

From Sit-Ins to Fish-Ins

Broadening the American Civil Rights Movement to Include Native Americans and Other Minorities

Glenn T. Eskew

The scope of protest begun in the 1950s by black and white activists in the American civil rights movement to end racial discrimination in the South had expanded during the 1960s as other minorities adopted direct action strategies to gain political freedom and equal access to the system. Students on college campuses voiced their support for the civil rights struggle and against the war in Vietnam. Women activists rejected male chauvinism by opposing discrimination based on gender. Homosexuals protested police brutality and advocated for acceptance. Hispanics organized against economic exploitation. Joining in the clamor for reform, Native Americans escalated longstanding calls for self-determination. Like threads of various hues, these collective acts—the warp of the sit ins or freedom rides or demonstrations in Birmingham, Selma, or Memphis of the modern Civil Rights Movement and the woof of the student Free Speech Movement, the women’s liberation movement, the Gay Rights movement, the Chicano Movement of the United Farm Workers, the Fish-Ins of the modern American Indian Movement, when woven together—all crossed and intertwined—these individual threads created a tapestry that revealed diversity in the United States.¹

Most activists proposed mainstream demands for integration into the existing system, the granting of what the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and others called first class citizenship by which they meant “the quest for freedom and human dignity.”² Overall they did not challenge

the economic structure of the capitalist system but instead combined direct action tactics with legal cases to win equal access as consumers and wage earners. Assimilation signified an end to humiliating discrimination and the beginning of public acceptance of diversity. While the Sixties protests of the Civil Rights Movement, the Student Movement, the Women's Movement, the Gay Rights Movement, and the Chicano Movement all followed similar trajectories designed to accomplish integration into the existing system, the struggle by Native Americans remained distinctive. All these efforts had extreme wings that criticized the mainstream and demanded a more radical form of acceptance beyond simple diversity or equal access. The Black Power Movement, the Weathermen Days of Rage, the Red Power Movement expressed a frustration born out of the limited nature of the objectives and constrained outcomes of the reforms. With violence, the state suppressed such radical separatist groups, advocating instead the broadening of the civil rights movement and opening up the system to include on a basis of equality other minorities, resulting in a new ideology of tolerance ultimately endorsed by the stateless multinational corporate structure.

Yet unlike these protest movements, American Indians truly remained on the outside, thanks to their distinctive relationship to the federal government and connection to the reservation. Consequently their activism focused on the enforcement of existing treaties to enhance their status as sovereign "domestic dependent nations." Those Indian leaders who joined Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "beloved community" and supported the expansion of the civil rights movement did so out of a desire for self-determination. Indians demanded federal support for cultural centers to offset years of national policies that promoted assimilation and cultural genocide. In short, while Native Americans contributed to the era of reform—often adapting direct action strategies first used by African Americans—they remained focused on protecting their separate tribal existence and status as independent nations.³

Modern Civil Rights Movement

Events coalesced in the late 1950s and early 1960s to position the African American civil rights movement as the leading proponent of social change in the United States. The Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1955-56 marked the awakening of the black community while the spontaneous outburst of the sit-in movements in Nashville, Tennessee, in 1959 and Greensboro, North Carolina, in 1960 suggested the growing expectations among black consumers. The idealism that accompanied the election of John F. Kennedy as the first Irish Roman Catholic president extended to many of his generation and their children the baby boomers who saw unlimited potential in a hegemonic United States that dominated the postwar globe. The free market ideology of democracy promulgated internationally by American agents of corporate business, made omissions of equal rights at home particularly glaring. As the black sociologist Manning Marable argued, “the Second Reconstruction actually began in earnest on the afternoon of 1 February 1960.”⁴ On that day direct action nonviolence by four black men who sat down at the Woolworth’s lunch counter in Greensboro and demanded equal service as consumers in America provoked a series of protests against discrimination collectively known as the modern civil rights movement. Out of the sit-ins came the Freedom Rides of 1961 that continued what strategists called a “direct action” demand for immediate access to the system by pressuring local, state, and federal governments that allowed racial discrimination to persist.⁵ The seminal scholarship of historian Clayborne Carson documented the black youth who organized the multiracial Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) as a decentralized approach to the reform movement.⁶ King and the black ministers involved in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)—like the lawyers in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)—followed a more

bureaucratic and authoritarian approach as detailed in works by political scientist David Garrow.⁷ The top down systemic reforms proposed by SCLC and the NAACP often clashed with the more radical bottom up efforts of SNCC, for as the sociologist Gene Sharp has discovered in his years of studying nonviolence, there are many approaches to nonviolent resistance to oppression and discrimination.⁸ Because of the media's focus on the persistence of southern racial discrimination in a nation that held an idealistic view of itself as the democratic leader in a global environment where the medium was the message, the country underwent serious self-reflection over race relations.

By the spring 1963 demonstrations in Birmingham, Alabama, the nation could no longer tolerate segregation and inequality. King and the SCLC joined a local movement led by the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth in protests against racial discrimination in public accommodations, voting, and employment in the industrial city of the New South, Birmingham, which movement leaders called America's Johannesburg because it shared a history of violent race relations with the South African mining capital. In April 1963 sit-ins at lunch counters by African Americans demanding basic service as consumers expanded by May 1963 to protest marches led by school children. Rather than grant equal accommodations and citizenship rights, authorities in Birmingham turned loose police dogs on nonviolent protesters and blasted marchers with water from fire hoses. International outrage followed as demands for federal intervention reached the Kennedy Administration. The Congress could no longer avoid race reform, so it proposed legislation to end discrimination in public accommodations and thereby treat all citizens equally regardless of race, religion or gender. Following the assassination of President Kennedy in November 1963, the Texan President Lyndon B. Johnson pushed through the Congress as a tribute to the martyred Kennedy and over the filibuster of southern Democratic senators legislation that signified a watershed in American

race reform. Johnson encouraged passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that ended discrimination in public accommodations and outlined equal employment opportunities thereby opening the American system to not only African Americans but also other minorities. Only Native Americans secured exemption from the nondiscriminatory requirements of the new legislation, for tribal leaders insisted on the right to provide preferential treatment to other Indians.⁹

Indeed, Birmingham provided the climax of the civil rights movement, and the March on Washington simply celebrated that fact. Instead of the massive protests in the Capitol as originally envisaged by A. Phillip Randolph, the event became an affirmation of the American Dream. No one sounded that theme better than Martin Luther King who gave the address of his life before an integrated audience of at least a quarter million with millions more watching by television. With rolling cadences, his "I Have A Dream" speech epitomized African American desires for assimilation. Nearly tailor made to fit the demands of the civil rights legislation before the Congress, the oration reasoned the need for reform just like his "Letter From Birmingham Jail" while concluding with a resounding expression of faith in the American system. The next two years expanded these race reforms by targeting voting rights through demonstrations in Mississippi, Georgia, and finally, the riveting protests in Alabama. King and the SCLC joined young black and white SNCC field workers in Selma, Alabama where the march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge on Bloody Sunday, March 1965, led to the violent suppression of the nonviolent struggle. Again President Johnson intervened, appearing on television to quote the anthem of the civil rights movement—We Shall Overcome—and to propose legislation to secure the franchise for minorities. Once enforced, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 led to black political empowerment across America as African Americans in rural areas of the Deep South and urban centers of the Industrial North took charge of local governments.¹⁰ These

changes signified integration into the existing political system and a shift in the distribution of resources into communities previously neglected. The result of the growing black electorate and changes in the racial attitudes of many Americans ultimately contributed to the election of Barack Obama as the nation's first African American president.

