

Developing a Voice **The Evolution of Self-Determination** **in an Urban Indian Community**

David R. M. Beck

More American Indians live in urban areas than anywhere else in the United States, a fact that the larger American population has been slow to comprehend. Over the past half century this demographic shift from reservation to city has been a factor of steadily increasing significance in shaping the modern Indian experience in America. The implications have been broad-ranging at the community level on reservations and in urban centers, and on the individual level for tribal members in both reservation and nonreservation communities.

The American Indian population, despite a significant growth spurt,¹ has remained below 1 percent of the total U.S. population. Notwithstanding these small numbers, tribes that are federally or state-recognized have been able to advocate with some success for their own needs. They do this based on the semisovereign status accorded to them under the law. Tribes' ability to do this improved markedly in the era of self-determination, which encompasses the last quarter to third of the twentieth century, although gaps still exist among tribes and in terms of definitions of sovereign rights.

"Self-determination" is in the narrow sense a term with legal implications in which the federal government recognizes the authority of tribes to govern themselves under the political and judicial definitions of limited sovereignty. In a larger sense, self-determination means the ability of a people to determine the direction of their own society and community in political, economic, social, and spiritual arenas. In this

article, in relation to an urban Indian community, it means that community's ability to define itself and its needs and its ability to advocate for itself in the larger society under its own terms. It implies the development of a voice through which all of these things can be done.

Indians in cities lack the legal protections available to tribes and so have had to develop their own means of self-advocacy. Often urban Indian leaders have done this through the organizations they developed to address specific community concerns. Through these organizations, Indians have created dynamic urban communities in which the focus of leadership is generally advocacy on behalf of those community members in need. The history of such organizations dates back to the early decades of the twentieth century, predating the relocation era of the 1950s to 1970s. In the latter half of the century, their numbers and activities increased dramatically.

The development of organizational and community agendas that clearly reflect an Indian voice occurred in cities throughout the United States in the 1900s, from New York to Chicago to Los Angeles, from Seattle to Minneapolis to Dallas to Detroit. Myriad smaller cities such as Albuquerque, Tucson, Sioux City, and Billings saw such development as well. One large urban area, Chicago, provides a valuable case study for several reasons. Chicago is in a state with no Indian reservations but is surrounded by several states that are home to recognized and unrecognized tribes. As such, and due to its industrial and political reputation as "the city that works," as well as being a critical locus for the country's rail and trucking systems, Chicago has attracted American Indians from a broad variety of Indian nations.

Chicago housed an Office of Indian Affairs warehouse in the early 1900s and became one of the federal government's relocation centers in the 1950s. Indians educated at boarding schools who chose to make their way in the white world did so in places like Chicago. Others, who simply desired to leave the reservation for economic opportunity, likewise moved to Chicago. Yet contrary to the commonly held stereotype, many of these urban migrants had no desire to give up their Indian identities or their connections with Indian communities. By the late 1910s, Indians in Chicago began to create organizations and articulate their roles to shape a more positive place in society for Indian people. From the beginning, tribal members involved in this work have recognized the necessity of working together across ethnic boundaries. Intertribal cooperation has been a focus of community development time and again throughout the century. This continues through the present day. Indian organizations in Chicago have retained a distinctly American Indian nature, which is reflected in their values and the ways in which they do their work.

Throughout the twentieth century American Indians in Chicago have worked to develop community. Four historical occurrences in

particular define that development: (1) the work of Dr. Carlos Montezuma in the first quarter of the century, advocating on behalf of American Indians both in and outside of Chicago; (2) the development of an organizational voice in the 1920s and 1930s under the leadership of Scott Henry Peters and the Grand Council Fire of American Indians (GCFAI); (3) the development of an All Tribes American Indian Center (AIC) in the 1950s postwar/relocation period; and (4) the cooperation of Indian-run organizations that occurred through a Chicago American Indian Community Organizations Conference (CAICOC) held in 1981. The development of self-determination in the Chicago American Indian community will be explored here with these four historical anchors providing a structure within which to understand it.

This article begins with overviews of the urbanization of American Indians in the United States and the Indian history of Illinois. It then provides an analysis of Indian leadership in Chicago in the twentieth century, with a focus on organizational development.

U R B A N I Z A T I O N

American Indians lived in urban communities in the Americas for hundreds of years previous to Columbus's arrival here. The largest ancient urban center in what is now the United States was Cahokia, located a few miles from present-day St. Louis on the Illinois side of the border.² And American Indians have lived in or near Euramerican and American cities since the earliest establishment of such places. Early Euramerican frontier towns on occasion held more people of mixed Indian and white blood than whites.³ Many American cities have had a continuous, though small, American Indian presence throughout their history. But urban Indian populations in the United States remained minute until after World War II.

After this time, two factors converged that led to a rapid increase in the population of American Indians in U.S. cities. After the war many Indian people, veterans, for example, migrated to cities in search of work and a way to support their families, disgusted with impoverished conditions in their reservation homelands. Tribal economies had been destroyed in the nineteenth century, Indian lands had been stolen, economic development and self-sufficiency programs established by the U.S. government were largely failures, federal wardship crippled attempts by tribes to resolve these problems, and many individuals became victims of a well-founded sense of helplessness. After the war, with the American economy booming as it had not done in peacetime since the 1920s, many Indians moved to sources of work.

