about change. As a result, Deloria needed to frame his narrative in a way that helped to promote white America’s acceptance of it.

To this end, Deloria openly acknowledged the fact that the Native American rights movement was, in many senses, “anti-American.” However, he re-termed the movement as being “pre-American” instead of Anti-American in an attempt to help connect his narrative to people’s values of tradition and thereby lessening his offensiveness to their values of patriotism. He wrote,

The Indian position was often seen by the supporters of civil rights as anti-American, and in many respects it was. The tribes were concerned about their separate existence as dependent nations for whom the United States had a responsibility. The Indian attitude might be called pre-American rather than anti-American, since it demanded that the original status of Indians be respected (p. 24).

As a revivalistic social movement, designed to “replace existing social norms with ones from a venerable, idealized past” (Stewart et al., 2001, p. 12), the Native American Rights movement in America was revolutionary in its desire to replace the federal government and fully restore its members to their former status as independent nations. Therefore, Deloria needed to show his audience why the movement was legitimate in rejecting American values. Presenting the movement, not as a purposeful rejection of Euro-American values, but as the desire to re-

establish a higher set of values that pre-dated America, Deloria was able to foster a better connection with his audience. However, his attempt at smoothing the implications of his narrative to white America was not sustained throughout the course of the book and, perhaps, thereby lost much of its intended effect.

Like Manuel, Deloria described the catalyst in sparking the protest expressions of Indian discontent in the mid-twentieth century as centering on a case of white society withholding a traditional food source from the native people. In Canada, the issue had been the outlawing of the ceremonial sharing that was an important part of the natives' economy. In the case of the United States, the issue was over the natural resource of fish. Disregarding former treaty agreements, states in the Pacific Northwest by the 1960s had begun an attempt to greatly limit and regulate Indian fishing rights.

The first group to stage protests (that came to be known as "fish-ins") was the National Indian Youth Council. The protests gained attention but also gained a backlash of anti-Indian sentiment from the whites. Though the initial protests were unsuccessful, according to Deloria, they did lead to several important results for Native Americans. First, the idea of protesting soon caught on with other groups of young Native Americans across the country who had their own grievances to express. Second, the formation of protest groups gave the tribal governments more influence than they had carried in the past. Formerly, they had been forced to deal with the United States government on a singular basis and had lacked any real power to voice their will. However, the U.S. government was suddenly faced with new protest organizations that were making higher demands than the tribal governments had ever made. The government knew that if they did not start making some concessions with the tribal governments, then they would soon have to start answering to the protest groups who would be much more forceful with larger demands. As a result, the government began working more closely with the tribal governments. Deloria wrote,

Tribal governments had to deal with the federal government on a one-to-one basis. Indians could not develop the necessary leverage on the government to make changes, since the tribal governments were the only formally organized groups in existence. With the development of protest groups, the tribal leaders had a chance to play off the government against the expanding activist organizations. The government

officials knew that if they were unreasonable or did not make concessions to the tribal officials, they would be confronted by activists who sought even more radical change than did the tribal councils. Therefore, the United States, for the first time in its history, had to offer concessions to the tribes, in return for tribal support for some of its more exotic policies (p. 28).

Later, as Deloria recounted, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) was spurred by this new sense of power into creating a plan for “self-determination” of indigenous tribes. This plan was a response to reject a newly proposed policy designed by the Department of Interior for taking poverty funding away from the tribes and turning it over to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. “Self-determination” soon became a rallying cry for protest organizations.

From there, the “Red Power” movement developed. In a perceived throwback to the glories of the Indian warriors of the past, the movement became more militant and began to focus its demands on the restoration of illegally taken land. Also during this time, the American Indian Movement formed in Minnesota to combat unfair police harassment of Native Americans in the twin cities. Then Nixon was elected President, which some feared would bring a new wave of Republican termination policies. Meanwhile, other movements like the anti-war and civil rights movements were getting extensive coverage in the media for their extreme tactics of protest. In order to keep up with the changing times, the Native Americans were pressured to make bold moves as well. Each of these developments, as Deloria explained, fostered a sense among the Native Americans for the need to begin staging public media events in order to be heard.

In the context of his narrative, Deloria presented each of these developments in a way that helped to explain the mentality that led to the militant take-over of the abandoned Alcatraz Island prison facility in late 1969 (which had been promised to the Native Americans in a past treaty and later taken away). At the time that Deloria was writing, many Americans were probably unaware of the factors that had led the protest group to take the island. As Stone-Mediators (2003) explained, it was beneficial for Deloria to use his narrative to connect the actions of the event with the complex underlying causal relationships in order to help justify them to the rest of the world. In order to maintain legitimacy for the movement, Deloria needed to show why the seemingly hostile and violent action of the take-over was morally justifiable

considering the circumstances. Therefore, he placed the events within the greater context of the underlying socio-cultural and political issues. Deloria moved deftly from the sparking issue of protest (the infringement on one of the Native Americans' main sources of food through fishing regulation) to covering the pressures Indians faced in the turbulent media circus of the 1960s for becoming more militant in order to have people pay attention to their message. As a result, he presented the sudden instance of Indian militancy as part of a natural progression for seeking justice instead of an offensive outburst meant to disrupt the peace of the general public. To this end, he was successful in re-characterizing the actions of the movement as being more legitimate. However, this legitimacy was established at the expense of white American society, a major portion of Deloria's intended audience, which he characterized as the main cause of the protest actions and events taken by the movement. This created a sense of further polarization in Deloria's work that may have worked against his ultimate goal of facilitating change.

While justifying setbacks in an effort to help maintain a positive momentum of the movement, Deloria identified particular aspects of the 1960's Indian militancy that may have prevented it from accomplishing its intended goals. He wrote,

The ideological basis for demanding a restoration of tribal lands was grounded in the treaty relationship of the tribes with the United States. This basis began to erode as activists viewed the treaties as an excuse for protests and not as the basis for establishing a clearer definition of the federal relationship...By mid-1972 the middle ground of progressive ideology in Indian affairs was fast eroding, and desperate confrontation was in the air over the issue of the nature of the modern Indian community (p. 39-41).

In this portion of Deloria's narrative, his main "character" (i.e. the movement) was characterized as being distracted from the correct path it needed to take in order to reach one of its goals (the restoration of tribal land). As stated by Stewart et al. (2001), another main goal of rhetoric in a social movement is to alter the self-perceptions of members *within* the movement. In identifying what had gone wrong in the movement (i.e. that the members had focused too much on what they had suffered from their relationship with the United States in its rejection of the treaties) Deloria was also asserting that the treaties needed to be viewed as a source of power

for members of the movement. In other words, the treaties were not merely the reason for the movement. For Deloria, the treaties were what *legitimized* the cause.

As Gregg (1971) explained, rhetoric in social movements must address issues of the “ego” of movement members and the status that they hold in relation to the rest of society. For Gregg, the oppressed are often in a situation where they must defend themselves before they can establish a new and more positive identity. Addressing this aspect of Native Americans, Deloria was asserting the idea that they needed to stop thinking of themselves as being at the whim of the United States government and start thinking more in terms of how their past relations with the government as a separate and distinct group of people gave them a legal basis for confronting the ambiguously assumed power of the United States.

In narrative terms, by describing the method that the movement had taken in its effort to reach its goal and then asserting that the actions had not reached their intended goal through that method, Deloria de-sanctioned the direction that the movement had taken. This section of the book was important and effective at providing a moral to the story. The basic foundation of the moral was that the movement needed to re-focus back to the treaties. This effectiveness, however, would not become fully apparent until later on in the book when Deloria began using it for prescribing future courses of action.

“The Occupation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs”

As previously mentioned, 1972 and 1973 were years that became marked with major events in the Indian community. 1972 involved several high profile murder cases where Native Americans were brutally killed by white citizens and state law enforcement did little to punish those involved.¹⁷

For Deloria, it appeared that mainstream white society was reacting in violent and hostile ways to the perceived pressure being exerted by the movement. He wrote,

The summer brought news of far-flung incidents involving Indian-killing. It appeared as if the whites of the west had decided to embark on an Indian war of their own, for no sooner had one incident cooled than another one arose. Indians marched for justice as a result of the killings of Indians in both California and Arizona, without

¹⁷See the previous discussion of the Raymond Yellow Thunder case on page 17.

receiving any relief in either state. The emotional commitment of the movement had now penetrated into every part of Indian country, and people were anxiously awaiting some word from the activist leaders as to what could be done to prevent more killings (p. 45-46).

The killings prompted the planning of the “Trail of Broken Treaties.” The idea for the event was loosely modeled after the 1963 March on Washington. It was intended to be a caravan that crossed the entire United States and ended with a march in the nation’s capital. The plan for the event was officially solidified following the September 1972 shooting and death of Richard Oakes (who had led the invasion of Alcatraz).

The caravan began on the West Coast in October of that year. As it crossed the country, members from tribes throughout America joined in the march. During the cross-country trip, leaders of the march wrote the Twenty Points, which were to be presented to Richard Nixon the week before the 1972 Presidential election. Deloria described the Twenty Points as being a document that, “presented a new framework for considering the status of Indian tribes and the nature of their federal relationship” and “harkened back to the days of freedom, when the United States courted the friendship of the tribes” (p. 48). Like Manuel’s idea of “mutual dependence,” the Twenty Points was attempting to revive the original existence of mutual respect that had subsisted between the colonists and the Native Americans.

However, as Deloria recounted, the organization of people involved in the march broke down once it reached Washington. The march went directly to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but the building was not prepared to receive the large number of people who showed up. When the Indians were asked to move to another building, several guards pushed some of the protestors and the Indians took over the building for fear that they were being forced out. Following several tense days, the Indians agreed to leave the building after being promised that they would not face criminal charges for their occupation of the BIA.

Deloria wrote,

As the weeks followed and the real stories of the occupation began to emerge, it became increasingly evident that the Indians had been had. Some of the Indians who had been in the building during the actual occupation went on the official tours of the

occupation site. They were astounded to see extensive damage in rooms where they were certain there had been no damage. The walls were marked up with slogans and names and addresses where there had been no marks whatsoever at the time of departure. Some of the paint appeared fresh, an indication that it had been applied recently and not in connection with the Indian's takeover of the building.

Later events would indicate that the federal government had had a substantial number of agents among the protestors, and some were so militant and destructive as to be awarded special Indian names for their involvement in the protest. It became apparent why the government had been so willing to agree not to prosecute the Indians: The presence of agent-provocateurs and the intensity of their work would have made it extremely difficult for the government to have proven an intent by the real Indian activists to destroy the building (p. 57).

Deloria concluded this chapter by pointing out that the response from the Nixon administration was to reject the Twenty Points and deny the need for treaty reform. Therefore, the AIM leaders were left more infuriated by their inability to make any headway with the government (p. 62).