After the success of Selma, King tried to take the movement outside the South, but as an external force that did not resonate with a local community, the northern movement fell flat. In the suburbs of Chicago in 1966, King said he found racism worse than any he had seen in the South. While advocating fair housing in Cicero, Illinois, white counter protesters pelted him with bricks. Following several weeks in the ghetto, he abandoned Chicago, but with the knowledge that the problems being faced by African Americans extended beyond racism. Having gained access to the system—being able to sit at a lunch counter and order that hamburger—proved of limited value if one could not afford to pay for the food. King came to understand the role of poverty in perpetuating racism. Soon he linked this understanding to the broader issue of anticolonialism. By 1967 King announced his opposition to the war in Vietnam during a speech in New York at the Riverside Church. Thereafter President Johnson turned against King and the civil rights movement.¹¹

By 1968 King had concluded that the problems of America were not those of race but those of class. Poverty was at the root of the system's oppression that left so many people excluded from the American Dream. He proposed a Poor People's Campaign to organize disposed Americans into a nationwide movement. Thousands of poor people—black, white, Native American, and Hispanic—were to descend on the capital and, unlike during the 1963 March on Washington, they would occupy the Capitol and other federal buildings, demanding housing, health care, jobs, education. King warned he intended for poor people to “dislocate the seat of government with non-violent, massive civil disobedience.” While

assisting a strike by garbage men in Memphis, Tennessee, the 39-year-old King was assassinated on April 4, 1968 by James Earl Ray. "We live in a sick and neurotic nation," King had despaired only months before, "Out of the social darkness of America's present evils, morning will surely come. If I didn't believe this, I couldn't make it." When Ku Klux Klansmen set off bombs in Birmingham in 1963 in an effort to kill King and destroy the truce he had secured for the movement, the first of the inner city riots in response to police brutality took place, initiating the "long hot summers" of the 1960s. The legal lynching of a black suspect shot to death by a policeman in Harlem in 1964 led to rioting and looting that lasted a week. A police raid in the black slum area of Los Angeles triggered the Watts riot of 1965 that claimed the lives of 25 black and 9 white people in a neighborhood where sixty percent of the population received public relief. Rioters and looters cried "burn, baby, burn" as property went up in flames that caused \$35 million worth of damage. In 1966 riots occurred in Newark and other cities and in 1967 a violent outburst in Detroit left 43 people dead and caused \$50 million in property damage, destroying one-fourth of the city that has never been rebuilt. That same year rioting occurred in Newark, Milwaukee, Cleveland and 18 other cities. After the assassination of King, rioting erupted in 60 cities across America, especially in Chicago and in Washington, D. C. where smoke from the flames surrounded the Capitol. Just before his death, King authored a book that asked the question, *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos Or Community?* In many ways the nation still struggles in its search for an answer.¹²

Black Power

Whereas King responded to the crisis of the 1960s by broadening his perspective on the problems in America and proposing an interracial Poor People's Campaign, the black radicals in SNCC turned separatist by

viewing the ills of society through the distorted lens of race. Henceforth for advocates of Black Power, the primacy of race became all-consuming. Previously John Lewis—who had participated in the sit-ins, Freedom Rides, Selma Campaign and advocated Dr. King’s vision of a multiracial beloved community—had held the position of chairman of SNCC, but separatists forced him out and put in office Stokely Carmichael who had coined the phrase “Black Power” during the Meredith March of 1966. Determined to make it on their own, the black members in SNCC kicked the white members out of the organization. They rejected the white dominated system and everything it stood for in America. Carmichael and other black SNCC members were influenced in their thinking by the writings of Malcolm X. They admired the independence of The Lost-Found Nation of Islam or Black Muslims and its message of Black separatism, economic self-help, and self-defense against white racists. Through black nationalism they emphasized economic self-help and African-American institutions. Rejecting the destructive ideology of white supremacy designed to make non-white people feel inferior, African American intellectuals promoted “Black is Beautiful.”¹³

Inspired by the political activism of rural African Americans in Lowndes County, Alabama who used the symbol of a black panther to represent their separate political party, Bobby Seale and Huey P. Newton organized the Black Panther Party in Oakland, California, in 1966, around the principle of self-defense against racial oppression. They developed a Ten Point Program based on ideas expressed by the Algerian independence leader and intellectual Frantz Fanon. They saw the inner city black poor as an “oppressed black colony within white America.” On one hand, the Black Panthers advocated self-determination over their communities with better schools and housing, independence from military service and the white power structure’s system of justice. Yet on the other hand, the Black Panthers responded to police brutality with militant talks of violence and

public displays of automatic weapons. Coming from an individualistic perspective, the Black Panthers attempted to reorganize society for the good of the black community. Yet because of their challenge to the system, J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI targeted the Black Panthers as public enemies. Following a shootout in 1967, police arrested Huey Newton. The next year Eldridge Cleaver fled the country. A coordinated effort in 1969 by local police, state agents and federal officers, to eradicate the black separatists left 27 Black Panthers dead, some 749 Black Panthers wounded, and many on the run. The turn to militant Black Separatism had doomed the movement in America.¹⁴

Feeling trapped in the ghetto with no chance of escape, the Black Panthers tried to combat the devastating poverty of the urban core. Their rhetoric suggested the government had coordinated a plan of genocide against African-Americans. They realized that many black people had been shut out of the system. With limited access to education and training necessary for the post-industrial world, many black people missed the boat on the modern, consumer economy. As images of the desperate black poor caught up in New Orleans thirty-five years later when the levees broke after Hurricane Katrina makes clear, the diagnosis of a trapped black underclass in the inner city shut out of the system as articulated by the Black Panthers was not entirely incorrect.