The other important factor leading to a rapid increase in the urban Indian population was shifting federal policy, of which relocation of Indians from reservation lands to cities was a key feature.

Relocation was part of a three-pronged policy aimed, as federal policies have been before and since, at ending, or at the very least diminishing, federal trust responsibilities toward Indian tribal nations. Coming on the heels of a policy that had restored power to tribal governments in a limited way, the policies of the 1950s were a new attempt by the federal government to bring American Indians into the mainstream of American society. These modern attempts at assimilation were conducted under the twin rubrics of emancipating or freeing Indians from federal rule and downsizing operations and programs within the federal government.⁴

The major thrust of the policy aimed at tribal governments was termination, which eliminated the government-to-government relationship between Indian nations and the United States, closed tribal rolls, removed tribal lands from trust status, and allocated tribal wealth to individual tribal members. This policy was applied to over one hundred Indian nations. It was enabled under HCR 108, passed in 1953. Termination proved to be one of the most disastrous federal programs ever applied to Indian nations.⁵

A second thrust of the changing federal policy, which attempted to turn all criminal and civil jurisdiction in Indian Country over to states under Public Law 280, also passed in 1953. The law originally applied to five states and Alaska, and later was expanded to include others under certain more restrictive conditions. This, too, was clearly aimed at ending federal responsibilities toward tribes.

The third prong of this policy aimed at draining the labor source from reservations. This was the relocation policy. Under this policy the Bureau of Indian Affairs stationed relocation officers in reservations and in cities, and paid Indians travel money to get to the city and start-up money for rent and food upon arrival. The urban relocation officer lined up training or jobs for the migrating tribal members. Like the boarding school policy, education and job training under this program was almost exclusively for manual labor. It was in this atmosphere that many tribal members began to move to America's urban centers.

In Chicago the Indian population rose dramatically, from less than 1,000 in 1940 to more than 20,000 in the 1960s. This reflected the national trend. The city's Indian population became extremely diverse during these years. The relocation program itself petered out in the 1970s, but the demographic trend was not reversed. By the 1990 census, approximately 56 percent of the two million Indians living in the United States were classified as urban residents.⁶

The growth of the Indian community in Chicago reflected this pattern. Chicago is located where the Chicago River emptied into Lake Michigan until the city's engineers reversed its flow to send the city's effluence to the interior river system and eventually the Mississippi River in 1900. The area was swampy, and the name for Chicago trans-

lates in the Miami language to wild onions or wild garlic, also known as skunk weed.⁷ Historically, the region served as a trading center and provided village sites for various tribes, including the Miami and the Ho Chunk. The nation most associated with the area was the Potawatomi.⁸

In 1832 and 1833 a series of treaties ceded all of the remaining tribal lands in Illinois to the United States. The United States was able to make these treaties after it had “established military supremacy in the western Great Lakes Region during the Black Hawk War.”⁹ In the treaty process, a number of individual Indians, including Sauganash (Billy Caldwell), Archange Oiulmette (the wife of a French trader), Alexander Robinson, and several others were awarded plots of land in what is now Chicago and its suburbs.¹⁰ Their fellow tribesmen, however, were forced to leave Illinois.

Throughout the nineteenth century, those families remained in Chicago, establishing small homesteads and tiny pockets of an Indian presence.¹¹ As the city grew, other Indians traveled to Chicago from neighboring states to sell items such as berries and fish. Others passed through as ship hands—Chicago’s ports were kept busy hauling Wisconsin and Michigan lumber to build the city that would burn so famously in October 1871. By the late nineteenth century, Indians also came to Chicago as members of Wild West shows, entertainers, and members of an incipient professional class.

CARLOS MONTEZUMA

The most well-known American Indian to live in Chicago as the twentieth century dawned was Dr. Carlos Montezuma, the Indian rights activist, a Yavapai man who had trained at the Chicago Medical School and who was renowned as one of the best stomach surgeons in the United States.¹² Montezuma took for himself a role that was firmly in the tradition of tribal leadership—that of caring for less fortunate tribal members, of hosting visiting tribal members, and of advocating for tribal rights before entities such as the federal government. The difference was that while traditional leaders did these things for their own tribes, Montezuma did so for a multitribal population from an urban platform. His case is instructive, as he both reflected that traditional tribal role as transferred to an urban setting and established a model that was carried on through the rest of the century within organizations more than by individuals.

Montezuma was undeniably the individual who fought most consistently for Indian rights in the first quarter of the twentieth century in Chicago. The great passion of Montezuma’s life was fighting against the policies of the federal Indian Service, in fact, fighting for the abolition of the Service or the Indian Bureau or the Office of Indian Affairs

as it was also known. Montezuma believed Indians should become fully assimilated citizens of the United States, as did the Indian Service. But he also believed that the major barrier to this was the Indian Service itself, which so completely controlled Indian lives.