Once again, the purpose of Deloria's retelling of the events preceding and following the Trail of Broken Treaties was to place the events in the context of the Native Americans' perspective. The dominant narrative of the general public in relation to the events was probably one that assumed a group of hostile and unreasonable Indians had shown up in the nation's capital plotting to take over the BIA. To combat any assumptions the reader might have along these lines, Deloria did not treat the Trail of Broken Treaties as an isolated event but linked it to the atmosphere of anti-Indian hostility and the weariness and confusion of the protestors upon their arrival in Washington D.C. Recounting and accounting for the events, Deloria implied that the cause was a progression of frustration. Deloria's reframing of the story was rhetorically effective because it allowed him to portray the movement as of a group of peaceful protestors seeking justice who were manipulated by a group of CIA-agent villains into taking an action they had never intended.

As a result, in his description of the events that took place surrounding the Trail of Broken Treaties, Deloria was able to downplay the fault of the protestors in the BIA takeover and reassign agency of the event to the CIA. From there, he was able to stress his view that the Twenty Points were more important than anything else, despite the fact that the take-over had overshadowed their importance to the general public. In this way, Deloria's narrative of the event (as the title of his book suggests) presented the take-over as an unfortunate outcome that was unrelated to the real purpose of the Trail of Broken Treaties. The lasting message that Deloria was working toward maintaining was the underlying purpose of the Twenty Points: to reopen the treaty process between the U.S. government and tribal governments and to restore the native nations to their previous level of independence.

It is safe to assume that, as a retelling of the events of the Bureau take-over, the story was effective at providing an understanding to people both within and outside of the movement. Deloria's account of the event was a best-seller and is probably one of the most often cited versions in this respect.¹⁸ However, in its goal of refocusing attention to the Twenty Points, it was generally unsuccessful. The Twenty Points never achieved any real level of recognition after it was dismissed by the Nixon Administration.

“The Confrontation at Wounded Knee”

As Deloria explained, it was in January of 1973 that Wesley Bad Heart Bull was murdered in Buffalo Gap. Racial hostilities between whites and Native Americans escalated to a high degree in South Dakota following the trial of Bad Heart Bull's killer (who never served jail time as a result of his trial for “manslaughter”). However, according to Deloria, the tensions gradually abated and AIM leaders were assured by the government of a better level of justice in the future. With better relations forming, AIM leaders Russell Means and Dennis Banks moved to the Pine Ridge Reservation to celebrate what appeared to be a success in the movement (p. 64).

At this point in the narrative, Deloria provided an extensive review of the Oglala Sioux tribe (who lived on the Pine Ridge Reservation). His narrative included major events from the full breadth of history that lay between the two Wounded Knee confrontations. Those events

¹⁸See Forbes, 1981, p. 4.

included the assassination of Sitting Bull and the following massacre of women and children at the hands of the United States Army in the first confrontation at Wounded Knee. In addition, he discussed the Sioux's loss of their cattle during World War I (sold by a government agent "for war needs"), the allotment of their land following the war, and the development of a new tribal government following the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (p. 64-69). His purpose in providing this history of the Sioux was to establish a track record of their victimization at the hands of the United States.

The setup of the new tribal government due to the Reorganization Act is what had created the government that Richard Wilson became the leader of in 1972. It was Wilson, acting as tribal President at the Pine Ridge Reservation, who had sworn to prevent any further AIM protests from occurring at Pine Ridge. Therefore, when Means and Banks returned to Pine Ridge in 1973, Wilson did not hesitate in sending his "goon squad" (as the tribal police had come to be called by the residents of the reservation) to try and intimidate Means and Banks into leaving. In response to the hostility they were facing from the tribal police, the angered members of AIM took occupation of the small town of Wounded Knee.

Coincidentally, at the same time, several local Indian groups in Pine Ridge were in the process of trying to determine the nature of the rights they had been afforded by the Fort Laramie treaty of 1868. So, as the occupation was determining what their demands would be, it was decided that they would demand a review of the Treaty of 1868. In what Deloria called a "bold, dramatic, and probably legally sound" move, AIM requested that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee review the potential violations of the treaty that may have been committed by the United States government (p. 74).

Deloria provided his own justification by accounting for the AIM members' decision to make that call. He wrote,

Indian treaties had been ratified and proclaimed in the same manner as had foreign treaties. The federal courts had frequently concluded that Indian treaties had the same legal status as foreign treaties, and that the same doctrines of interpretation should be used to interpret the provisions of both kinds of treaties (p. 74).

Supporting his claim, Deloria alleged that statements made by the Library of Congress and the Senate Parliamentarian also informally upheld this idea.

In his recounting of the events, Deloria explained that during the seventy-two day standoff between AIM and the FBI that followed, Russell Means made the rhetorical move of going on national television and pronouncing that the Oglala Sioux Nation was declaring its independence from the United States. His basis was that the United States had illegally violated the provisions of its own 1868 treaty with the Sioux Nation. This radical statement, according to Deloria, left both the Native American community and the government in a state of “trauma” and the occupiers with an upper hand. He wrote,

The people at Wounded Knee lost no time in pushing their advantage. They sent emissaries to New York, and Indians began to show up at the United Nations seeking the assistance of friendly nations which might raise the question of the Sioux treaty before that body. While few tribal governments openly supported the Wounded Knee people, Indian country secretly glowed with the knowledge that the mouse had finally roared (p. 78).

Deloria wished to assert that Wounded Knee carried significance far greater than the goals of the confrontation itself. Through the issue of treaty rights, the confrontation had carried an international aspect and Deloria saw this as a means for launching a new perspective that held international implications. He wrote,

Wounded Knee marked a historic watershed in the relations of American Indians and the Western European peoples. The theory of treaties as articulated by the Oglalas called for a re-examination of the four centuries of contact between Indians and whites on the continent. In demanding independence for the Oglala Nation, the people at Wounded Knee sought a return to the days of pre-discovery, when the tribes of this land had political independence and sovereignty. They sought the recognition by the nations of the world of their rightful status as nations in the community of nations.

Wounded Knee marked the first sustained modern protest by aboriginal peoples against the Western European interpretation of history, for the Oglala Sioux refused to accept the definitions which the American legal system had used to cover up the status of Indian tribes and make them appear to be merely a minor domestic problem of the United States. In their declaration of independence, the Oglala Sioux spoke to the world about freedom for all aboriginal peoples from the tyranny of Western European thought, values, and interpretations of man's experiences...

The Third World ideology which proved so useful to Europeans in interpreting the events of the world in the last two decades seemed to be fulfilling itself in North America as well as Africa and Asia. Wounded Knee meant that American Indians were determined to seek their rightful place in the world existence which had previously been denied to them...

The frightening aspect of the declaration of Indian independence has many facets. It seems incredible to many Americans that Indians have feelings distinct from those of other Americans. This attitude had been developed by the sanitized version of world history which is taught in the American educational system. Children are taught that it was inevitable that Indians would be subjugated and become American citizens. Indian political allegiance is therefore assumed to be American...

What the occupation of Wounded Knee has done has been to remove the cloak of isolation behind which Americans hide from the rest of the world and confront them with the question of what constitutes a nation. Does a nation cease to exist when it is overrun by a larger nation? Or does it remain a nation so long as its people give it allegiance? Can the Oglala Sioux nation be consumed by the United States through the confiscation of its lands? Or does it exist so long as the people consider themselves Oglala Sioux? (p. 80-83)

This part of Deloria's book is what Yates and Hunter (2002) called the "world-history" narrative. It distinctly placed the actions of the movement at the level of "far reaching significance" meant to situate the movement in a "global context" (p. 128). For Deloria, American history had become a case of society going wrong. The American government had taken a path that was morally unjustified and had then developed a false version of history that

assumed untrue things about the Native Americans in order cover its mistakes. For Deloria, the story of the declaration of independence at Wounded Knee revealed that the American version of history was unable to truly answer the question of whether or not the tribes had ever fully lost their nationhood.

Deloria's strategy was the same as the one advocated by Manuel in his story of Alex Thomas (see "*We Honor Our Grandfathers Who Kept Us Alive*" in Chapter III). By questioning the "logic of good reasons"¹⁹ and the implicit values behind the assumption that Native Americans no longer retained their right to sovereignty, Deloria was challenging the myth that American society had presumed to be valid.

In terms of the six persuasive functions of a movement, this story is a continuation of Deloria's attempt to transform perceptions of reality. However, it can also be seen as a story meant to mobilize others to action. In sanctioning the actions taken by the AIM members, Deloria was encouraging others groups (in both the U.S. and throughout the world) to begin publicly questioning the status of Native American tribal sovereignty.

"The Doctrine of Discovery"

In the next three sections of his book, Deloria extensively attacked the legitimacy of three philosophical aspects of Western law that had come to be characteristic of Indian policy in the United States. Before a critical analysis can occur, a description of those three philosophical aspects is necessary. Therefore, before continuing with the critical analysis, the next three sections of this paper will briefly present Deloria's case against each of the three aspects of law and how, as a group, they served to create an ideology of domination that supported the removal of sovereignty from the Native Americans. In terms of Deloria's narrative, they represented the major antagonists or obstacles that stood in the way of Native Americans achieving their desired goal of sovereignty and self-determination. Therefore, this portion of his book provides a judgment on them as symbolic antagonists and immoral villains (so to speak) against the native people in America.

The first that Deloria discussed was what is generally called the "Doctrine of Discovery." The Doctrine of Discovery was the philosophical doctrine adopted by the European nations during the period of early exploration that dictated that the rights to acquire land and make

¹⁹Refer to page 26.

settlements on it belonged solely to the country that “discovered” that land. However, this did not allow for the rights of discovery to be taken when a group of people already possessed and inhabited the land as a sovereign nation. In other words, Spain could not simply decide to “discover” France and then claim sovereignty over it. The Doctrine of Discovery required that already existing sovereigns be respected and dealt with as sovereigns.

However, under the Doctrine of Discovery, aboriginal people who were not recognized as sovereign nations were not protected. Therefore, a colonizing “sovereign” had the right to determine how indigenous people would sell or convey the land they lived upon. Europeans assumed that it was not forceful stealing as long as land was not taken from another *nation* and the Europeans defined the meaning of what constituted a nation in their own terms.

Deloria made a strong case for why the Doctrine of Discovery was not only an illegitimate philosophy but also that it was not followed by the United States government anyway. He based his claim on the fact that both representatives of the English Crown and representatives of the later United States government signed multiple treaties with Indian nations. These treaties, all based on the European model of being a contract between two sovereign nations, inherently recognized the sovereign status of the Indian nations.

Therefore, by their own definitions, once the English signed the first treaty with an Indian nation, they lost their right (according to the Doctrine of Discovery) to claim the lands occupied by that particular indigenous nation. The English had, in effect, signed a legal agreement that recognized the Indian nations as equal sovereigns.