Other African Americans experienced access to the system and prospered as the Sixties gave way to the Seventies. Many middle class black people achieved integration with better paying jobs, admission to the better formerly all white schools, improvements in housing and steady increases in a general standard of living. Black political empowerment came to symbolize their success. After the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, federal registrars oversaw southern elections and guaranteed political equality. With the growing black electorate—rising from 43 percent in 1964 to 62 percent in 1968—many black candidates for political office,

now receiving a fair shake in the campaign and in many cases appealing to a majority black electorate, won positions of power that enabled them to shift resources back to the black community. Furthermore interpretation by the federal courts of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with affirmative action decisions increased African American contractors gaining lucrative government contracts. Consequently the black middle class grew as its influence expanded. In Atlanta a plaster worker named Herman Russell became a general contractor and a millionaire while civil rights activists John Lewis won Atlanta's seat to the U. S. House of Representatives in 1991 where he continues to serve today. The gains made by many African Americans underscore the possibilities of success through access to the system.¹⁵

Protest Movements of Other Minorities

The student movement evolved out of the civil rights struggle and drew from the Baby Boom that followed World War II. Led by Tom Hayden and Abbie Hoffman, the formation of the Students for a Democratic Society at the University of Michigan in 1960 announced the concerns of a new generation of Americans. They embraced the civil rights movement, sending volunteers into Mississippi Freedom Summer in 1964. That fall at the University of California at Berkeley, when the college administration tried to silence protests the students responded with a Free Speech Movement that quickly spread to college campuses across the country. Soon the students voiced opposition to the growing war in Vietnam, targeting the military recruitment offices on campuses and opposing the military draft. They condemned American foreign policy as imperial and immoral. Students contributed to riots at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1968 and joined the 1969 Vietnam Moratorium in New York City. They organized protests on college campuses at Kent State University where

Ohio national guardsmen opened fire and killed four while wounding 13. Radicals in SDS organized the Weathermen to “bring the war home” with “Days of Rage” that resulted in suppression by the FBI. Other students adopted a separatist route, experimenting with drugs and living on communes as part of a counter culture. Soon the self-absorption turned into the Me Decade as captured in the prose of Tom Wolfe. The concept of community that once set parameters on individual behavior gave way to a belief in absolute rights of the individual.¹⁶

Just as the Student Movement derived from the civil rights movement, so too did the modern Women’s Movement. When a majority of SNCC workers adopted the primacy of race and kicked out the white members, the white women who left joined with women from the Student Movement to focus on the primacy of gender. Casey Haden and Sara Evans had participated in the SDS and concluded that “the personal is political” or what had been seen as personal concerns of women were in fact societal in nature and constrained by the system. Indeed some feminists came to see the very idea of gender—like the idea of race—as a social construct. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 opened the system up for African Americans and other ethnic groups but perhaps even more strikingly for women. During the congressional debates, white men added the word “sex” to the anti-discrimination bill in a bid to torpedo the legislation, so that the clause required that in addition to race and ethnicity, one could not discriminate against someone on the bases of gender. Yet President Johnson got the bill passed and Michigan Representative Martha Griffiths who sat on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission that implemented the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made sure that the act’s Title Six led to an end to gender discrimination.¹⁷

Following the example of the NAACP, twenty-eight women led by Betty Friedan created the National Organization for Women (NOW) in 1966. Within a year, NOW had ratified a “Bill of Rights” that set as its

agenda the adoption of a constitutional amendment to secure equal rights and equal pay for women. Proposed by NOW but quickly endorsed by mainstream organizations, the Equal Rights Amendment was sent to the states for ratification by Congress in 1972. Yet a backlash against gender reform emerged in response to ERA led by Phyllis Schlafly that articulated a pro-family, pro-marriage, pro-children position that made feminism appear anti-family, anti-marriage, and anti-children. The conservative opposition steadily grew until ERA fell three states short of ratification and was defeated in 1982. The opposition to ERA also reacted to another issue raised by the Women's Movement, for in 1973 the United States Supreme Court had ruled in *Roe v. Wade* that states could not prevent a pregnant woman from having an abortion during the first trimester. In demanding new definitions of individualism and family, strident defenders of pro-choice and radical feminists who rejected heterosexual society made the issue one of acceptance of what many people at the time viewed as a deviant lifestyle. Increasingly the feminist movement reflected an absolute individualism among middle class white women working within the system dominated by stateless multinational corporations.¹⁸

Likewise homosexuals demanded a transformation of society that went beyond simple tolerance to acceptance of sexual diversity. In the wake of the civil rights movement, gay men rejected discrimination when on June 27, 1969 New York City officers raided the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village and a fight broke out between the patrons and the police. While in the past select liberal organizations had fought to end discrimination over sexual orientation by quietly advocating change, after Stonewall, gays and lesbians marched in Gay Pride protests that vocally demanded equal access to the system. Less concerned with economic issues than social acceptance, the Gay Liberation movement proclaimed "Gay Power." The struggle for acceptance of gays and lesbians continues today over definitions of marriage and family.¹⁹

Similarly, Mexican Americans embraced their ethnic heritage in the Chicano Movement that ran contemporaneously with the Black Power Movement of the 1960s. Having long been discriminated against but occupying large neighborhoods in urban areas of Los Angeles and other Southwestern cities, people of Mexican descent and other Latinos participated in sit-ins and other protests in a struggled against inequality. Hispanic students led voter registration drives and protested the war in Vietnam. Through grassroots organization and protest, Latinos succeeded in emphasizing the inherent racism of the system. In 1965 Caesar Chavez organized migrant Mexican labor that harvested grapes in the California vineyards to protest their cheap wages. By 1968 the United Farm Workers with which Chavez and other Hispanics affiliated, launched a boycott of table grapes that proved successful when it forced landowners to negotiate contracts with the laborers who harvested the fruit. Enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965 helped end discrimination against Latinos who assimilated into the system.²⁰

Modern American Indian Movement

While suffering similar racial discrimination as African Americans and Latinos, Indians did not organize their Modern American Indian Movement over issues of second-class citizenship. To be sure, American Indians had long resisted white supremacists who encroached on their territory. In one celebrated example, when targeted by the Ku Klux Klan with a cross burning in Maxton, North Carolina on January 18, 1958, the Lumbee Indians routed the robed race-baiters. Reporting on the humiliation suffered by the white supremacists, newspapers used stereotypes to offer a backhanded compliment: “the Indians scalped the Ku Klux Klan.”²¹ Nor did voting rights remain a pressing concern since a series of United States Supreme Court decisions beginning with a 1948 Arizona case that

subsequent rulings regarding Idaho in 1957 and New Mexico in 1962 reinforced, secured the right of Indians to vote in elections.²² Only the issue of police brutality served to galvanize the protests of Native Americans as much as it did that of Gays, Latinos, and African Americans.