Montezuma was a founding member of a national organization, the Society of American Indians (SAI), in 1911. SAI membership consisted solely of American Indians, although "honorary membership" included "'persons not on any tribal roll and having less than one-sixteenth Indian blood,' thus taking care of supporters whose 'Indian blood' was difficult to trace or possibly imaginary." The organization was reform-oriented and represented middle-class Indians who understood that Indians were *not* a vanishing people, but a people whose role in society was defined by a complex relationship between reservation, tribal background, and society.¹³ The SAI was one of the first pan-Indian movements with a membership base in urban areas, off of reservations.

Montezuma's relationship to the SAI was strained and tenuous throughout the rest of his life, largely because his views toward the Indian Service were so controversial. In 1915, after a heated debate at the SAI's annual meeting that resulted when he distributed his essay "Let My People Go," which called for the abolition of the Service in no uncertain terms, Montezuma and the SAI split.¹⁴

Montezuma then began publication of his own monthly newspaper, *Wassaja*, in Chicago in 1916. (Montezuma claimed *Wassaja* was his Apache name, and that it means "signaling.") The sole stated purpose of the newspaper was to encourage the abolition of the Indian Service; Montezuma said he would discontinue publication when the Service was abolished.¹⁵ The masthead of *Wassaja* included three different drawings over the years. Two of these depicted the Indian Bureau crushing Indians. The third showed Indian people fighting back. In the introduction to the first edition, Montezuma said, "This monthly signal . . . is to be published only so long as the Indian Bureau exists. Its sole purpose is Freedom for the Indians through the abolishment of the Indian Bureau."¹⁶ He published the newspaper until his death in 1923.

Although he later briefly worked on the editorial board of the SAI's quarterly publication and arranged for the SAI's 1923 conference to be held in Chicago, there was only uneasy peace between the SAI and Montezuma. He did maintain contact with the organization and its members, however, both by mail and through his newspaper. Issues important to Indians, such as the retention of Indian culture, were debated in this way.

Montezuma believed that, because Indians were stereotyped as savage and backward, Indian cultural practices, including music and art, should be abandoned. He wrote articles for Chicago newspapers protesting the building of an Indian art center at Carlisle Indian School

in Pennsylvania, arguing that the art offers “only evidence of that dark period in Indian life of which the best that can be said is that it ought to be forgotten in the march toward the more advanced life.”¹⁷ Culturally he did not grow up Indian, so it may be that he did not understand the value of such practices.

Not all Indians agreed with Montezuma, and it must be remembered that Montezuma spent almost his entire life living in white society and maintained an allegiance to his long-time friend Richard Henry Pratt, the assimilationist founder of Carlisle Indian School.¹⁸ It was within white society that he saw the best hope for Indians to advance from the state of degradation in which the government kept them. We can most clearly see the dilemma in a letter from one man who disagreed with Montezuma, but who also highly respected him. Unfortunately, there is no record of Montezuma’s reply to this letter. Arthur C. Parker, the Seneca ethnologist, wrote to Montezuma in March 1913, asking if it would be all right, in Montezuma’s view, to teach Indian folk music to Indian children if this music were also taught in white schools. The implication, of course, was that this would require an abrupt shift in thinking about Indians on the part of white society. Parker seems to be asking Montezuma whether Montezuma would support the perpetuation of Indian culture, which Parker believed to be worth perpetuating, if whites would stop defining that culture as savage or backward.¹⁹ Perhaps other Indians struggled with Montezuma’s ideas: should they abandon cultural ways or not? They may have wanted a dialogue with Montezuma because they were still grappling with these issues themselves.

Despite Montezuma’s belief that assimilation, as he defined it, provided the best opportunities for Indians to survive in modern society, he did not give up ties to his home reservation community or to his friends. Many of his actions clearly reflected traditional tribal values—even though he was not raised in a tribal community. Besides his loud advocacy work on the national level, Montezuma played a low-key yet perhaps more significant role in Chicago. He carried on his advocacy both within and outside of his profession as physician. When a train carrying members of the Buffalo Bill Wild West Show crashed near Maywood in 1904, he was called upon in his capacity as physician. Among the dead and injured were eighteen Indian show members from Pine Ridge, South Dakota. The Indian Affairs agent for Pine Ridge, J. R. Brennan, collaborated with the railroad company, agreeing to a quick settlement between the railroad and survivors and families of the deceased. This was possible because Indian people were wards of the government, and the agent had near total control over most important decisions regarding their lives.

The injured people thought the decision unfair. A committee including Luther Standing Bear, a Sioux from South Dakota, and three

others contacted Dr. Montezuma, asking him to intervene. Montezuma wrote to the Indian Service on April 19, 1904, requesting that he be able to attend to the injured Indians. In this letter he pointed out that since Agent Brennan's brother had a connection with the Buffalo Bill show, the compensation might not have been awarded with partiality. In a letter to Montezuma dated April 30, W. A. Jones of the Indian Service said he would be glad to meet with Dr. Montezuma but, he added, "I understand the Pine Ridge agent is looking out for the interests of the Indians." Soon Jones received a letter from Brennan, dated May 2, which argued that value was calculated in relative terms and since, for instance, two of the deceased never worked, their families did not deserve a larger compensation.