“Domestic Dependent Nations”

In some ways, this led to the second political doctrine attacked by Deloria that was used by the United States government to take land from the Native Americans. According to Deloria’s description, due to the need to characterize the Native American nations as being *incompletely* sovereign, the government had to invent a category under which they could put the indigenous nations in order to take their lands. Therefore, in the controversial U.S. Supreme Court case *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, Justice John Marshall made the assertion that the Cherokee Indian nation could not be considered a foreign nation because their lands were adjoining and enclosed within the United States. In order to justify the position of the United States government in taking the Cherokee’s land, he characterized them as being a “domestic

dependant nation” and that their relationship to the United States resembled that of a ward to a guardian. However, as Deloria claimed, there was no legal basis allowing for the court’s decision to “make” the Cherokee nation a “domestic dependant nation.” Instead, the decision seemed to be based in the interests of the U.S. and its economic need for expansion, which were pressured upon the court by President Andrew Jackson. As a result, this use of the idea of “domestic dependant nations” and the “Doctrine of Discovery” were then liberally applied to the Indian nations throughout North America in the taking of Indian territories.

“The Plenary Power Doctrine”

As a result, the court invented the Plenary Power Doctrine (the third political doctrine criticized by Deloria) in order to assume an almost complete governmental control over the Indian nations. This doctrine, developed by the courts late in the 19th Century, asserted that the courts did not need to investigate the constitutionality of governmental action taken in reference to indigenous people, because they were not a recognized political group in the United States that was protected by the Constitution. As a result, it was determined that the Supreme Court could defer authority to Congress and the executive branch. This gave both branches of government the unlimited freedom to take actions with regard to Indian lands, their trust funds, and their cultural existence with no consequences for any misuses they engaged in. Once again, there appears to be no legal justification for the court’s decision to do this other than the desire to further the interests of the United States.

In describing these three doctrines from the perspective of the political motivations that inspired their adoption, Deloria intended to provide a critical perspective for those attempting to understand the inconsistencies that had developed in Indian policy in the United States. One of the biggest problems that Deloria identified in the struggle for Indian Rights was the fact that many activists and lawyers working on behalf of the movement had internalized the “lies” inherent in the conceptualizations of the Doctrine of Discovery, Domestic Dependent Nation status, and Plenary Power Doctrine. After centuries of being normalized to believe the dominant narrative that the law was formed on the principle of justice, most of the activists of the late twentieth century had been conditioned to see the status of indigenous nations in the same conceptual terms as the society that dominated them. Deloria’s narrative reverses this by

proposing a causal relationship between white interests and the formation of the law, thus undermining the aura of legitimacy attached to law in a democracy as an institution presumably protecting the rights of all. His purpose in re-narrating the creation and character of these legal doctrines was to create a basis for others to continue questioning their legitimacy. Deloria believed that if he could get people to accept his criticisms and he could show that there truly was *no* legal justification for the Indian policy that had been promoted by the United States, then his readers might feel (as he did) that the legitimacy of the U.S. government was built on thin and delicate presumptions like a house of cards and could easily be made to fall. However, getting people to go along with something that undermines the basis of their society is easier said than done. Still, at the very least, in this section of his book, Deloria did give trial lawyers involved in Indian litigation an interesting new perspective on the law around which to mobilize. Deloria's re-narration and moralizing judgment of the setting in which the three philosophies developed attempted to enlighten his audience in a way that would explain the need for a change in setting and courses of action for the future. As Fine (2002) explained, narratives in social movements serve the dual function of being both retrospective and prospective. First, in recounting and accounting for events, stories process and moralize aspects of a society's shared past. Second, in creating this conceptualization of a shared past, stories coordinate future action by providing the audience with lessons and morals about the world that are meant to be taken as guides for behavior. Thus, in his recounting of these three doctrines, Deloria accomplishes a justification for others to take future actions in questioning the morality and validity of the assumptions made by American law.

"The Size and Status of Nations"

A quick summary of Deloria's narrative up to this point shows that he spent an extensive amount of time strategically re-narrating history because he needed to transform the perceptions that people had of the past of Native America in order to provide his vision for the future. Therefore, in showing that issues like sovereignty and self-determination were not new topics but rights that had been claimed by the Native Americans throughout time, Deloria avowed the indigenous claim to inherent nationhood. In relating a narrative account of the more recent past and present (of the Trail of Broken Treaties, the occupation of the BIA headquarters, and the seizure of Wounded Knee) from an indigenous perspective, Deloria was able to relate the

overblown media events to their underlying causes and provide a justification for their taking place. In order to undermine the perceived justice and legitimacy of the law, he provided a re-interpretation of the creation of Indian policy that allowed him to place the law within the overarching narrative of history, thus joining the law with its underlying motivation of governmental interests.

At this point, Deloria was finally ready to begin transforming his readers' perceptions of what the future of Native America could potentially become. However, he needed to convince his readers that the common objections his opponents used to argue against the Indian claim to sovereignty as nations were unfounded. His basic premise was that the argument against recognizing the tribes with fully sovereign status was based on a "misunderstanding" of the concept of sovereignty as it existed in modern international law and practice (p. 161).

Seeing sovereignty as being possible in the form of a protectorate relationship between the United States and the Indian nations, Deloria asserted that this would be a clear solution for the United States to solve the complex problems and errors of jurisdiction, authority, and responsibility that had plagued the United States government's relationship with the indigenous people. He wrote,

Indians are not seeking a type of independence which would create a totally isolated community with no ties to the United States whatsoever. On the contrary, the movement of today seeks to establish clear and uncontroverted lines of political authority and responsibility for both the tribal governments and the United States so as to prevent the types of errors and maladministration which presently mark the Indian scene (p. 162).

To prepare his counter-argument, Deloria identified five general reasons commonly made for why indigenous tribes could not become fully sovereign nations. These were that (1) "land areas presently possessed by Indians are too small to qualify," (2) "the United States totally surrounds the respective reservations," (3) the tribes have a very small population in comparison with other independent states," (4) "the tribes' lack an independent economic base," and 5) "many tribes lack sufficient education to succeed in the modern industrial society" (p. 161-162).

Deloria then narrated aspects of the present state of being for nations within the world, which showed how each of the objections were misrepresentative of the concept of sovereignty

as it existed internationally. For example, he cited multiple nations (like Luxembourg, Monaco, and Vatican City) that are smaller in both territorial land and population than several of the Native American tribes. He cited others (like San Marino, Lesotho, and Singapore) as examples of fully sovereign states that are totally surrounded by another nation. He cited nations (like Indonesia, India, and most of the Third World) as examples of fully sovereign nations that were incapable of economic independence. Last, he cited how most of the nations in the Third World had far less enrollment in schools than the Native Americans. Also, Native Americans had a higher literacy rate than many Third World countries at that time. Therefore, according to Deloria, the amount of education held by the people of a nation could not be considered a standard for determining its ability to hold sovereignty (if the standards applied to Native Americans were to be consistent with international practice).

At one point in his analysis, in a directly confrontational demand of the establishment, Deloria posed the question,

If the United States can participate in the creation of Israel as a national homeland for the Jews in partial compensation for the genocide committed against them by Hitler during the Second World War, why is the United States incapable of recognizing the Sioux Nation as sovereign over its lands in South Dakota in partial compensation for the genocide committed against it at Wounded Knee and other massacres? (p. 165).

This question accomplished two goals. First, it made reference to the genocidal practices engaged in by the United States Army toward Native Americans and did so in a way that drew an analogy between the United States and Nazi Germany. This association was strategically an indirect vilification used to illegitimize the United States. Second, it held the creation of Israel as a precedent in international political practice for providing reparation to the victims of genocide by providing them with a land base for the creation of a new fully sovereign state. This allowed Deloria to begin adopting the values and practices of international policy to further legitimize his claims.

Deloria concluded his chapter by stating,

...in the world today sovereignty permits an abundance of different forms of relative dependence or interdependence, any of which could be available as a model for a future U.S. Government-Indian relationship. Therefore, the proposal advanced in this book and by other Indian spokesmen for a return to the sovereign relationship of the early nineteenth century has every justification from an international point of view (p. 186).

This explanation of the practice of sovereignty in global politics continued Deloria's objective of making the issue of the creation of a fully sovereign Indian state less of an abstract desire and more of a potentially realizable reality, thus giving further legitimacy to his claims. In narrative terms, the event of the creation of Israel and the conditions under which it came into being, along with the existence of other nations that shared common characteristics with the Indian nations, presented an argument by analogy for how the Native Americans could aspire to sovereignty. If Israel could reach its goal, then the natives could too.

"The Indian Reorganization Act"

In a seemingly backward step in his next chapter, Deloria left this vision of the future to return to describing issues of the past. Deloria claimed that for the Pine Ridge Indians, the major indication of their loss of sovereignty was the adoption of the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) of 1934. Once again, providing his own retelling of history, Deloria explained that the original version of the IRA announced federal policy to allow the Indians to develop their own tribal self-government. It called for education that stressed the importance of Indian culture. It required the end of the allotment practices. Last, it created the Court of Indian Affairs to preside over all legal issues dealing with Native American controversies.

However, as described by Deloria, the IRA became a controversial piece of legislation for many groups who found faults with various aspects of it. As a result of the controversy and the multiple sides attempting to change different parts of the legislation, the final version had many changes from the original and reflected several differing and conflicting viewpoints. The conflicted final version was the beginning of many problems in Indian policy.

Due to a clause added to the final version (called the option clause), the members of the tribes were only given a one-year period to vote if they wanted to organize a tribal government

under the Act. This was a major problem, because many of the people did not have enough time to understand the many disjointed aspects of the Act. Also, following relocation and the sale of allotments by tribal members, it was difficult to determine which individuals were still considered “members” of a tribe. Even more important was that the norms of Indian culture did not fit with the norms of United States voting. As a result, those who dissented to the Act simply refrained from voting as an indication of their rejection of the bill. The United States government took many people’s decision to not vote as an indication of their consent and therefore, as Deloria recounted, the Act passed for tribes like the Sioux.

Deloria argued that the IRA still did have some good aspects to it; however, these were soon subverted by the federal government, which decided to ignore aspects of the legislation it had passed in order to continue acting in ways it wanted toward the Native Americans. Despite the fact that the final version that was passed was unlike the original, the fundamental assumptions of the original document were based in the idea of upholding the Native right to aboriginal sovereignty. Unfortunately, the general view taken by bureaucrats was that the IRA had been a form of trade-off, where aboriginal sovereignty was lost and replaced with formally recognized powers granted by the government.