Instead the Modern American Indian Movement organized in response to encroachment on Indian lands by the U. S. Government and private corporations trying to take what remained of the reservations. Rapid postwar development often resulted in the destruction of reservations as when in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers built the Garrison Dam in North Dakota and flooded much of the ancestral homeland of the Three Affiliated Tribes (Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara) along the Missouri River, displacing thousands of people and radicalizing a young Mandan woman named Tillie Walker. Similarly in April 1958 the New York Power Authority used imminent domain laws to claim Indian lands for flooding the Tuscarora River and building a hydroelectric dam. Led by Wallace “Mad Bear” Anderson, the Tuscarora Iroquois used nonviolent tactics to block the road into the wilderness area. Men, women, and children lay down in the dirt in front of the government and business trucks brought in to clear the land. Nearby Mohawks and Seneca Indians set up camps to protect their territory. Often the duplicity of chiefs paid off by business and government interests not to defend treaty rights led to the position of the Native Americans being undercut and sold out but not in this case. Although police arrested Mad Bear, the negative publicity generated by the land grab forced a change in power company plans. A year later in March 1959 some 1,000 Tuscarora Iroquois responded to the bad decisions of some of their leaders in cahoots with business and government interests by declaring sovereignty and occupying the Council House located on the Six Nations Reservation outside Ontario, Canada. After six days, the Canadian Mounties forced the Tuscarora Iroquois and Mohawks from the council house. The success of Mad Bear in upstate New York convinced Seminoles

in the Miccosukee Indian Nation of Florida to seek his help in stopping federal attempts to take Indian land for the Everglades Reclamation Project. These actions reflected a renewed effort by American Indians to defend treaty rights and demand self-determination.²³

Organizations soon joined the scattered efforts. The National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) had organized in 1944 to advocate on behalf of Native Americans before the United States Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Rejecting federal policies adopted in 1953 called "Termination" that intended to destroy tribal identity and reservations through assimilation, the NCAI embraced the call for "Self-Determination—Not Termination" as an overt challenge to BIA policies that promoted assimilation. By 1961, leaders in the NCAI representing 67 tribes joined together to issue a "Declaration of Indian Purpose" that recognized their common heritage, right to self-government, and need for federal assistance. It marked a bold statement against federal control. By 1964, Vine Deloria Jr., who descended from a venerable line of Sioux leaders, headed the NCAI's efforts to alter federal policy towards Native Americans. He helped place the nearly bankrupt NCAI back on a firm financial foundation then developed a strategy that concentrated on government intervention in support of treaties. Deloria found allies among college age American Indians who in 1961 had organized the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) led by a Walker River Paiute from Nevada named Mel Thom. While the NIYC youth accepted the NCAI's "Declaration of Indian Purpose," they criticized their elders for not resisting enough federal policies that promoted cultural genocide. As head of the NCAI until 1967, Deloria developed an "inside-outside" strategy that pitted the Office of Economic Opportunity and its War on Poverty against the Bureau of Indian Affairs in a struggle to gain tribal sovereignty, a strategy similar to the SCLC's reliance on federal support for civil rights. Meanwhile the young members in the NIYC led by Mel Thom grew radical.²⁴

The young activists in the NIYC had much in common with black and white youth in SNCC and SDS similarly inspired by the idealism of President Kennedy. Mel Thom tried to keep the NIYC working with the NCAI, noted that the leaders of these groups “had decided that what we needed was a movement. Not an organization, but a movement. Organizations rearrange history. Movements make history.” With young Native American radicals, Thom advocated direct action, joining with others in the NIYC who called their critics “apples,” meaning “red on the outside and white on the inside,” or “Uncle Tomahawks,” echoing black radicals who criticized black conservatives as Uncle Toms for working with white people. Thom realized the conservative nature of tribal leaders: “The Indian had been stereotyped to act in certain ways; he was not supposed to take direct action, or to picket, or to demonstrate. People were curious to see if the Indians could do these things. So were the Indians!”²⁵

In the Pacific Northwest, indigenous people responded with direct action to corporate encroachment on their fishing rights that stemmed from new governmental restrictions instituted at the behest of the commercial fishing industry. As the courts restricted the off-reservation fishing rights Indians had retained during initial negotiations that the treaties had recognized as legitimate, a series of protests erupted. Like the sit-ins and Freedom Rides of the civil rights movement, Native Americans used civil disobedience in the form of “fish-ins” held from 1964 to 1970 to insist on their traditional fishing rights. Tribe members of the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Nisqually Nations deliberately harvested their catch in off-limit areas. As in civil rights protests elsewhere, the American Indians organized marches to generate attention to their cause. They received assistance from the NIYC led by Thom and such members as Hank Adams of the Assiniboine tribe. Celebrities and civil rights movement veterans such as the white actor Marlon Brando and the black comedian Dick Gregory participated in the public demonstrations and suffered arrest. Similar

protests developed over hunting rights in Wisconsin and Minnesota. In 1966, Indians from the Yakima Tribe arrested a Washington State policeman claiming that he had trespassed on native lands. And like the civil rights movement's trajectory that went from the streets into the courts, the Native American protests over fishing and hunting rights traveled from the forests and riverbanks into the government's legal system to await justice. While decisions handed down in Oregon supported the fishing rights of Native Americans, in neighboring Washington State the courts defended the commercial fishing industry and fought Indian appeals all the way to the United States Supreme Court. Consequently the direct action and legal strategies achieved mixed results.²⁶

Since the arrival of the white man on the shores of America, Indians had insisted on the enforcement of treaties. The example of the Pueblo Indians to secure their claim to the sacred Taos Blue Lake in New Mexico in the twentieth century demonstrates the slow and tedious process of working within the system to resolve the conflict. A site taken by the U. S. Government in 1906, the Taos Pueblo demanded its return and declined an offer of payment in 1926. During the New Deal, the Senate Indian Affairs Committee recommended the Taos Pueblo be granted a permit to use the lake but it was not issued until 1940. Like the NAACP that filed school desegregation cases, the Taos Pueblo filed suit with support of the NCAI in 1951 before the Indian Claims Commission for clear title to the lake and despite a positive ruling in 1965, a Senate subcommittee stalled the legislation until in 1969 the Nixon Administration adopted it as a symbol of a change in Indians affairs. Rather than the paternalistic support for Native American assimilation into the system, the federal government began to recognize the American Indian desire for self-determination, an outgrowth of Vine Deloria, Jr.'s "inside-outside" strategy that had made headway under President Johnson's Great Society. It would take pressure generated by the 1972 Trail of Broken Treaties to secure a shift in federal policy along

the lines of the Twenty Points mostly written by Hank Adams that outlined Native American demands.²⁷