Carlos Montezuma and three others, including Honoré Joseph Jaxon, a white labor agitator originally from Canada who posed as a *métis* (mixed-blood white and Indian) while he lived in Chicago, sent Jones a letter on May 6 protesting Brennan's handling of the case and demanding an investigation. Montezuma sent his nine-page medical report to the Indian Bureau on May 19. It detailed the injuries, present conditions, prospects of recovery, and permanent injuries suffered by the fifteen survivors. Montezuma was unsuccessful in his attempt to advocate on behalf of the victims. The Bureau accepted the settlement Brennan had made, despite Montezuma's detailed evidence. In a final letter of May 20, the cover letter for the "Estimate of Compensation Properly Due Indians Injured in Wreck on Chicago and Northwestern Company's Tracks near Maywood, Illinois," Montezuma had argued that Indians should be compensated the same amount as if they were white and that the settlement should be based on circumstances, not race or prejudice. The government, in the final analysis, was not prepared to admit that Indians had the same rights as white people.²⁰

Besides providing medical attention for Indians in need, Montezuma served as the Chicago connection for Indians passing through the city on their way east or west, and for those who got stranded there for one reason or another. If a tribal delegation changed trains in Chicago, Montezuma might meet the members at one station and help them find another. When tribal members became waylaid in Chicago, abandoned by fly-by-night Wild West shows, for example, he might help them find their way home—or find a job in Chicago. He seems to have made a special effort to meet children going to or from boarding school, primarily Carlisle School in Pennsylvania, where he himself had worked before moving to Chicago. Children traveling to these schools from out West often needed to pass through Chicago along the way.²¹ These dual roles of advocacy and social service, such a major part of Montezuma's personal life, were functions that would be needed by Indians in Chicago even as times changed. Toward the end of Montezuma's life, the first recorded Indian organization in Chicago,

the Indian Fellowship League (IFL), was established. It was actually founded by both Indian and non-Indian members and, during its short life, reflected the struggle between these two groups over who would provide direction, whose voice would be heard. The IFL unsuccessfully recruited Montezuma to take part in its activities. Its objectives included helping create a "better understanding of the American Indian," according to its "Declaration of Purpose."²² In part, this was to be accomplished by the collection and dissemination of Indian arts, crafts, and cultural objects. Montezuma had a copy of the Declaration, perhaps sent to him for suggested revisions. On his copy he crossed out those sections detailing the preservation of cultural items. He also substituted the words "the freedom and citizenship" for "better understanding" so that the first objective would call for "the freedom and citizenship of the American Indian."²³

Montezuma never joined the Indian Fellowship League, and in fact by 1922 wrote of it only in negative terms. The secretary by then was R. D. Parker, who was probably a white man but called himself a "Pequad."²⁴ Parker was a showman whose extravaganzas were reviled by Montezuma. In 1919 the state legislature in Illinois passed a bill recognizing the fourth Friday in September as American Indian Day.²⁵ The IFL sponsored Indian Week encampments and powwows during that week over the next several years, as well as other entertainments. In 1920 Parker wrote letters to Montezuma encouraging him to be one of the Indians taking part in Parker's entertainments. The language in Parker's letters indicates that he assumed Montezuma would help him.²⁶ Montezuma's replies are unknown, but he assuredly did not participate. In a letter to his friend Pratt in 1922, Montezuma vented his disgust for Parker's ventures, saying that Parker thinks he is doing something good for Indians, while he "is actually a Buffalo Bill or P. T. Barnum," an epithet in strong terms for Montezuma and Pratt.²⁷ Montezuma had just excoriated Parker and the Indian Fellowship League in the August 1922 issue of *Wassaja*, saying that the "spectacular shows" are a "sham," which "does injustice to the modern progressive Indians."²⁸

Despite Montezuma's objections to the organization, the IFL was able to accomplish two things of importance. It gathered Indians and non-Indians together to work on behalf of Indian issues, and it provided a platform for Chicago's already diverse Indian population to advocate on behalf of their people.²⁹

The IFL, which was sponsored by the Chicago Historical Society, reorganized in October 1920, when it claimed its membership included representatives of thirty-five tribal groups. Non-Indians never let Indian members hold a controlling representation on the governing board, and non-Indian goals differed from Indian goals in transacting organizational business. Non-Indian members held common societal stereotyped views of Indians. They thought Indian members could

help them advance conservation-oriented issues, such as development of a forest preserve system, and they hoped to change schoolteachers' presentations of Indians from those of *savage* savages to those of *noble* savages.

Indian members such as David Buffalo Bear, a Sioux, and Oliver LaMere, a Winnebago, attempted to use the organization as a platform to advocate in Washington, D.C., on behalf of outstanding tribal claims, for example. In 1922 the organization initiated a public relations campaign to push for full Indian citizenship in the United States. And despite their disagreements with non-Indian members, Indian leaders of the IFL also worked hard through their organization to present more accurate views of Indian life and culture to the larger society. They succeeded in this to some extent, through the wildly successful encampments they sponsored, which were known to draw as many as 140,000 visitors, and garnered ample positive coverage in Chicago's daily newspapers.³⁰

GRAND COUNCIL FIRE OF AMERICAN INDIANS

The IFL apparently dissolved in 1923, and Carlos Montezuma passed on that year, too. 1923 was a watershed year for American Indians in Chicago for another reason as well: the founding of another organization of mixed Indian and non-Indian members, the Grand Council Fire of American Indians (GCFAI), which eventually came to be known as the Indian Council Fire.³¹ Originally the GCFAI served as both a social service agency and a tool to educate non-Indians about Indians. Its early Indian membership included a number of people already active in the SAI. The first president, Francis Cayou (Omaha), was a Carlisle graduate who later left Chicago and became a leader of the Native American Church.³²