For many in the federal government, this ended the question of native sovereignty. For Deloria, however, the IRA did not change the inherent sovereign status of the Indian nations that adopted it. His support for this was the Supreme Court case of *Toledo v. Pueblo de Jamez*, which found that adoption of the IRA did not remove the Pueblo Indian’s right to forbid protestant Christian missionaries from entering the Pueblo. The Supreme Court’s decision to uphold the Indians’ right to protect their religious freedoms assumed their right to self-govern on the reservations.

Therefore, for Deloria, the problem of Indian status did not lie in the adoption of the IRA but in the years of colonial rule attempting to subvert the inherent right of Native people to self-govern. Concluding the chapter, Deloria wrote, “[The original] intent in creating the Indian Reorganization Act was to use this newly clarified legal status as the prototype for legal reform in the conditions of Indians in both Americas. That is precisely the proposal of this book, at least with respect to the Indians of the United States” (p. 206).

Once again, Deloria is trying to make the point that history in the United States had diverted from the correct path. His description of the creation of the IRA was meant to show that

the United States had, at one point, been trying to reform itself in a way that would provide the Native Americans with the self-governance they deserved. However, the law's implementation had been faulty and had only furthered the political ambiguity of where the Indian nations stood in terms of sovereignty and self-determination.

Setting in this part of Deloria's narrative was also important, for it was not the IRA itself but the remnants of colonial suppression and antiquated mythical assumptions that clouded the act's usage and made it incapable of meeting its true intended purpose for promoting Native American self-determination.

This section is effective in serving its intended purpose of explaining the development of the IRA and its uses and pitfalls to his readers. However, it seems out of place in the context of the rest of the text. Up to this chapter, Deloria had kept a fairly structured chronological organization for his narrative. He started with the distant past and then moved through the recent past. After that, he recounted the national policies that hindered the future of native sovereignty and then listed the issues in the international state of the world that provided a future potential for native sovereignty. However, with this chapter, his focus moved back to the past. It would have been more logical for this to have been explained after the first chapter or with his discussion of the three philosophical doctrines. He may have done this in order to separate the significance of the passing of the IRA from the rest of history. It is obvious that he saw the IRA as a definitive step in American Indian policy that had held a great amount of potential but had fallen short of that potential. Due to this characteristic of Deloria's opinion of the IRA, his retelling of the passing of the IRA was not simply a retelling of the past, but also functioned as a vision of how the future could finally meet the potential for a positive level of native sovereignty by finishing what the IRA had started. In commenting on the work of John Collier, who originally designed the IRA, Deloria wrote, "His intent in creating the Indian Reorganization Act was to use this newly clarified legal status as a prototype for legal reform in the conditions of Indians in both Americas. That is precisely the proposal of this book" (p. 206).

"Litigating Indian Claims"

In this chapter, Deloria recounted the progression of the multifaceted legal status of Indian nations throughout time in an effort to clarify the historical process by which the American legal treatment of Indians had become so complex. Continuing his narrative of the

manifold factors that had come to shape the Native American world, Deloria maintained that the Indian community had consistently been defined by the United States government in terms that best suited the United States' needs. Moreover, he claimed that there had been a consistent legal double-standard applied to Indians that had never been applied to the United States or its citizens.

Attempting to prove these claims, Deloria described how some early treaties signed by the federal government had contained stipulations that the tribes would have to pay reparations for any depredation that they committed against a *citizen of the United States* (and vice versa). Later on, many whites used this aspect of the treaties to file judicial claims against the Native Americans in the years that followed the Indian war, seeing the potential for a substantial payoff. In 1891, the government passed the Indian Depredations Act to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction for forcing Indian tribes into an "unlimited liability for acts committed in the Indian wars" (p. 212). This was despite the fact that the court remained closed to any claims made by Indians about injuries inflicted on them by the whites during that time.

For Deloria, the legal basis of the Indian Depredations Act necessarily had to assume that the Indian nations were independent and sovereign. Otherwise, if they were not, then the tribes (being nothing more than a group existing *within* the protection of United States) could not have been held responsible as a whole for injuries suffered by other Americans. In other words, if they were "domestically dependent" and existing under the lawful jurisdiction of the United States, then they could not justifiably be held liable for their actions in the terms that would have been applied to a separate nation engaging in war against the United States. Instead, they could only be held accountable in the same way that any other common citizen would be. Therefore, only those individuals specifically proven to be responsible for the destructive acts could be held responsible for damages and not the entire tribe. They could only be held responsible for war crimes as an entire tribe if they constituted what the government considered a distinctly separate foreign nation. So, by holding the tribes responsible for war crimes, the United States violated the legal precedent assumed by the *Cherokee Nation v Georgia* case.

Moreover, the United States' application of this policy was selectively upholding one specific aspect of the Indian treaties (the agreement for the payment of reparations) while ignoring the rest of the treaty, including the fact that the initiating force of the Indian wars was the vast encroachment of whites on lands that had been set aside for the Indians by those very

treaties. Also during that time, in a decision that further complicated the matter and acted inconsistent with the recently established practice of recognizing the tribes as if they were foreign nations in the Depredations Act, the Supreme Court (in *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock*) declared that the Indian nations had *never* been independent and were under the plenary power of congress.

Once again, Deloria's strategy was to undermine the legitimacy of the federal government. By his account, the law that had determined the present state of Indian policy had been consistent only in its inconsistency. Its dealings with the Indians were at a point where federal Indian policy held little meaning to anyone, either to the federal government or to the Native Americans it had been ineffectively applied to and, as Deloria suggested, meaninglessness in law equates to illegitimacy.

Building upon this inconsistent and illegitimate basis for the practice of law, Deloria recounted how a period of forced development and mismanagement of Indian monies and lands followed the Depredations period. Along with the mismanagement, the government created the Indian Court of Claims to hear cases of grievances suffered by Native Americans prior to 1946. However, the Court was mainly designed to clear out any further discussion of reparations that were owed to the Native Americans and not to settle any real legal issues affecting Indian policy.

Deloria contended that despite the general assumptions of lawyers in the United States (most of whom were generally unfamiliar with the actual history and purpose of the Court of Claims) there was still never any legal liquidation of the Native Americans' political claims against the United States. The treaty obligations were never settled by the Court (only certain issues of monetary reparation for mismanagement were) and the right of Native Americans to continue claiming national status remained undamaged. Thus, through a very elaborate telling of the history of the courts and their relationship to Native Americans, Deloria was able to mark out an important condition in the present state of being for Native American tribes: that they still had the legal right to proclaim themselves as nations. He wrote,

The present payment from claims cases received by tribes does not settle treaty obligations, but is more in the nature of compensating tribes for the real-estate-contract aspect of their treaties. The issue of political status and sovereign rights of the tribes remains the important and unresolved issue. There has been no liquidation of the

political claims against the United States, and the national status of the Indian tribe remains intact. Rather than finally settling the Indian claims against the United States, the Indian Claims Commission works merely to clear out the underbrush and allow the claims created by the forced political and economic dependency during the last century to emerge (p. 227-228).

As already mentioned, the main point of this portion of Deloria's historical narrative was to establish legitimacy for the movement by removing it from the United States government and its inconsistent practices. Deloria typified the American judicial system as having dodged its way through a century of Indian issues by making conflicting legal maneuvers that had eventually left it in the same place it started. Despite any claims made by members of the legal community, the government was still without a legal justification for assuming control over the American Indian tribes and was not capable of reaching its goal without trampling its own standard of justice.

Throughout the course of the historical narrative of his text, Deloria characterized the two opposing forces of the American government and the indigenous tribes almost as if they were attorneys in a trial. Though each side can *assume* it represents justice and morality, only one side can actually represent the truth. His narrative presents the two characters of the Native Americans and the United States in a way that invites the reader to judge which side was more likely to carry the truth.

In stories, characters that show conflicting traits in their behaviors are representative of individuals (or institutions, in this case) that are uncertain. Also, characters who are uncertain of truth obviously cannot claim to know the truth. However, characters who remain consistent in behavior can claim, at the very least, to know what truth is for them.

Therefore, in the context of the overarching historical narrative that Deloria presented, the American government could not claim to *know* that Indian nations were not truly nations, because its behavior was conflicting and represented an institutional level of indecision on the topic. Despite the fact that certain identifiable members in the institution of American government (for example, President Andrew Jackson) could claim consistency in their opinions on Native Americans, the institution as a whole could not. By making the American government

(as one entity) a main character in his narrative, Deloria was able to characterize it with the attributes of indecision, inconsistency, and the incapability of knowing truth because inconsistency, as a personal attribute, shows an error in judgment.

In contrast, the Native Americans (as they were characterized by Deloria) could claim that their behavior had never been uncertain. Regardless of where certain members stood on the political issues of the twentieth century, their tradition had always been consistently to see themselves as autonomous and separate from the rest of the United States. For Deloria, their consistency indicates the knowledge of a higher truth. The “truth” is that regardless of any imposed or assumed colonial authority, people who see themselves as a nation cannot lose their identity as a nation as long as they continue to envision themselves in those terms. Thus, as a presentation in narrative terms, Deloria’s argument appeared effective and sound.

“The International Arena”

At this stage in his narrative, Deloria finally began addressing issues of the international political scene. Deloria opened this chapter by explaining that many discontented Indians and Indian groups had been calling for the issue of their status to be taken to the world court in the years that had preceded the 1973 seizure of Wounded Knee. In 1940, a gathering of indigenous representatives from nations in North and South America, called the Inter-American Indian Conference, began meeting to discuss problems of native people in the Western hemisphere. However, as reported by Deloria, the governments that sponsored the conferences often held strict regulations on who could attend and the formal policies of the conference often prevented any real criticism of a nation’s policy toward its Indians. The participation of the United States in the conference was also (as admitted in formal statements written by the government and provided by Deloria) meant to prevent “the accusation by organized Indian groups in this country that the United States is neglecting its international obligations towards the Indian” (p. 236).

Deloria saw the United States’ stance on the conference as an indication that it recognized the validity of the Native Americans’ claim to international political status. He wrote,

The federal government is afraid that the Indian organizations might accuse it of failing to fulfill its *international obligations* to Indians. There is, then, an international dimension to Indian problems and Indian existence, recognized by the nations of the Western Hemisphere and carefully obscured by the United States government through rhetoric, that continues to emerge with the rising consciousness of peoples around the world becoming aware of the conditions of Indians on the American continents. The fear of the United States is that Indians may become a world issue and that the carefully constructed theories concerning the demise of the American Indian may be revealed to a startled world as slightly premature” (p. 236).