On the local level most American Indians apparently avoided the civil rights movement, perhaps for fear the racial hatred generated against African Americans might spill over onto the reservation. Such was the case during Mississippi Freedom Summer in 1964 when, just weeks after white supremacists murdered Mickey Schwerner, James Chaney, and Andrew Goodman—the SNCC workers who had investigated the bombing of a movement church outside Philadelphia—vigilantes dynamited a nearby mission to the Choctaw Indians that had not been involved in the civil rights struggle. Indeed more often than not, Indian leaders thought they had more to gain under a segregated system that recognized and supported their separate status than might be had through government policies that promoted an assimilation they despised. There seems to be little evidence of Native American and African American interaction regarding the civil rights movement until the SCLC began organizing the Poor People's Campaign in late 1967.²⁸

Poor People's Campaign

Radical Indians favoring direct action against the federal government joined in a show of solidarity for the nation's dispossessed with African Americans, Latinos, Appalachian whites and others in King's great effort to create the beloved community. Led by Mel Thom of the NIYC and joined by Hank Adams of the fish-ins, Wallace "Mad Bear" Anderson of the Tuscaroras, and Tillie Walker, now promoting Indian issues for the American Friends Service Committee, they reached out across the racial divide in common cause with other poor people. In the weeks following the April 4, 1968 assassination of King, these Indian representatives joined the Reverend Ralph David Abernathy on the SCLC's Committee of 100 that

led the Poor People's Campaign. They presented their demands before the Office of Economic Opportunity that waged President Johnson's War on Poverty. Thom spoke for all Indians "who don't have a chance to speak because tribal politics is dominated by the federal government, controlled by white interest groups that tell Indians what to think, how to be, how to act, and many of us young people are tired of that. We've had it." The notable absence of the National Congress of American Indians, now led by John Belindo, reflected the mainstream Indian organization's adherence to Deloria's "inside-outside" strategy that hesitated to criticize the Johnson Administration. Writing about it two years later in his book *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, Deloria dismissed the Poor People's Campaign as "too radical a departure for Indian thinking for the tribes to bridge."²⁹

Yet at the time the radical elements in the Modern American Indian Movement who joined in the protest as representatives on the Committee of 100 had no trouble meeting with officials in Washington. Abernathy headed the group singing "We Shall Overcome" as it entered the chamber of the Department of the Interior for an audience with longtime Indian adversary Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. There Abernathy explained about the protest, "We have decided poverty knows no racial boundaries, that 'poor' is common to many white people, red people, brown people, yellow people, as it is to black people." Again Mel Thom spoke: "We have joined the Poor People's Campaign because most of our families, tribes, and communities number among those suffering most in this country. We are not begging. We are demanding what is rightfully ours." He endorsed the objectives of the Poor People's Campaign—to gain jobs, housing, income—but echoed self-determination: "we want them on our terms." Hank Adams accused federal Bureau of Indian Affairs agents of stirring up "intense anti-Negro feeling" among Indians in order to prevent interracial cooperation, a charge repeated by Tillie Walker.³⁰

By the end of April 1968, some two hundred American Indians

— from western reservations but not from the Deep South — joined representatives of the nation's destitute who occupied the National Mall in Washington, D. C. Abernathy and the SCLC oversaw the settlement of Resurrection City and unintentionally allowed for the segregation of housing into Mexican, black, American Indian, Puerto Rican, and poor white neighborhoods. Recognizing it “flawed from the beginning,” and “full of ghettos,” Abernathy accepted the human division with bitter resignation. As the media doted on “inflammatory rhetoric” of militant Black Panthers rather than the daily life of the poor wallowing in the mud of Resurrection City, he found the protest to be “yesterday’s news and last week’s headlines.” Nevertheless he persisted as did the dedicated leaders of other minority groups.³¹

Occasional protests enlivened the demonstrations as when on May 29, 1968 a contingent of more than one hundred American Indians marched to the United States Supreme Court to protest rulings against treaty rights such as the Washington State Supreme Court regarding the fish-ins. Led by Hank Adams, these residents of Resurrection City dressed in their tribal regalia, “with their faces covered with colorful paint, carrying tom-toms, ritual tomahawks, and peace pipes” reached the temple of justice. The bronze doors of the supreme court stopped them from entering. Abernathy recalled joining twenty-five Indian leaders who through the efforts of Adams gained entrance to the building, intending to hand over their complaint when they approached the bench. As with many protests during the Poor People’s Campaign, these men occupied an outer chamber, waiting to be heard. After hours passed with no appearance by the black robed justices, the Indians began smoking the peace pipe, then later beating their drums softly, and finally chanting to the rhythm as their voices swelled in outrage towards the end of the day. It was unlike any other civil rights protest attended by Abernathy. By nightfall the movement veteran looked at the Indian leader who shook his head and announced to the other Native

Americans, "OK, you can knock it off. We're going."³²

The various protests of the Poor People's Campaign did little to alter centuries of stonewalling by government bureaucracies just as it failed to create the "beloved community" envisioned by Dr. King. Deloria ridiculed such protests, suggesting: "You go into those higher level federal officials, all they can possibly do is blow smoke up your ass for an hour and send you on your way." To the former head of the NCAI, the "wild threats and militant statements" generated "ill will" and undermined years of careful cultivation designed to alter longstanding bureaucratic policies and the attitudes of government officials. Yet the dramatic showing of 50,000 people who attended the great march on June 19 that culminated in speeches by Coretta Scott King and others focused the nation's attention on the needs of the poor. In the waning weeks of the demonstration, some Native Americans began leaving. When the appellate courts upheld the conviction of Dick Gregory for participating in the fish-ins and he returned to the state of Washington to serve his sentence in June 1968, several Indian supporters left with him. Only later did the U. S. Supreme Court overturn the lower court rulings and recognize the fishing rights of Native Americans in the Pacific Northwest. When the courts ordered the dismantling of Resurrection City, Wallace "Mad Bear" Anderson, Hank Adams and other Indian leaders presented a "Proclamation of Temporary Cession" to Abernathy who claimed it as justification for continuing the encampment. That night law enforcement agents fired teargas into the shantytown. When the original permit for the protest expired at dusk on June 23, 1968, Mel Thom and Tillie Walker submitted to arrest with Abernathy and other minority leaders as the bulldozers went to work clearing the national mall of Resurrection City, bringing to an end perhaps the most multicultural protest the nation had yet seen.³³

Red Power

Adapting the tactics of the Black Panthers in the urban ghetto, Native Americans took matters into their own hands. Just like African Americans who moved into northern cities, Native Americans left the reservation for opportunities in metropolis, often suffering similar forms of discrimination. A case of police brutality in Minneapolis, Minnesota resulted in the formation of the American Indian Movement (AIM) in 1968. As a pan-Indian organization that attracted members from a variety of nations, the AIM represented a national activist organization that expressed a shared belief in self-determination. The AIM activism swept aside the strategies of tribal representatives in the NCAI. Indeed when comparing the Native American movement with the civil rights movement, one might draw a parallel between the NAACP and the NCAI and a shared conservative approach to systemic reform, versus the direct action strategies adopted by SNCC and the AIM. One might even extend the analysis to the radical elements in the Black Panthers and the Alcatraz—Red Power Movement or ARPM. While the grassroots actions of the ARPM generated attention to and provoked international outrage over Native American concerns, the AIM through its national network and media outlet promoted supra-tribal strategies that fueled the protests of the Red Power Movement.³⁴