From 1925 to 1933 Scott Henry Peters, an Ojibwe from Mt. Pleasant, Michigan, and a suburban Chicago businessman, served as president of the Council Fire, which had begun to serve important social service roles, providing relief to sick or unemployed Indians, helping Indians find jobs, providing sick calls, arranging for funeral expenses, and creating loan, scholarship, and Christmas funds.³³ These projects supported individual Indians in the Chicago area and also provided outreach to reservations. The Council Fire "created a meeting place for the Indians," according to the late Willard LaMere, Oliver's son and a longtime resident of the Chicago Indian community. LaMere recalled that this social function was of utmost importance to the Indian members.³⁴

Peters, also educated at Carlisle, was a more activist president than Cayou had been. Peters believed Indian youth needed to be pro-

vided the opportunity to succeed in the white world, and he consistently called for "more educational and economic opportunities for Indians."³⁵ He also believed that white America needed reeducation about its Indian citizenry. In this, both the Indian and the non-Indian members of the organization agreed. In 1927 they jointly submitted a resolution to the mayor of Chicago, Big Bill Thompson. Peters penned the first part of this statement, which served as an eloquent response to Thompson's "America First" campaign, which was an effort to have schools teach American, rather than British, history. He wrote,

You tell all white men "America first." We believe in that. We are the first Americans. We are the only ones, truly, that are 100 per cent. We, therefore, ask you while you are teaching school children about America first, teach them truth about the first Americans.

Then he challenged a long list of American stereotypes regarding Indians:

They call all white victories, battles, and all Indian victories, massacres. . . .

History books teach that Indians were murderers—is it murder to fight in self-defense? Indians killed white men because white men took their lands, ruined their hunting grounds, burned their forests, destroyed their buffalo. White men penned our people on reservations, then took away the reservations. White men who rise to protect their property are called patriots—Indians who do the same are called murderers.

White men call Indians treacherous—but no mention is made of broken treaties on the part of the white man. . . .

White men called Indians thieves—and yet we lived in frail skin lodges and needed no locks or iron bars.

White men called Indians savages. What is civilization? Its marks are a noble religion and philosophy, original arts, stirring music, rich story and legend. We had these. Then we were not savages, but a civilized race. . . .

Put in your history books the Indian's part in the World War. Tell how the Indian fought for a country of which he was not a citizen, for a flag to which he had no claim, and for a people that have treated him unjustly.³⁶

In 1928 this memorial was entered into the *Congressional Record*.³⁷ Like Montezuma's moving defense of the Sioux tribal members injured

in the 1904 train wreck, this plea had no discernable impact on policy. In fact, as a measure of lack of progress in the field of education, as we enter a new millennium, members of Chicago's American Indian community still view Peters's comments as timely, and have presented them to state and local school officials.³⁸

Peters insisted that white America view Indians historically as human beings. "Peters, though, took this view a step further," an observer has noted, "insisting not only that the Indian in history was a man, but that Indians of the present were men and women capable of making important decisions regarding the future of Indians." At the 1929 Indian Day celebration, Peters made a speech in which he proposed bringing tribal leaders from all over the United States to Chicago "to discuss self-determination." He noted that white allies of Native Americans spoke well on behalf of Indian issues, but said, "It is necessary that the Indians themselves discuss their own affairs and set forth their views, that justice may prevail."³⁹ Interestingly, such a convention did take place—some thirty-two years later. The 1961 American Indian Chicago Conference, which brought together Indian leaders from across the United States, is credited as being one of a number of critical events in the 1960s that jump-started the modern self-determination era.⁴⁰ Its organizers, however, were apparently unaware of Peters's prescient speech.

In 1933 and 1934 the Council Fire moved in a new direction as a result of events related to the Century of Progress World's Fair in Chicago. Scott Peters had been chosen as chairman of the Indian Participation Committee for the fair in 1930. Indians also gained employment at the fair, due to influence from the GCFAI. "Despite this inclusion," however, "conflicts erupted at the Fair regarding the image of Indians." An Indian village set up as part of the larger social science exhibit perpetuated the very stereotypes Peters had protested in his 1927 memorial to Mayor Thompson. The exhibit also portrayed Indians as occupying a lower rung on the evolutionary ladder. Housing in the white village, for example, included eight modern homes, complete with African-American maids; the Indian village consisted of bark homes for the Winnebago, tipis for the Sioux, and cedar plank houses for the "Cedar and Salmon tribes" of the Northwest Coast. "Of course, by 1933 few Winnebago lived in wigwams and few Sioux lived in teepees," an observer points out.⁴¹

The GCFAI protested this depiction, pointing out that it juxtaposed poorly with the theme of "Progress" around which the fair was organized. As a result of these protestations, fair officials approved construction of a "Hall of Honor" that would display photographs accompanied by biographies of "prominent modern Indians." This successful display led to the publication in 1936 of Marion Gridley's popular book of biographical vignettes, *Indians of Today*, which was later revised and republished three times, most recently in 1971.⁴²

Also as a result of these concerns, the GCFAI initiated an annual presentation of the Indian Achievement Award to outstanding Indian individuals. The first two recipients, the Sioux physician Dr. Charles Eastman and the San Ildefonso potter, Maria Martinez, both reflected examples of Indians succeeding economically within American society. This was engineered largely by Marion Gridley, who was the non-Indian secretary of the organization at the time. Eight of the nine initial selectors for the award were non-Indian. They included John Collier, Mrs. Harold Ickes, and Dr. Fay Cooper-Cole.⁴³ In this process of presenting a more accurate depiction of modern Indian life and culture, ironically the Indian voice was largely squeezed out.