Deloria also asserted that the United States *was* negligent in its assumed obligations to Indians, because the Indian delegates who were selected by the government to attend were usually people who were not likely do anything “embarrassing” to the United States by expressing criticisms of any other nation’s policies. Deloria supported this claim by citing the fact that during the 1972 conference, the Indian delegates from the U.S. had actually proposed a resolution to honor Brazil in its policies towards its Indians, despite the fact that European journalists had been making extensive reports of mass genocide against indigenous groups taking place in the Amazon forests of Brazil

This led Deloria to his second topic in describing the state of being for the United States and Native Americans’ involvement in international affairs: the Genocide Convention. Deloria made it a special point to discuss the fact that the United States, as of 1974, had not ratified the Genocide Convention (originally signed by the international community in 1948) which was designed to make the practice of genocide a punishable crime under international law.²⁰ Deloria saw this as an indication that the United States was aware that some of its practices could easily be interpreted as genocidal. For example, Deloria pointed to practices taken by the United States Army in its conflicts in South East Asia. Moreover, he pointed to Indian policy in the United States in its practice of systematically attempting to destroy the Native American cultures, as an example of a continued system of genocide. He wrote,

²⁰As a point of reference, the United States did eventually ratify the Genocide Convention in 1988. Then, in 2000, the U.S. ratified the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court allowing the international court to have jurisdiction over the United States in matters of genocide. However, the U.S. renounced its signature of the Rome Statute in 2002 (Prevent Genocide International, 2003).

The question of the Genocide Convention has not yet been settled by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Perhaps the disgusting behavior of the United States in Southeast Asia has made some Senators hesitant about endorsing a convention that the United States has systematically been violating for nearly a generation.

Even if we allow the courts of the United States the luxury of developing their own very favorable interpretation of the Genocide Convention's words and phrases, questions regarding the treatment of American Indians will eventually arise. Federal policy for the major portion of this century had been oriented toward the systematic destruction of Indian communities (p. 244).

As a definition of human rights that sprang from the United Nations, Deloria's discussion of the Genocide Convention is an important aspect for revealing his rhetorical strategy in this chapter. Through his recounting of the events at Wounded Knee in one of his previous chapters, Deloria had already sanctioned the idea that indigenous groups needed to start taking their issues to the world court. Deloria's encouragement of the movement in seeking further recognition from the United Nations revealed that he was aware of the potential for a transnational growth in Native American rights. This is because, as an organization created in response to the atrocity of World War II, the United Nations had distinct aspects in its design that were meant for promoting endeavors to prevent immoral treatment of human beings. When the UN was founded, the members of the world community had sensed the need to prevent a situation like that of Nazi Germany from ever happening again. From this desire, the United Nations began developing its sense of purpose. Consequently, much of the modern purpose that has come to be ascribed to the UN is that its predominant role is not simply in protecting the rights of its nation-state members, but of working to protect the human rights of the individuals in the world community that are most vulnerable to the aggressions of the state. This character of the UN made it an optimum forum for indigenous groups to project their movement efforts across the world.

The fact that the United States had been hesitant in devoting itself to certain principles of human rights that the United Nations had long advocated (values that related directly to the past treatment of the Native Americans) provided a foothold that Native Americans could exploit for gaining access to the United Nations and airing their grievances in an international forum. It is

logical to assume that Deloria was aware of this potential and that this was his motivation for recounting the United States' history with the Genocide Convention. He appears to have been successful in his goal of stimulating interest in the international forum (as will be explained in the next chapter).

In terms of narrative structure, this chapter established a new character in Deloria's narrative: The Genocide Convention. As a character in his historical narrative, the Convention acted as a helper supporting Native Americans in their goal to claim international political status by making their claim to legitimacy more salient to the world stage. The setting of the Inter-American Indian Conference and the United States' behavior of honoring the nation of Brazil in that forum, despite their genocidal practice, served the purpose of exemplifying the extent to which the United States was at odds with internationally held values of human rights.

“Reinstituting the Treaty Process”

Deloria began this chapter by providing a description of the present situation of Native Americans. He saw the period of the 1970s as a turning point in their history as a people. For him, it was a time when Native Americans were at the greatest risk of losing the unique distinctiveness that had once made their cultures prosperous. It was also a time when Native Americans had been looking for answers to why their tribal societies were breaking apart. They looked to history, legal doctrines, and the rest of the world for answers to their problems.

For Deloria, the answer to the root of their problems lay with the many incompatible definitions for the status of Native American tribes that had been used by the government to describe their relationship to the United States. Providing a vision for the setting of the future and prescribing a course of action to bring that vision to reality, Deloria encouraged the government to adopt the definition of making the tribes “protectorates” of the United States, thus restoring their sovereign status to them. Deloria saw this as a way of answering the problems faced by not only the Indians but also the government. In passing jurisdiction over to the tribal governments, the United States would no longer be held liable for the gross mismanagement of Indian lands and funds. Also, funding money would be saved by eliminating the need for bureaucratic organizations like the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Meanwhile, the Native Americans would be assured that no more of their lands could be taken by the United States government and their customs could remain intact. Both the tribal governments and the U.S. governments would

be able to clearly define their roles and expectations with one another by reinstating the treaty process as a way of creating formal agreements between two nations. Also, it would remove the problems of the vast complexity of Indian law and policy. Congress would no longer have to devote time to making the minutely detailed decisions required of them to continue enforcing U.S. control over the many different tribes throughout the nation.

Deloria acknowledged that this solution was an idealized one that assumed a great deal of trust to be placed in the hands of the Native Americans. However, he also stressed that the alternative was not very promising. Deloria related that at that time the United States was spending nearly a billion dollars a year on training new bureaucrats to work on solving Indian problems that were not going away. In the conclusion of his book, Deloria succinctly presented his prescribed course of action. He wrote,

We would strongly recommend that the United States government face the Indian problem squarely. That it acknowledge to the nations of the world that international status of Indian nations as perhaps among the smallest and weakest nations of the world but yet as nations with an inherent right to political and cultural existence comparable to any other nation.

We would strongly recommend that the United States reinstitute treaty-making with Indian tribes on a tribal or regional basis, and that that mechanism be used to clarify and define the rights which an Indian tribe has. In conjunction with the treaty-making process, we recommend that those programs which the United States and the tribe reach an agreement on be the programs of the reservations, and that the Department of the Interior be forbidden to develop programs of its own design which are then forced upon the reservations under the guise of federal policy (p. 261-262).

Chapter V: Summary of Analysis, Follow-Up and Future Implications

The issues facing indigenous peoples are not new. Loss of territory, loss of cultural identity, and loss of sovereignty are just a few of the issues that have threatened the livelihood of indigenous groups in the past. Increased globalization of business has impacted these groups in the modern era because it has increased the speed with which these other threats can become a serious problem for indigenous people. As cultural encroachment and the dominance of Western ideology continues to spread across the globe, more and more groups of people like the indigenous will find it harder to resist the influence of powerful outside corporations and governments.

At the same time, modern technology has created a worldwide network of communication structures that help provide options for these groups of people to create messages for defending their worldviews. Globalization also helps provide the opportunity for these groups to connect with others in similar situations to band together. It has afforded the potential for messages from indigenous cultures to be disseminated among inside and outside publics, opening communication avenues in environments that are both internal and external to the indigenous community. Therefore, the rhetorical effectiveness of the messages that are coming from indigenous groups today may be incremental in helping them to maintain their traditional lifestyles and values.

This thesis has attempted to provide a case study look at indigenous authors of the past who were capable of providing rhetorically effective messages that were influential in internal and external publics during a period of importance for their movement. This analysis was meant to provide indications for how modern indigenous leaders can also make effective use of narrative argument in their struggle against issues stemming from globalization.

The approach of this rhetorical analysis started with a definition of narrative taken from Foss (1996), which was any presentation or ordering of a sequence of events or states of being that created a particular view of the world “through the description of a situation involving characters, actions, and setting” (p. 400). Applying this definition, the aspects of the texts considered “narrative” in form were then identified and examined through several narrative components in terms of how they helped to formulate the worldview presented by Manuel and Deloria. These components were events, characters, setting, time relationships, causal relationships, and the main point.

When discussing the main point of the story, aspects of movement theory were incorporated to tailor the analysis to examine the functioning of the narratives in the context of a social movement. The conclusions that came from looking at this lists of components and persuasive functions were meant to demonstrate how Manuel and Deloria were able to fit Walter Fisher's original conception of a good narrative by meeting the criteria of narrative probability (or coherence of the message within the text) and fidelity (or how they were able to remain consistent with the values of their intended audiences). Also, the writers of each text were explored in terms of how they developed the narrative components identified by Foss to structure their worldview, how they addressed and met Stewart et. al.'s six persuasive functions of social movements while fostering political action on Leatherman et. al.'s three levels of global politics (people-to-people, national, and transnational).

Probability and Fidelity

Both *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality* and *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence* can be considered to have a high level of persuasive capability as narratives. An indication of their power as rhetorical artifacts is the fact that they each presented a strong level of narrative probability in terms of the coherence within their individual structures. The narratives within Manuel's book were all linked by the common themes of a need for mutual dependence, mutual respect and an open dialogue between the two cultures. Deloria's book, as a re-narrating of history, was designed in a way that all of his discussion on the varying different subjects eventually led back to the same need for tribes to be given a fully sovereign protectorate status by the United States.

Another indication of their validity as acts of rhetoric in addressing the social issues of their time is the level to which they resonate with each other. Exhibiting narrative probability to one another as representative indigenous narratives, Manuel's and Deloria's works had several key aspects in common. This was despite the fact that the types of narratives used by each author were very different in their approach to the issues they discussed. Their common themes included the fact that they both made it a point to place the movement within an ongoing resistance to colonization that stemmed back to the earliest times of European settlement in North America. Both spent much of their texts discussing the downfalls of the bureaucratic

systems that governed Indian policy in their country. Both directly petitioned their governments for action in restoring tribal sovereignty and reinstating the treaty process. Last, both exhibited an increased interest in gaining support from other world nations and indigenous groups.

In terms of narrative fidelity, the implicit and explicit values revealed in the texts were fundamentally in line with basic American values. Manuel and Deloria both placed value on the traditions of their ancestors, their inherent right to autonomy for living however they chose, and their right to own and use their own property however they chose. These values were appropriate for them to uphold in arguing for the right to native sovereignty and self-determination. Those values are consistent with ones that most Americans take for granted as being inherent rights of all people, which made it likely for them, at the very least, to understand the merit of the “transcendent issue” that Manuel and Deloria were arguing for. The issue that Indigenous people were a distinct group of people who had been maltreated by the governments of North America in that past and, as a result, deserved to have their sovereignty returned to them was not something that violated people’s notions of the ideal human conduct. Though the changes that they called for required a massive restructuring of political organization in their respective countries, in terms of the inbuilt values of North American society, Manuel’s and Deloria’s contentions were still undeniably moral and just.