The Indian occupation of Alcatraz Island in 1969 symbolized the Red Power movement that launched a series of protests over the next decade resulting in the occupation of nearly one hundred sites across America. On November 20, 1969, some 89 Native Americans landed on windswept Alcatraz Island in the San Francisco Bay, claiming the abandoned federal land as their own. They organized themselves into a council structure, assigned duties such as security and sanitation, but also to sustain a long-term occupation such domestic chores as housing, daycare, laundry, and communal cooking. For the next nineteen months Native Americans

and other activists squatted on Alcatraz. Clearly the occupation reflected a rejection of assimilation and a desire for self-determination by all Native peoples. They adopted a Pan-Indian approach for what actually turned out to be the third occupation of Alcatraz. The first occupation had occurred in March 1964 when Sioux Indians living in San Francisco briefly lay claim to and occupied the island the year after the federal government had shut down its notorious prison and abandoned "The Rock." Five years later on November 9, 1969 a small group of college students occupied the island in the name of "Indians of All Tribes." After three days they left but made plans to return. Hence the third occupation on November 20th that caught the attention of the nation.³⁵

New Native American Studies Programs on college campuses had radicalized the young Indians who occupied Alcatraz. The leader of the group, a Mohawk named Richard Oakes, had attended classes on Native American history at San Francisco State College while similar courses took place at the University of California on its Berkeley campus under Professor Jack Forbes. Part of a larger academic shift that began analyzing ethnicities through such course offerings as Chicano studies or the founding of such disciplines as African American Studies, Native American Studies in San Francisco drew strength from the National Indian Youth Council headquartered in Berkeley as well as the Far West Laboratory for Research and Educational Development, which often hosted NIYC veterans Clyde Warrior and Mel Thom. The month before the students occupied Alcatraz, a fire had burned the San Francisco Indian Center, so the activists claimed the island in the name of "all tribes" in a radical bid to repatriate land. In addition to the island, they asked for federal funding to finance a Native American University, museum, and new cultural center to replace the one that had burned in October 1969.³⁶

A pan-Indian effort, the Alcatraz Occupation evolved over its year-and-a-half long life. On the second attempt, fourteen Indian students

had occupied the island with Richard Oakes. Of the original 89 protesters who settled in the first few days of the third attempt, some 70 came from the Native American Studies Program at the University of California, Los Angeles. Their numbers grew in the weeks and months that followed as representatives of numerous nations including the Mohawk, Cherokee, Hoopa, Navajo, Sioux and Yakima participated. The Indians held powwows and celebrations. Mirroring the Black Panthers with their display of submachine guns, the Indians exercised self-defense by shooting arrows at passing ships. Like most protest movements, the demonstrators developed a series of objectives.³⁷

Just as occurred against the Black Panthers and Weathermen, so too regional and federal law enforcement agents aligned against the Indians occupying Alcatraz. As the weeks of the occupation turned into months, the Native peoples won sympathetic support among the public that supplied donated food and other goods to a collection center on the mainland for transportation to the island. To curtail public assistance, federal authorities intervened to block the re-supply ships. Then authorities cut off the electricity and fresh water to the island. The Native American protesters suffered hardships as tensions mounted. Throughout the nineteen months of occupation, the total number of demonstrators hovered around one hundred people. Yet at the beginning of the spring term in 1970, the students who initiated the protest returned to the mainland to attend classes at UCLA. Although other native peoples initially replaced the Indian students, as the cause celebre grew, it attracted hippies from San Francisco's Height-Asbury neighborhood. Initially drugs and alcohol had been banned from the island but in time they became commonplace. With electricity cut off, the Alcatraz lighthouse no longer warned ships in the bay. Negotiations between the representatives of the Indians and the U. S. Coast Guard failed to restore the needed navigational aids and convinced the federal government to intervene. Thirty-five U. S. Marshals forcibly removed the

remaining fifteen protesters on June 11, 1971. While the occupation of Alcatraz failed at first to win the group's stated objectives, it succeeded in galvanizing the Red Power Movement in America.³⁸

The Alcatraz occupation in 1969 prompted similar protests by Native Americans across the country. The subsequent Red Power movement forever altered the way the nation perceived of Native Americans just as it forever changed Indian self-perception. The Native American painter Fritz Scholder—a descendant of California Mission Indians in the Luiseno tribe—captured the spirit of the new contemporary Indian in a series of controversial paintings now on display in the Smithsonian Institute's long awaited and recently opened National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, D.C. Just as African Americans embraced the idea of "Black Is Beautiful," so too Native Americans expressed a sense of pride in their traditional culture. By the 1970s, the American public no longer viewed its indigenous population the same as before.³⁹

While the Alcatraz protest symbolized the first of the one hundred or so occupations that occurred between Alcatraz in 1969 and the Longest Walk in 1978, the most famous took place at Wounded Knee in 1973. The protest that occurred in South Dakota at the Pine Ridge Reservation reflected the culmination of a decade of direct action demonstrations. The Oglala Lakota or Sioux Tribe that lived on the reservation suffered from the same problems that plagued many of the Indian Nations, not only poverty, alcoholism, and limited education and employment opportunities, but also leadership corrupted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Responding to the controversial Sioux Tribal leader Richard Wilson, some 250 members of a protest group led by Russell Means and Dennis Banks and derived from the American Indian Movement descended on the Pine Ridge Reservation and occupied the site on February 27, 1973. Over the next ten-weeks that spring, a standoff occurred between the occupiers advocating Red Power and the forces loyal to Wilson and subsidized by the federal government. Called

Wounded Knee II, the protest evolved into a violent siege whereby the two parties fired gunshots at each other during shootouts over roadblocks. On March 11, 1973, the occupiers identified themselves as the Independent Oglala Nation and in a bid at self-determination asked for recognition by the United Nations with the intent of sending a delegation to New York. A few days later tribal leaders extended citizenship to some 350 people living on the reservation. Throughout it all a series of negotiations in which Hank Adams assisted as a go-between hammered out an end to the standoff that had claimed the lives of two Indians and a Federal Bureau of Investigation agent. A truce allowed the lifting of the siege on May 9, 1973 with the conflict unresolved and Wilson still in office. The protest revealed the entrenched problems faced by Native Americans.⁴⁰