In 1933, Peters left his post as Council Fire president. After he left the Council Fire, its leadership was taken over by non-Indians, primarily Gridley, for several decades. The social service function of the organization was dropped, but Indians still used it for social gatherings. For many years the primary function of the GCFAI, which was renamed the Indian Council Fire, became granting the annual Indian Achievement award and providing a social gathering point for American Indians in Chicago.⁴⁴

Another organization, First Daughters of America, founded by a woman who was excluded from the Indian Council Fire, provided an Indian voice from the late 1920s, possibly into the 1940s. Mrs. Charles Fitzgerald (Chippewa) was a key figure in the organization of Indian women and girls, and spoke before white audiences in Chicago and the suburbs during these years. Newspaper articles indicate a definite presence and voice in the late twenties. The organization was supported in part by the Federation of Women's Clubs, a non-Indian organization.⁴⁵

Nonetheless, throughout the 1930s and 1940s the Indian population in Chicago remained low, and with the loss of control at the Council Fire, relatively voiceless. Individual community members such as Anna P. Harris, who was renowned for her hospitality and generosity toward Indians in the city, and Willard LaMere, whose family had been in Chicago since the 1920s, continued to carry on the types of social and social service functions provided by Montezuma and the Council Fire in the early part of the century. Harris did this as an individual, while LaMere cofounded a short-lived social service organization in the late 1940s, as Chicago's Indian population began to grow steadily after the Second World War.⁴⁶ LaMere and several others founded the North American Indian Council in 1946 as a social club. By 1947 it was known as the North American Indian Mission and focused its efforts on providing "social welfare services to American Indian veterans of World War II living in Chicago." Although it closed within a year, it fulfilled a need that had become increasingly problematic: providing both services and a voice for Chicago's Native American population. Many participants in this organization's activities went on to participate in

those of its successor, the Inter-Tribal Council, founded by Ben Bearskin. Members of this organization and others voiced frustration over the refusal of the Indian Council Fire to help meet the needs of Indians in Chicago. In fact, the Indian Council Fire by the 1940s and 1950s was viewed as a reactionary force, and was primarily run by whites.⁴⁷

ALL TRIBES AMERICAN INDIAN CENTER

It was not until the relocation program got underway that the community again organized itself in a way that it could effectively begin the process of self-advocacy and self-definition.⁴⁸ The relocation program found housing for Indians, primarily in a port-of-entry neighborhood on Chicago's North Side, Uptown. Established Indian communities at that time centered in both the North and South Sides of the city. Because of its role as a relocation center, Chicago became home to a broad diversity of Native American tribal members, eventually representing over a hundred Indian nations. This made intertribal cooperation an important aspect of community building. In 1952, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), working with both South Side and North Side communities, began to urge tribal members in Chicago to establish an organization that would serve as a focus for social gatherings. In 1953 community members, some of whom had been involved in developing previous organizations in Chicago and others who were new to the city, established the All Tribes American Indian Center, with an emphasis on the first two words in the name.

Although supported by the BIA, the AIC from its early years was an Indian-run organization. It began as a social gathering place. Over the years it developed a social service function and became central to the identity of the Chicago Indian community. When in 1957 Carl Rowan published a series of articles in the *Chicago Sun-Times* that highlighted the conditions of poverty in which Indians lived and blamed Indian refusal to assimilate for that poverty, the American Indian Center hosted a community meeting in which Native Americans told their side of the story to the press, criticizing both Rowan's depiction of them and the relocation program itself. At this point the organization broke ties with the BIA, and in the words of one observer, "transformed Native Americans from passive figures in imagined landscapes of others, into active figures on a new landscape."⁴⁹ In other words, the community began to develop its own voice and define the ways in which outsiders thought of them.

Actually, of course, this had been going on for several decades already, but the influx due to relocation and postwar migration had caused two related changes: it increased the size of the Chicago Indian community, and it increasingly forced Indians into the consciousness of Chicagoans. In 1959 the AIC, which was controlled by a board of

directors elected by its Indian membership, hired Robert Rietz, a non-Indian who had been relocation officer at the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota, as its executive director. Under his leadership the social and social service functions of the AIC flourished throughout the 1960s. Aside from Rietz, the entire staff during those years was Indian.⁵⁰ The AIC hosted an annual powwow that began to draw people from all over the United States for social interaction and competitive dancing, and weekly or monthly powwows for community members. It sponsored athletic clubs, including baseball, bowling, and tournament basketball teams, and tribal clubs such as the Ojibwa Club, the Oneida Club, and the Winnebago Club. In 1963 the AIC opened a job placement program. In 1964 it turned its programmatic attention to youth, developing an after-school study program for children from fourth grade through seniors in high school under the direction of Dorothy Davids (Stockbridge-Munsee), sponsoring a Boy Scout troop, and holding its first summer youth camp.⁵¹ Youth programming has been central to AIC activities since and now is the focus of a number of Chicago Indian organizations. The AIC also sponsored activities such as the Canoe Club, which took regular outings on the area's rivers and Lake Michigan, as well as flea markets and arts and crafts bazaars, and offered family services, counseling, and tutoring.⁵²