The Narrative Elements

The presentation of events in Manuel’s narratives was designed to be analogous to conditions in society. His specific examples of the daily life for Native Americans were meant to be representative of what the world had become for Native Americans in the twentieth century. In this way, the events in his narratives were *stative* and were assumed to be representative of characteristics of the two cultures of Native America and European-American Canada that were ingrained and slow to change.

His commentary on the events was designed to provide supplementary meaning to what should be already be obvious to his audience. For example, in his telling of the story of Alex Thomas,²¹ Manuel assumed that it was obvious to his readers, even prior to his stating it, that the priest’s treatment of the children was unethical and Thomas’s reaction was just. The connections

²¹See page 62.

to society were also meant to be apparent. The unethical actions of the priest forcing the children into hard labor were meant to be representative of the general conditions of all boarding schools. His presentation of the stative conditions of white society allowed him to imply that Native Americans needed to be allowed to govern themselves. In this case, Native Americans needed to run their own schools, because white society had not been capable of treating their children ethically.

A fault of Manuel's text was that the majority of his narratives were of specific instances from which he attempted to make generalizations. Though this does not violate the basic premise of narrative argument, it does leave Manuel's text less effective than it would have been had he diversified more in the types of narrative arguments that he was making. Very personalized narratives have the potential to connect deeply and emotionally with those who easily identify with the experiences described, but they are far less convincing to those who do not share those experiences. Therefore, to the general public outside of the movement, they are less powerful in their attempt to claim a representation of reality.

The meaning of the events in Deloria's narratives was not so immediately apparent. Deloria presented the events as significant pieces of history by themselves. The general conditions of society that they represented were only apparent when Deloria assigned his own interpretation and commentary to the events. In this way, the events of his narratives were *active* and mainly representative of actions that were significant by themselves. For example, in his discussion of the Indian Reorganization Act,²² the decisions taken by the government in the implementation of the Act were only meant to represent specific actions of policy and not unchanging aspects of society. This allowed him to suggest that the policy could easily be changed to function in a different way if the government would simply begin to take a different course of actions.

In terms of his presence as a narrator, Manuel consistently placed himself within his narratives by telling them from a first-person perspective. Either he or specific individuals he had known in his life were the main characters. Quite often he was the protagonist of the story and the either the government or white society, in one form or another, were the antagonists. Hence, he generally characterized himself as a victim of the establishment.

²²See page 102.

The psychological vantage point of Manuel's first person account was very intimate for the reader. It freely encouraged the audience to feel the outrage and frustrations that he had felt in experiencing the events he described and made his presence an intrusive (in that, he placed himself and the reader inside the event) part of the stories through his commentary on the events. Manuel's approach of narrating his life experiences helped him to claim a certain level of authority over the issues he was discussing. His narrative implied a certain higher wisdom of one who had experienced the problems and issues faced by Native American's firsthand. Though his vantage point encouraged his audience to identify with his perspective, it avoided encouraging that the two cultures should become one with each other. Instead, it maintained that there should be an acknowledgement by white society of its role in creating the dire situation of the Native Americans and an acknowledgement of mutual respect.

In terms of his presence as a narrator, Deloria differed from Manuel by distancing himself from his stories. Even in the one story he told from the first person perspective (of the meeting of the National Congress of American Indians),²³ he made no reference to his own role in the event but merely characterized himself as an observer. He generally assumed the role of the omniscient narrator, allowing him to retell history from the vantage point of a removed critic. Due to the nature of his narrative as a re-telling of history, his main characters were usually institutions, like the United States government or the American Indian Movement (AIM), instead of specific people. This made his role as the narrator much less personal than the role Manuel assumed. This difference in the level of intrusiveness of the two as narrators probably had a lot to do with who they were as individuals. Though both were national leaders among Native Americans in their respective countries, Manuel was predominantly a tribal and community leader, while Deloria was predominantly an academic. As an academic, Deloria's writing was far more formal and assumed more authority as an intellectual scholar in the assertions it made.

The different settings of the narratives as the frames within which the narrators presented their stories colored Manuel and Deloria's narratives in different ways. The settings of Manuel's narratives were more likely to place the characters in personal situations. Often, as a result of the personal interactions they experiences, the characters were forced to make a choice. An example would be his narration of the Expo '67 committee meeting where he the other members were forced to choose between the pavilion designs that had been created by indigenous artists and the

²³See page 81.

expensive model presented by the Department of Indian Affairs.²⁴ This type of situation in a story, where the character is forced to make a difficult choice, indirectly invites the reader to place himself/herself in the position of the characters. In fact, Manuel even made reference to imagining how the artists felt at finding out the Department had already spent a massive amount of money in its attempt to outdo their designs.

In contrast, Deloria's method of setting his narratives in the context of political and judicial venues, like in his description of the occupation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs office²⁵ or the formation of the Indian Claims Court,²⁶ presented the events in a way that invited the reader to judge the validity of the actions taken by the characters. In this way, Manuel placed the readers *within* the setting to treat them as participants in the formation of the story, while Deloria placed his readers *beyond* the setting to treat them as outside observers and judges.

The social setting in Manuel's narratives was usually characterized as an environment where indigenous people, due to the circumstances of the time period in which he was writing, were being pulled in opposing directions. The backdrop for his stories was often the affect of the split between the two societies of white and native North America on the Indians. Manuel's frame for the problem was that the whites were not respecting the rights and contributions of Native Americans. Whites presupposed that Native Americans needed to reject their traditional way of life but reality for Manuel suggested the opposite. Those in the Native American community who attempted to adopt the predominant white culture most often only ended in poverty and a declined standard of living. This maintained idea that the two societies were only both functional as separate entities working parallel to one another was what allowed Manuel to use his narratives to argue for a political separation of the two societies despite the fact that his narratives encouraged the audience to only take a native perspective.

This aspect of Manuel's approach can be seen as both an advantage and a disadvantage. This is because the nature of his work, in its more personalized atmosphere, would necessarily be more likely to validate the personal experiences of other Native Americans while instilling a sense of personal guilt in white Canadians. As a result, Manuel's work may have appealed more to the Indian portion of his audience than to the white portion.

²⁴See page 72.

²⁵See page 89.

²⁶See page 104.

In addition, while writing about very specific situations of his experiences in Canada, he often assumed that the reader understood the situation he was discussing. For example, when he discussed the Expo '67 pavilion, he included few details explaining the international nature of the event or the significance and purpose of the pavilion itself (I had to look these up in Stanton, 1997). This is a fault that prevents his work from being easily understood by people outside of the Canadian culture and should be avoided by people attempting to address issues of global significance.

The setting for Deloria generally remained within the context of the political environment for Indian/government relations. Whether it was the fields of protest or the courtrooms, the settings in Deloria's narrative were consistently places where the interests of the government and the native people collided. This gave his narrative the appearance of a much more "outside" perspective and allowed Deloria to characterize the struggle in simplistic terms that made the issues easily understood by people who were both inside and outside American culture.

Both Manuel and Deloria moved freely between the past, present and future in their narratives and did not follow the natural order of time. Manuel often discussed events from his life alongside events that had taken place hundreds of years before he was born, in order to draw connections between the past and the present. Deloria freely traveled between the retelling of aspects of the past and present while projecting potential aspects of the future. He engaged in summarizing vast periods of time and indiscriminately engaged in commentary and evaluation of the events throughout the course of his narrative.

In this way, the true chronological organization of the events was ignored in both texts. This aspect of their writing is consistent with the traditional worldview taken by indigenous cultures that tend not to think of time in terms of linear progression. Unfortunately, this is also a potentially problematic issue that presents a unique dilemma for indigenous rhetors. The purpose of most indigenist rhetoric is to assert the right of indigenous people to maintain their own standards of living and worldviews. However, in order to be rhetorically effective with their messages aimed at addressing audiences outside of their indigenous communities, indigenous rhetors must adopt the perspectives and methods of logic that are held by the outside culture they are attempting to influence. Though it may have seemed logical to Manuel and Deloria to present events out of chronological order, it ran the risk of making their messages

more confusing to members of white society. This is because Western (European/American) cultures think of time as a linear progression.

Deloria seemed to resolve this dichotomy much better than Manuel. Despite being out of chronological order, Deloria's text was much more able to tie the various events in a way that still presented a type of progression. As a narrative argument, his retelling of history appeared to proceed from one topic to another in a progression of importance, instead of one of time, for establishing the right of Native Americans to claim sovereignty. Retelling the history in his own way by actively choosing what to address and how to address its intended importance allowed him to simplify the complex situation of Native America in way that his readers could easily understand.

In contrast, Manuel's text lacked the surface appearance of any intentional Western progression of logical thought and mostly leapt from one topic to the next. At one point in his text, Manuel actually discussed how the stories that were traditionally considered "good" in his culture were ones that were told in such a way as to cover many topics and situations at once. For Manuel, this was seen as a strength in a narration, because it made the story applicable to different situations and capable of being interpreted in multiple directions to fit the needs of the audience (p.36-38). This may very well have been his intended goal in writing *The Fourth World*. Unfortunately, it is this particular quality of his writing that often appeared to subvert his intended message as an act of rhetoric.

This difference between the two authors provides an explanation for why Manuel's book mostly remained successful among other indigenous communities where the people reading it could best identify with the message he was presenting. Meanwhile, Deloria's book went on to become a best-seller even in white American society.

In both Manuel's and Deloria's books, the causal relationships were consistently instances where intentional human actions had caused negative consequences for the Native Americans. The process of colonization and its results were not characterized by either as being accidental in any way. They were almost always directly linked to actions taken with deliberate motives for serving white interests. This allowed both to foster the idea that white society had a responsibility to fix the damage of its actions and restore Native Americans to their proper place.

The Six Persuasive Functions of Social Movement

Though they both engaged in all six of the persuasive functions of social movement, the vast majority of both texts were dedicated to the functions of transforming perceptions of reality and legitimizing the movement. Manuel and Deloria's efforts to transform perceptions of reality coincided with Stone-Mediatore's (2003) description of how narratives are typically used by marginal groups. Many of their stories were designed to re-narrate their identity in a way that denied the dominant group's devaluing of them and asserted their right to claim a status of nationhood. For example, Manuel discussed how the indigenous worldview developed as a way of life that was designed to insure the continued survival of all living things, while the European worldview was designed to dominate and take resources from others.²⁷ This re-narrated the identity of Native Americans in a way that was meant to dispel the notion that they were uncivilized compared to the Europeans. This also served the further purpose of addressing how the Indigenous nations met one of White's (1985) criteria of a nation: "civilization."²⁸ Deloria engaged in the same kind of re-narration of identity when he asserted that the indigenous nations had many characteristics in common with other fully-sovereign nations.²⁹ Specifically, he noted that they were of equal size and population to some nations of the world. This served to meet the two criteria that White called "significance" and "territory." Also, by claiming that the indigenous nations had never officially relinquished their sovereignty and continued to think of themselves in terms of their status as distinctive groups of people, Manuel and Deloria both were attempting to re-narrate the identity of the Native Americans in a way that met White's last two criteria of "solidarity" and "sovereignty."