Conclusion

Nevertheless in response to the direct action protests the U. S. Congress reversed itself on “termination” and passed the Indian Self Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 that gave Native Americans greater control over federal programs on reservations and official legal status for tribes. Henceforth tribal governments negotiated directly with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other federal agencies such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. By following the example of the modern civil rights movement and using direct action tactics to reject assimilation and insist on treaty rights during the protest era of the 1950s to the 1970s, Indian radicals had forced the federal government to re-evaluate Indian policy. Yet also by working within the system, the NCAI and Deloria had strengthened the legal position of tribal leaders who claimed the right to build gaming facilities such as off-track betting and bingo parlors on reservations. Congress recognized the right with the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988. By gaining direct access to federal resources and

then building gambling casinos on tribal lands, Indian leaders created economic engines that generated proceeds as cash allotments to tribal members that began lifting some Native Americans out of poverty.⁴¹

A decade after Dr. King had planned the Poor People's Campaign in 1968, Native Americans launched their own Longest Walk as an appeal to Congress. In March 1978 a group of Indians affiliated with the Red Power Movement left San Francisco on a march to Washington, D. C. They arrived in the capital in July 1978 intending to draw attention to the continued abrogation of Indian Treaties and persistent problems on the reservation. In place of the direct action that marked the land seizures earlier in the decade, the Longest Walk returned to the spiritual movements of the previous century. No violence occurred. In many ways the national debate had moved on to confront other problems, no longer interested in the issues raised by the Native Americans. In the decades that followed brief protests occurred over land use on reservations but little else has happened regarding Indian rights.

Inspired by the success of African Americans in the civil rights movement, other minorities organized direct action protest movements to achieve their objectives. While distinctive in their own way, the Student Movement, the Women's Movement, the Gay Rights Movement, and the Chicano Movement followed similar strategies and trajectories to gain equal access to the American system. Only the Modern American Indian Movement rejected assimilation as its primary objective, instead using direct action to highlight violations of treaties and to force a change in federal Indian policy. Just as with African Americans, women, gays and lesbians, and Chicanos, these protests altered public perceptions about American Indians. When combined with an "inside-outside" strategy designed to work the system for the external gain of self-determination, the Modern American Indian Movement accomplished many of its goals. Securing the right to negotiate treaties empowered tribal leaders who through access to

federal resources developed strategies to tackle poverty and other problems on the reservation, thereby helping American Indians control their own affairs.

Notes

¹ The author would like to thank Professor Juri Abe, the director of the Institute for American Studies at Rikkyo University, for the invitation to present an earlier version of this paper at the institution's annual American Indian Dialogue Symposium, June 2, 2009. He would like to acknowledge the assistance of Professors Akiyo Ito Okuda, Kohei Kawashima, Fukuko Kobayashi, Azusa Ono, Hayumi Higuchi, and Kazuhisa Honda, as well as Rio Okumura of the Institute for American Studies at Rikkyo and scholars of Native American studies Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green. For brief histories of these social movements see Roger S. Powers, William B. Voegelé, Christopher Kruegler, and Ronald M. McCarthy, eds., *Protest, Power, and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action from ACT-UP to Women's Suffrage* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1997).

² James M. Washington, ed., *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (New York: Harper and Row, 1986), 86.

³ Through a series of rulings the U. S. Supreme Court under Chief Justice John Marshall defined relationships between Indians and the federal government throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with Marshall's language of tribal governments as "domestic dependent nations" and his analogy of a "ward to his guardian" setting in motion often contradictory objectives. See the entry "John Marshall" in James S. Olson, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Indian Civil Rights* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997), 231-34.

⁴ Manning Marable, *Race, Reform and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America, 1945-1982* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1984), 66. On King and the movement see Numan V. Bartley, *The New South: 1945-1980* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995).

⁵ Raymond Arsenault, *Freedom Riders: 1961 and the Struggle for Racial Justice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁶ Clayborne Carson, *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981).

⁷ David J. Garrow, *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference* (New York: William Morrow, 1986).

⁸ Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Boston, MA: Horizons Books, 1973); Aldon D. Morris, *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change* (New York: Macmillan, 1984).

⁹ Glenn T. Eskew, *But For Birmingham: The Local and National Movements in the Civil Rights Struggle* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); "Civil Rights Act of 1964," in Olson, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Indian Civil Rights*, 79.

¹⁰ For interviews with the various historical actors during the civil rights struggle see Howell Raines, *My Soul Is Rested: Movement Days in the Deep South Remembered* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1977). On Selma see David J. Garrow, *Protest At Selma: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Voting Rights Act of 1965* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1978). The Voting Rights Act of 1965 benefited Native Americans in Arizona and New Mexico still confronting resistance by white supremacists, see "Voting Rights" in Olson, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Indian Civil Rights*, 373. Vine Deloria, Jr., *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties: An Indian Declaration of Independence* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1974), 23-26, Deloria found the lack of Native American involvement in the civil rights movement resulted from its ideology that "was anathema to the majority of Indians" who held suspect "anyone who spoke of either equality or helping them to get into 'the mainstream.'" (23). He acknowledged that while "several Indians attended the March on Washington," the "sparsity of their numbers was a true measure of the importance which Indians placed on the civil rights movement." Deloria blamed a Bureau of Indian Affairs policy that squelched support for direct action by emphasizing "Indians don't do those things" (25).

¹¹ For a thoughtful evaluation of the last years of King's life see Adam Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America: The Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987). As King grew radical, he alienated not only the Johnson administration but also the mainstream media, see Richard Lentz, *Symbols, The News Magazines, and Martin Luther King* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990).

¹² Martin Luther King, Jr., *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968). King concluded the original 1967 publication with the lines "We still have a choice today: nonviolent coexistence or violent co-annihilation. This may well be mankind's last chance to choose between chaos and community." See also David L. Chappell, *A Stone of Hope: Prophetic Religion and the Death of Jim Crow* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

¹³ On the Poor People's Campaign see Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 357-88; John Lewis with Michael D'Orso, *Walking With the Wind: A Memoir of the Movement* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1998); Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America* (New York: Random House, 1967).

¹⁴ Originally published in 1961 in French, a common paperback English edition appeared as Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1968); Ward Churchill and Jim Vander Wall, *Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars Against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1990).

¹⁵ On the outcome of changes since movement days see Steven F. Lawson, *Black Ballots: Voting Rights in the South, 1944-1969* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976); David R. Goldfield, *Black, White, and Southern: Race Relations and Southern Culture 1940 to the Present* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990); Hugh Davis Graham, *The Civil Rights Era: Origins and Development of National Policy, 1960-1972* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). The Stanford

University economist Gavin Wright has delivered several papers on African American economic success in the post-movement South, the subject of his forthcoming book.

16. Alan Adelson, *SDS: A Profile* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972); James Miller, *'Democracy Is In The Streets': From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987).

17. Operations Manual, *The Civil Rights Act of 1964: Text, Analysis, Legislative History* (Washington, D. C.: BNA Inc., 1964); Public Law 88-352, 88th Congress, H. R. 7152, July 2, 1964, "Civil Rights Act of 1964."