Meanwhile, in 1961 Father Peter Powell founded the St. Augustine's Center for American Indians. This organization functioned primarily as a social service agency. Many of the key positions in this agency were hired out to members of the Indian community, which now views it as an Indian organization, although it is supported by the Episcopal Church.⁵³ Indian leaders in Chicago by the end of the 1960s were focusing their energies on finding ways to build community within a diverse urban background, in which Indians were a small minority of a racially, ethnically, and religiously diverse larger community, and in which community members themselves represented a rich diversity of ethnic tribal background. Much of the leadership for this was provided by Indians who had lived in Chicago since well before the relocation era.

But the social center and voice of the community was clearly the AIC. St. Augustine's Center and the AIC did not view each other in competitive terms. Employees of St. Augustine's were likely also to be members of the American Indian Center, for example.⁵⁴ In 1966 the AIC sponsored an event similar to that of 1957—a "talk-back" in which Ben Bearskin and others spoke on the need for cultural retention.⁵⁵ This kind of work was supported by activities of the AIC-sponsored clubs, but the lack of a permanent home became increasingly problematic. Early on the AIC had rented space in downtown Chicago, in 1963 it moved to a site in the Uptown neighborhood that, due to relocation, held a majority of the city's Indian residents. In 1966 the AIC received

a bequest of one hundred thousand dollars to purchase a building. In 1967 an old Masonic Temple was purchased on Wilson Avenue in Uptown. This building was dedicated in 1969 and became the central meeting place in the Indian community.⁵⁶ In fact, it remains so to this day, though only about 10 percent of the Indians in Chicago and 5 percent of those in the Chicago region live in Uptown anymore.⁵⁷

The years 1969 to 1974 are seminal years in which the Chicago Indian community took new organizational directions. In 1969 a new local organization, the Native American Committee (NAC), was founded and ushered in an era of unparalleled growth in the number of Native-run organizations representing Indian interests in Chicago. That year NAC members briefly occupied the BIA offices in downtown Chicago as part of national anti-BIA protests.⁵⁸ Then in May 1970 a group of Indian demonstrators, who would splinter from NAC, put up a tipi near Wrigley Field to protest the eviction of a Menominee woman from her apartment. The protest soon took on the larger issues of housing, poverty, and the various problems Indians found living in Chicago. This group over the next two years took over and occupied, or set up camp outside of, several sites in Chicago and the surrounding areas to bring attention to these issues. These sites included an abandoned Nike missile site on Chicago's North Side lakefront and Fort Sheridan in the northern suburbs. These activities brought a good deal of publicity to the group's anti-relocation message during these years of more general civil unrest in Chicago.⁵⁹ Many Indian community members supported the ideas of these protesters, but not their tactics, and worked for the same ends in other community organizations.

In 1971, during the heyday of community development and the chaotic activity related to it, Robert Rietz passed away. A dispute over leadership of the American Indian Center ensued, in part because he had run the organization without training future leaders to step in and take over. This dispute erupted in the city's press as financial troubles at the AIC led to accusations of misuse of funds. Financial problems had begun when the building was purchased and program funding was depleted in the late 1960s. A lawsuit led to a judge dismissing seven of fifteen board members, but leaving the AIC membership in control of its board of directors.⁶⁰

The AIC leadership dispute helped disperse future Indian leadership among other organizations. Over the next several years, a number of Indian-controlled educational programs were established, including a high school and grade school within the Chicago public school systems that were conceptualized and run by Indian staff, a native studies program at the University of Illinois at Chicago that was directed by Indian educators, and a private college, NAES (Native American Educational Services), with an Indian-controlled board of trustees. Meanwhile an Indian business association and a federally funded Indian Health

Service were also founded in Chicago. By the late 1970s there were a plethora of new organizations that worked, sometimes together, sometimes at odds, to support the needs of a population that numbered about twenty thousand in the city and surrounding areas.⁶¹

CHICAGO AMERICAN INDIAN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS CONFERENCE

After ten years of development in which new organizations splintered from old, and leaders and organizations explored new directions, it became clear that the community had lost the unified voice with which it had been able to advocate for community needs in earlier times. Also, it was evident to most community members that the population of American Indians in Chicago was becoming less transient. Whereas people initially had viewed Chicago as a temporary home due to relocation, more and more were staying. By 1981 the community had stabilized to a large extent. There were now Indian families in Chicago who were third-generation urban Indians, who identified themselves as Chicagoans as well as members of individual tribes.