Both Manuel and Deloria also engaged in re-narrating agency in their efforts to transform perceptions of reality. Several of their narratives, like Manuel's story of Alex Thomas and Deloria's condemnation of the United States' failure to ratify the Genocide Convention,³⁰ helped to empower the movement. They accomplished this by illustrating how Native Americans continued to have power over their colonizers because, as outsiders, they had the ability to see the inconsistencies between the values espoused by white society and the actual immoral practices white society engaged in. Deloria devoted much of his text to re-narrating actions and events of the movement by connecting the Trail of Broken Treaties, the occupation of the Bureau

²⁷See page 47.

²⁸See page 7.

²⁹See page 99.

³⁰See page 109.

of Indian Affairs, and the occupation at Wounded Knee with the underlying circumstances of the situations that led up to those events in an effort to justify them to the public.

In terms of legitimizing the movement, there are two basic options that rhetors have when attempting to establish legitimacy. They can either use a coercive strategy by identifying with the values of the establishment or they can use a confrontational strategy by attacking the establishment's values. In terms of their method for gaining legitimacy, both authors predominantly used confrontational methods of attacking the legitimacy of the establishment. This strategy was a logical one for both to take. The coercive strategy was not really an option for them because the goal of their discourse was to work toward separating themselves from the establishment. Identifying with the establishment's values would have worked contrary to their goals. Instead, they needed to show why the government did not deserve to hold legitimate power over Native Americans. Therefore, much of both works centered on attacking the legitimacy of the establishment in terms of hypocrisy and the conflicting policies and actions taken by the government. As already discussed, Stewart et al. (2001) asserted that showing the illegitimacy of the establishment is an essential part of getting legitimacy prescribed to the movement by the general public. However, this appears to be even more significant in movements working with implications for global politics. Smith (1995) explained that the perception of legitimacy of the nation that a movement is working against is very important in determining reactions of the rest of the world to a transnational movement. She wrote that an "appeal to international norms, however, is only likely to be a movement resource in a cultural context where the state is widely seen as abusing its authority or as illegitimate. In contexts where the state is generally seen as a legitimate authority that uses its power appropriately, a movement that appeals to international standards is likely to be viewed as treasonous" (p. 195).

To be convincing, Manuel and Deloria had to convince the rest of the world that Canada and the United States were guilty of gross neglect, mismanagement, and outright oppression of indigenous people. From the amount of time that they each devoted to attacking the legitimacy of their respective governments, they were well aware of this fact.

The Three Levels of Global Politics

As previously stated, Leatherman et al. (1994) identified three levels of functioning in global politics: people-to-people, national, and transnational. The great majority of Manuel's

text was devoted to the people-to-people transfer of knowledge and education in order to bring about change. For Manuel, the path to change started at the level of face-to-face communication between people. He had multiple narratives that involved change coming through people-to-people interaction. For example, his first narrative involved a co-worker who had come to regard him as a friend through their interaction with each other, despite his false assumptions that Native Americans were incapable of feeling emotions.³¹ Also, he claimed that he and the nurses he met in the hospital he stayed in as a child were able to come to understand of each other through the basic interaction of the care he received from the nurses.³² His final narrative of the Japanese and Chinese officials illustrated how forgiveness between two groups of people can begin with the personal interaction between leaders.³³ These narratives all reflected his theme of mutual dependence and respect between people.

For Manuel, the direction of policy in the world needed to start at the local level and then branch out from there. He believed that if it were to go in the opposite direction, it would only be a continuation of colonization. He wrote, “development without full local control is only another form of imperial conquest” (p. 151). Even in his discussion of international aspects of the movement, Manuel still referred to it as a “banding together” of people in an international brotherhood. Manuel unfailingly privileged individuals and their one-on-one interactions with each other over institutions.

As opposed to Manuel’s bottom-up approach to social movement, Deloria was more inclined to advocate a top-down approach. Deloria spent a substantial amount of time detailing aspects of international standards for sovereignty and the criminal status of genocide in order to suggest that the United States needed to fall in line with the higher international standards and begin to recognize the Native Americans as politically sovereign nations. Deloria also made references to the United Nations and their ability to review the treaty status of native tribes in the United States.

Both Manuel and Deloria addressed the national level of the movement in terms of how their respective governments had not acted in ways that coincided with standards of morality. However, they differed in the way that each approached this idea. Manuel tended to claim the

³¹See page 44.

³²See page 66.

³³See page 77.

illegitimacy of the government by citing specific instances of how bad policies had affected actual people in a way that appealed to a universal ethic of humane morality. In contrast, Deloria tended to claim that the national government acted in illegitimate ways simply because its policies did not meet the generally held standards of logic or international law. As a result, though they took differing approaches to their subject, both advanced a globalized view of native politics.

Follow-Up on Artifacts:

There are several indications that both of these books were successful in serving their intended functions. One indication is the extent to which they are still known and cited by members of the Native American rights movement, despite being written thirty years ago. For example, American Indian activist Ward Churchill, in his 2003 collection of published essays, *Acts of Rebellion*, made several references to the writings of George Manuel which included quoting Manuel's original definition of the Fourth World.³⁴ Activist Glen Morris, in another 2003 essay, discussed the role of Deloria's *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties* in creating a "decolonizing critique" that came to be used by Indigenous groups working in international politics.³⁵

A second indication of their success as rhetorical works is that the level of Native American activity on the international scene suddenly became much greater following their publication. For example, after the publication of *The Fourth World* and *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties*, gaining access to global venues became much more of a central focus for Native American activist groups. Though the book *The Fourth World* may have not garnered much commercial success, the idea of a "Fourth World" and the ideology Manuel ascribed to it were influential as a rallying call among leaders in indigenous communities. Manuel was able to articulate the experiences and hardships that many leaders of his day had been facing. In addition, it gave them a basis for how to begin their work anew on local, national, and international levels. In many ways, as an act of rhetoric, his piece was geared toward members within the movement and helped to legitimize many people's feelings of discontent.

³⁴See Churchill's "The New Face of Liberation: Indigenous Rebellion, State Repression, and the Reality of the Fourth World" in *Acts of Rebellion* (p. 263) and "I am Indigenist: Notes on the Ideology of the Fourth World" (p. 275).

³⁵See Morris's "Vine Deloria, Jr. and the Development of a Decolonizing Critique of Indigenous Peoples and International Relations" in *Native Voices* (p. 97-154).

Manuel followed up his book's publication by increasing his diplomatic efforts with other indigenous organizations. Using an agreement with the National Congress of American Indians in the United States and meetings with indigenous groups in South America, Central America, Australia, and Northern Europe, Manuel was able to found the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (WCIP). Formed on principles of self-determination and the need for "community consent" in governmental actions taken with regard to indigenous people, the WCIP held its first meeting in 1975 at Port Alberny, Canada. At the Second General Assembly of the WCIP in Samiland, Sweden in 1977, responding to pressure from Manuel himself, the organization made a call for the international community to create a proclamation of the rights of indigenous people. In less than ten years, the United Nations began drafting a "Universal Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples" (Ryser, 2003). This was a big step toward creating a normalized standard that favored the rights of indigenous groups and can be directly attributed to the work of George Manuel.

At the end of 1974, the American Indian Movement in the United States, desiring to further the internationally-focused arguments it had formed at Wounded Knee (and which had been expanded upon by Deloria in *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties*), founded the International Indian Treaty Council. The IITC was created to further the interests of indigenous people (in terms of treaty rights and sovereignty) on an international level by focusing its efforts on gaining access to the United Nations. Morris (2003) wrote,

AIM joined with traditional indigenous political forces and a few legal interests to utilize the U.S. federal courts to advance indigenous peoples' claims. Soon, the obstacles to challenging the entrenched ideological roots of U.S. law and policy affecting indigenous peoples became insurmountable. In 1974, guided in part by Deloria's arguments in *Broken Treaties*, AIM formed the International Indian Treaty Council (IITC) to advance positions of treaty rights and indigenous self-determination at the United Nations and other international forums (p. 177).

The IITC was comprised of elders from across the North American continent who saw the need for Indian people to begin acting as "nations." For those involved, acting as a nation included developing international ties through the use and implementation of active diplomacy.

In the first conference of the IITC, it was decided that Native Americans should begin discussing issues of their status with other nations throughout the world in an effort to extend their struggles to a larger platform. In the following years, the IITC was able to gain recognition in the United Nations as a non-governmental organization and was allowed to sit in on U.N. meetings as an observer (Deloria and Lytle, 241).

Despite the fact that Native Americans had the social networks and media to express their messages internationally, they still had to contend with the fact that the United States and Canadian governments held (and continue to hold) such a strong amount of economic influence and power over the other nations of the world that they were trying to reach. Though they were able to get their message out, the actual ability to affect international standards on indigenous recognition has remained limited. Despite being given several chances to speak in front of the U.N., the IITC has not yet been able to go beyond its status as a non-governmental organization.

It is not hard to understand why this is so. The idea of creating more safeguards for protecting the rights of indigenous groups would mean that the national governments would lose power over the resources that accompany those groups' associated lands. It also presents the possibility of forming new nations that would detract from the territory of current nations.

Still, this does nothing to undermine the fact that the indigenous rights movement has made many strides in promoting its message. As Niezen (2003) wrote, the actual term "indigenous" barely even appeared in books twenty years ago as a reference to a category of humans (p. 2). The fact that these people have been able to become so vocal on the international level in recent years is the strongest indication that they have been able (at the very least) to change the way that they are regarded by the rest of the world. If anything, they have won a victory simply by asserting the fact that they are still here. As a report from the United Nations International NGO Conference on Discrimination against Indigenous Populations in the Americas stated, "Those who would destroy their way of life would first have us believe that this task is already accomplished. We now have proof to the contrary, and we have received, with gratitude, the message of harmony and respect for all life brought to us by an ancient people whose culture may still yet be allowed to make a worthy contribution to the world community of nations" (United Nations, 1977, p. 21).