18. For a general history see Rosalind Rosenberg, *Divided Lives: American Women in the Twentieth Century*, Revised Edition (New York: Hill and Wang, 2008); and on the Second Wave Women's Movement see Flora Davis, *Moving the Mountain: The Women's Movement in America Since 1960* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991).

19. David Carter, *Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2004). For a more personal approach see Martin Duberman, *Stonewall* (New York: Plume, 1994).

20. See Tony Castro, *Chicano Power: The Emergence of Mexican America* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1974), but also Carlos Muñoz, *Youth, Identity, Power: The Chicano Movement*, Expanded Edition (New York: Verso, 2007), as well as Matt S. Meier and Margo Gutiérrez, *Encyclopedia of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 2000).

21. Timothy B. Tyson, *Radio Free Dixie: Robert F. Williams and the Roots of Black Power* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), quotation on 138.

22. The United States Supreme Court ruling in the Arizona case, *Harrison v. Laveen*, 67 Arizona 337, 196 P.2d 456 (1948), shifted the tide, resulting in the enfranchisement of 40,000 Native American voters. See also Olson, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Indian Civil Rights*, 371-73.

23. The 1851 Fort Laramie treaty recognized land holdings of 12 million acres claimed by the Three Affiliated Tribes but that had been reduced to only 1 million acres after the dam's construction. On Tillie Walker see Daniel M. Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America: The Struggle for Sovereignty* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008), 158; Troy Johnson, Joane Nagel, and Duane Champagne, eds., *American Indian Activism: Alcatraz to the Longest Walk* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 12-13.

24. Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America*, 8-13, 30-31, 59-60, on "inside-outside" strategy see 126. U. S. House of Representatives Concurrent Resolution 108 put the federal policy of "termination" into law, an act designed to use assimilation of Indians into the system and thereby end the special relationship between Indians and the federal government maintained through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, tribal governments and reservations. Not until a congressional omnibus act in 1988 did the federal government formally end the policy. See "Termination" in Olson, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Indian Rights*, 344-45.

25. First Thom quotation appears in Charles Wilkinson, *Blood Struggle: The Rise of Modern Indian*

Nations (New York: W. W. Norton, 2005), 111. Second Thom quotation appears in James Wilson, *The Earth Shall Weep: A History of Native America* (New York: Atlantic Monthly, 1998), 389.

^{26.} See Jack L. Landau, "Empty Victories: Indian Treaty Fishing Rights in the Pacific Northwest," in John R. Wunder, ed., *Recent Legal Issues for American Indians, 1968 to the Present* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1996), 63-106, and other volumes in Wunder's series with Garland. *Puyallup Tribe v. Department of Game of Washington*, 391 U.S. 392 (1968).

^{27.} On the Taos Pueblos see Johnson et al, eds., *American Indian Activism*, 17, and also the essay by Vine Deloria, Jr., "Alcatraz, Activism, and Accommodation," pp. 45-51. Deloria observed that "The administration appeared to be genuinely interested in correcting wrongs suffered by Indian people, and a general air of euphoria developed during the first year of the Nixon administration," see his *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties*, 36-37.

^{28.} Florence Mars with the assistance of Lynn Eden, *Witness in Philadelphia* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), 219; there appears to be no letters between Martin Luther King, Jr., and Native American leaders in the published series, Clayborne Carson, editor, *The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr., Volumes 1-5*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

^{29.} On the intersection of Indian activists and the civil rights movement, see the groundbreaking study by Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America*, especially Chapter Seven, "Many Roads." Thom quotation on 164. Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (New York: Macmillan, 1969), 183. With a free market orientation, Deloria promoted tribal financial independence, encouraging Indians to shift resources out of the U. S. Treasury and into the stock market.

^{30.} Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America*, Abernathy quoted on 166, Thom on 167, Adams on 169.

^{31.} Ralph David Abernathy, *And the Walls Came Tumbling Down: An Autobiography* (New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 511-14; as the housing on the mall filled up, many Native Americans encamped in a nearby church shelter. Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America*, 174 includes a map that shows the regions of the country from which the participants came.

^{32.} See *New York Times*, May 30, 1968, which reported, "At least 4 windows broken at the Supreme Court today as angry demonstrators from the Poor People's Campaign forced their way into the building." Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America*, 179-81; Abernathy, *And the Walls Came Tumbling Down*, 519-20.

^{33.} Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America*, 188-92, Deloria quote on 183; *New York Times*, June 20, 23, 24, 25, 1968. The long road of appeals in the Washington state case, *Puyallup Tribe v. Department of Game*, resulted in the high court recognizing the Indians had never surrendered their fishing rights when negotiating treaty cessions of off-reservation lands. See "Fishing" in Olson, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Indian Civil Rights*, 131-33.

^{34.} Donald L. Fixico, *The Urban Indian Experience in America* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000); On AIM and ARPM see Johnson, et. al, eds., *American Indian Activism*, 32-39, and for a thoughtful self-analysis, see Karren Baird-Olson, "Reflections of an AIM Activist: Has It

All Been Worth It?" on pp. 225-41.

^{35.} *New York Times*, November 21, 1969, headlined its article, "Indian Group Stakes a Claim To Alcatraz" with the article noting that the Native American activists "reportedly plan to establish a center for native American studies" on the island. See also Johnson, et al, eds., *American Indian Activism*, 25-28, and on page 24 the quotation of a Sioux—Richard McKenzie—who had participated in the 1964 occupation of Alcatraz and "recognized the uniqueness of the Indian situation as opposed to the civil rights movement. He said, 'Kneel-Ins, Sit-Ins, Sleep-Ins, Eat-Ins, Pray-Ins like the Negroes do, wouldn't help us. We would have to occupy the government buildings before things would change.'"

^{36.} Johnson, et al, eds., *American Indian Activism*, 104-12.

^{37.} Johnson, et al, eds., *American Indian Activism*, 28-30.

^{38.} *New York Times*, June 12, 1971; See John Garvey and Troy Johnson, "The Government and the Indians: The American Indian Occupation of Alcatraz Island, 1969-71" in Johnson, et al, eds., *American Indian Activism*, 153-85.

^{39.} An expression of Red Pride may be found in Chapter 10, "Indians and Modern Society," in Deloria, *Custer Died For Your Sins*, 225-42.

^{40.} See the op-ed piece by Alvin M. Joseph Jr., "What the Indians Want at Wounded Knee and all that!" *New York Times*, March 18, 1973; Churchill and Wall, *Agents of Repression*.

^{41.} See entries on Gaming, Institute for the Development of Indian Law, and Vine Deloria, Jr. in Olson, ed., *Encyclopedia of American Indian Civil Rights*, 100-101, 144-46, 191-92.