Future Implications:

The use of media for presenting the narratives of indigenous cultures can be seen as serving multiple roles in society due to the unique aspects of the indigenous life they are meant to represent. In this case, the books of Manuel and Deloria served several basic roles at once. In one sense, they were ethnographic anthropological accounts of Native American identity and were designed to explain what it meant to exist as an American Indian in twentieth century North America. In another sense, they were historical chronicles designed to present an historical recounting of the continued battle for tribal sovereignty in the modern era. Both works made multiple references to how the events should be viewed as a continuation of Native American resistance to colonization. In yet another sense, they were counter-narratives meant to combat the silencing of their marginalized groups by presenting an indigenous version of the events of the twentieth century in a way that amended the false assumptions made by the mainstream media and the general public in relation to Native American issues. Last, they were created to provide an ideal vision of the potential future for indigenous existence in North America. The success of these works in meeting their intended purposes as rhetorical artifacts can be attributed to their use of narrative arguments that held both probability and fidelity in furthering the persuasive functions of social movement that addressed aspects of the three levels of global politics. All of these aspects can be taken as guidelines for future rhetors attempting to use narrative to rhetorically fight the spread of colonization, globalization, and dominating worldviews. As already mentioned at the beginning of this paper, globalization presents a situation for indigenous groups that is both a blessing and a curse. Now is the time for alternative cultures to begin asserting the importance of their own perspectives in the great marketplace of ideas.

Future research in the narratives of marginalized groups should include looking at how other forms of media (like film, television, artwork, and the Internet) have been used to successfully further the ideology of indigenism. Though this thesis presupposed that books were the most useful medium for addressing long narratives of native experience to the general public in 1974, future studies may reveal that modern technologies have allowed other mediums to become better formatted for disseminating indigenous perspectives. The narratives of other major marginalized groups (like the Aborigines in Australia, for example) should also be

examined for their contributions to indigenist literature. Studies on the use of fictional accounts of native life in instigating or maintaining social change should be continued.

Many transnational movements for human rights are just beginning to take a stage in the world's political scene, and each of these, whether under the category of indigenous, feminist, or human rights, presents the potential for studying the use of narratives in transnational movement. This level of reflective study on the use of narrative is important for understanding how and why stories are capable of formulating knowledge that interferes with the continuation of dominating ideologies.

References

- Anderson, B. (1994). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism, fifth edition*. New York, NY: Verso.
- Asch, M. (1984). *Home and native land: Aboriginal rights and the Canadian Constitution*. Toronto: Methuen.
- Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies*. (A. Lavers., Trans.) New York, NY: Hill and Wang. (Original work published 1957).
- Barthes, R. (1989). *The rustle of language*. (Howard, R., Trans.) Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Benford, R. (2002). Controlling narratives and narratives as control within social movements. *Stories of change: Narratives and social movements*. Davis, J., Ed. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, p. 53-75.
- Cohen, F. (1982). *Handbook of Federal Indian Law, second edition*. Charlottesville, VA: The Michie Company.
- Cohen, L. Ed. (1970). *The legal conscience: Selected papers of Felix Cohen*. Washington, DC: Archon Books.
- Cook, S. (1998). "Self-determination without termination": Richard Nixon's Indian policy revisited. *Native American Studies*, v12, p.1-11.
- Churchill, W. (2003). I am indigenist: Notes of the ideology of the Fourth World. *Acts of rebellion: The Ward Churchill reader*. New York, NY: Routledge, p.275-299.
- Churchill, W. (2003). The new face of liberation: Indigenous rebellion, state repression, and the reality of the Fourth World. *Acts of rebellion: The Ward Churchill reader*. New York, NY: Routledge, p.263-273.
- Churchill, W. & Morris, G. (1992). Key Indian laws and cases. *The state of Native America: Genocide, colonization, and resistance*. Jaimes, M.A. Ed. Boston: South End Press.

- Churchill, W. & Vander Wall, J. (2002). *Agents of Repression: The FBI's secret wars against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement, second edition.* Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Deloria, V. (1974). *Behind the trail of broken treaties: An Indian declaration of independence.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Deloria, V. (1969). *Custer died for your sins: An Indian manifesto.* New York, NY: Avon Books.
- Deloria, V. & Lytle, C. (1984). *The nations within: The past and future of American Indian sovereignty.* New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Dickason, O. (1997). *The myth of the savage and the beginnings of French colonialism in the Americas.* Alberta: The University of Alberta Press.
- Dudley, W. (Ed.). (1998). *Native Americans: Opposing viewpoints.* San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Einhorn, L. (2000). *The Native American oral tradition: Voices of the soul and spirit.* Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fine, G. (2002). The storied group: Social movements as “bundles of narratives.” *Stories of change: Narratives and social movements.* Davis, J., Ed. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, p. 53-75.
- Fisher, W. (1987). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Flanagan, T. (2000). *First nations?: Second thoughts.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Forbes, J. (1981). *Native Americans and Nixon: Presidential Politics and Minority Self-Determination 1969-1972.* Los Angeles, CA: American Indian Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Foss, S. (1996). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice, second edition.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press Inc.
- Foucault, M. (1995) *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison, second edition.* Trans. by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1975).

- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Trans. by Myra Bergman Ramos. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.
- Gamson, W. (1992). The social psychology of collective action. *Frontiers in social movement theory*. Morris, A. & McClurg Meuller, C., Eds. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, p. 71.
- Gregg, R. (1971). The ego-function of the rhetoric of protest. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, v4, 71-91.
- Griffin, L. (1969). A dramatic theory of the rhetoric of movements. *Critical responses to Kenneth Burke*, William Rueckert, Ed. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Holloway, R. (1993). *In the matter of Robert J. Oppenheimer*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Holm, T., Pearson, J.D., & Chavis, B. (2003). Peoplehood: A model for the extension of sovereignty in American Indian studies. *Wicazo SA Review*, 18, 7-24.
- Hunt, S. (1991). Constructing collective identity in a peace movement organization. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Hunt, S., Benford, R., & Snow, D. (1994). Identity fields: Framing processes and the social construction of movement identities. *New social movements: From ideology to identity*. Laraña, E., Johnson, H., & Gusfield, J. Eds. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, p. 185-208.
- Kamler, H. (1983). *Communication: Sharing our stories of experience*. Seattle, WA: Psychological Press.
- Kashima, Y. (1997). Culture, narrative, and human motivation. *Motivation and culture*. Munro, D., et al, Eds. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Leatherman, J. Pagnucco, R. & Smith, J. (1994) International institutions and transnational social movement organizations: Transforming sovereignty, anarchy, and global governance. Panel on New Approaches to Transnational Relations, American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, New York, September 1-4.
- Macklem, P. (2001). *Indigenous difference and the constitution of Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Manuel, G. & Posluns, M. (1974). *The Fourth World: An Indian reality*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

- Marcus, G. & Fischer M. (1986). *Anthropology as cultural critique: An experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Morris, G. (2003). Vine Deloria, Jr. and the development of a decolonizing critique of indigenous peoples and international relations. *Native voices: American Indian identity and resistance*. Lawrence, KA: The University Press of Kansas, p. 97-154.
- Niezen, R. (2003). *The origins of Indigenism: Human rights and the politics of identity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Nolan, J., et al., Eds. (1990) *Black's Law Dictionary, sixth edition*. St. Paul, MN.: West Publishing Co.
- Prevent Genocide International (2003). 52 non-parties to the Genocide Convention by Rome Statute ratification status. Retrieved June 27, 2004. Prevent Genocide International web site: <<http://www.preventgenocide.org/law/gencon/nonparties-byICCstatus.htm#D>>
- Prince, G. (1982). *Narratology: The form and functioning of narrative*. New York, NY: Mouton.
- Robbins, R. (1992). Self-determination and subordination: The past, present, and future of American Indian governance. *The state of Native America: Genocide, colonization, and resistance*. (Jaimes, A., Ed.) Boston, MA: South End Press. p. 87-121.
- Ryser, R. (2003). The legacy of grand chief George Manuel. Retrieved June 5, 2004 from The Center for World Indigenous Studies web site: <<http://www.cwis.org/fwdp/manuel.html>>
- Said, E. (1994). *Orientalism, second edition*. New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1978).
- Sanchez, J. & Stuckey, M. (2000) The rhetoric of American Indian activism in the 1960s and 1970s. *Communication Quarterly*, v48, p. 120-136.
- Schouls, T. (2003). *Shifting boundaries: Aboriginal identity, pluralist theory, and the politics of self-government*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Schwartz, B. (1996). Memory as a cultural system: Abraham Lincoln in World War II. *American Sociological Review*, v 61, p.908-927.
- Schwartz, S. (1997). Values and culture. *Motivation and culture*. Munro, D., et al, Eds. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Scott, J. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Shankel, G. (1941). *American mottoes and slogans*. New York, NY: Wilson.
- Sillars, M. (1991). *Messages, meanings, and culture: Approaches to communication criticism*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc.
- Silverstein, M. & Urban, G. (1996). The natural history of discourse. *Natural histories of discourse*. Silverstein, M. & Urban, G., Eds. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, p. 1-17.
- Simons, H. (1976). *Persuasion: Understanding, practice, and analysis*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Smith, C., Burke, H., & Ward, G. (2000). *Globalization and indigenous people: Threat or empowerment? Indigenous cultures in an interconnected world*. Smith, C. & Ward, G., Eds. Toronto: UBC Press, p.1-24.
- Smith, J. (1995) Transnational political processes and the human rights movement. *Research in Social movements, Conflict and Change*, v 18. p185-219.
- Smith, R. & Windes, R. (Fall 1976). The rhetoric of mobilization: Implications for the study of movements. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, v42, 1.
- Stanton, J. (1997). Building Expo '67. Retrieved June 29, 2004. The North American Integration and Development Center web site: <<http://naid.spsr.ucla.edu/expo67/map-docs/buildingexpo.htm>>
- Stone-Mediatore, S. (2003). *Reading across borders: Storytelling and knowledges of resistance*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stuart, P. (1987). *Nations within a nation: Historical statistics of American Indians*. New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Stewart, C., Smith, C., & Denton, R. (2001). *Persuasion and social movements, fourth edition*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Thompson, W. (1996). *Native American issues: A reference handbook*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Todorov, T. (1984). *The conquest of America*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

- United Nations. (1977). *Report of the International NGO Conference on Discrimination against Indigenous Populations in the Americas-1977*. Special NGO Committee on Human Rights (Geneva), Sub-Committee on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Apartheid and Decolonization.
- Vanderford, M. (1989). Vilification and social movements: A case study of pro-life and pro-choice rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, v75, p.166-167.
- Washburn, W. (1971). *Red man's land, white man's law*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- White, P. (1985). What is a nationality? *Canadian review of studies in nationalism*, v12, 1-23.
- Wood, J. (2000). *Communication theories in action: An introduction, second edition*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Yates, J. & Hunter, J. (2002). Fundamentalism: When history goes awry. *Stories of Change: Narrative and social movements*. Davis, J., Ed. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, p. 123-148.

Vita

Charles W. Dyson, Jr, son of Charles W. and Patricia G. Dyson, was born on January 20, 1980 in Dover, Delaware. He graduated from Patrick Henry High School of Ashland, Virginia in June 1998. He then attended Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, receiving both a Bachelor of Arts in Communication and a Bachelor of Science in Psychology in 2002. This thesis completes his work for a Master of Arts in Communication from Virginia Tech.