So with all of these changes occurring, in 1981 under the leadership of Louis Delgado (Oneida), the son of Willard LaMere and grandson of Oliver LaMere, the organizations held the Chicago American Indian Community Organizations Conference (CAICOC), a meeting of Chicago's twenty-two Indian organizations. This conference was an attempt to prioritize needs and services and to provide an opportunity for organizations to work cooperatively rather than competitively. It developed from a project Delgado coordinated from NAES College, the Community Board Training Project, which itself began as a workshop designed to decrease internal conflicts within community organizations.⁶² CAICOC was called out of a need to coordinate interaction among organizations.

Significantly, the conference was designed to coordinate social services, and eight of the nine areas that were defined as most critical to the healthy future of the community involved the delivery of those services. The eight areas were economic development, education, employment, health, housing, legal services, social services delivery, and youth. The ninth area was public relations. CAICOC published a thirty-four-page statement of purpose as a result of the 1981 conference. The statement included definitions of problems, issues, and needs identified by the participants in these key areas. The document emphasized that the purpose of the work was to develop cooperation and coordination of the Chicago Indian community organizations.⁶³

CAICOC became a short-lived organization itself in the early 1980s. Throughout the 1980s CAICOC continued to hold retreats. Subcommittees consisting of leaders and staff of organizations were

formed. They developed extensive action plans for a June 1984 retreat. Comprehensive reports and updates were presented to community members based on both accomplishments and needs, as each subcommittee focused on areas of its expertise. Through this work programmatic changes at institutions led to a variety of new initiatives, including native language classes, development of truancy alternative programs, community health care education, programs for elders, development of business ventures, employee support services, and much more.⁶⁴

To a large extent CAICOC's activities shaped the direction the community's organizations took for well over a decade. The project invigorated the community's leaders with a new-found optimism.⁶⁵ The good feelings generated by this initiative became ingrained in community tradition. CAICOC is remembered in the community as a high point in community history. It has become a part of the oral history of the community that is recognized and retold at meetings and community events on a regular basis. It ushered in a new era in community development for two reasons. First, it was a recognition by community members that organizational growth had blossomed to the extent that the diversity was so great that there were bound to be conflicts relating to overlapping service areas and gaps in service areas, and that opportunities existed that needed full community cooperation to take advantage of. Second, it marked the first time in Chicago history that Indians had taken full control of directing the community's future and advocating on behalf of their own needs.

A decade later, in the mid-1990s, when it became clear to community members that re-envisioning organizational direction was again needed, CAICOC was viewed as the model to help define community development into the new millennium. In 1997 community organizations and agencies established a schedule of monthly meetings of their leaders, "policy breakfasts," which rotate among the organizations. They are in the process of developing a coalition whose purposes are to keep each other informed of issues impacting the community as a whole, and to act in cooperation to speak with one voice on issues all of the organizations agree are critical to meeting community needs.⁶⁶ This is viewed as an extension of the spirit of CAICOC.

The possibilities of this developed out of the growth of community organizations in the 1970s and are reflected in CAICOC's successes. Though American Indians had advocated, often with success, on behalf of community members' needs for most of the century, they had done so either as isolated individuals or as members of organizations whose agendas were a mixture of Indian and non-Indian goals, or from within organizations in which non-Indians held the key leadership roles. As CAICOC indicated, that began to change in the 1970s as Indians took control.

That control deepened throughout the last two decades of the twentieth century. The organizations that speak and act on behalf of the Chicago Indian community today, both local and statewide, are in some cases Indian controlled and in some cases controlled by non-Indians, but the leadership in nearly all of them consists of American Indian community members with their own autonomy in decision making and acting. In a parallel development, after CAICOC a significant shift occurred in the educational level of organization leaders. Surveys conducted during the early 1980s revealed that nearly all positions requiring less than a college degree were filled by Indians, while most requiring a college degree or higher were filled by non-Indians. A similar survey conducted in 1998 showed that Indians filled nearly all positions requiring a bachelor's degree or less. This represents a noteworthy increase in the educational level of the community's leaders. A significant number of these leaders earned their bachelor's degrees at NAES College.⁶⁷ This has both raised the standards of leadership within the community and given the community higher stature within the larger Chicago community.

S U M M A R Y

In retrospect, then, four milestone events define the development of self-determination for the Chicago Indian community in the twentieth century. Each represents a stage or level in that development. First, despite a small population, the Indian people in Chicago had a strong advocate in Dr. Carlos Montezuma. He defined issues of significance to Indians in the city and nationwide and advocated vociferously on their behalf. He dedicated much of his energy to this endeavor, both professionally and in his private life. He strongly believed Indians needed to take leadership roles in defining their future and worked hard toward those ends.

Second, Scott Peters took this type of advocacy to a new level, an organizational level. The organization he presided over for eight years, the Grand Council Fire of American Indians, was—like other “Indian” organizations of the time—a mixture of Indian and white membership and ideals. Peters's strong leadership pushed Indian goals to the forefront time and again in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Like Montezuma, he insisted that Indians should direct definition of Indian needs and Indian identity as well. The GCFAI was successful at this work, in advocating before the mayor and at the World's Fair. The organization retained this effectiveness only so long as it was Indian controlled, however. After Peters's departure, when the GCFAI became largely non-Indian controlled, it lost its importance to Chicago's Indian community.

It was not until the 1950s, in the period of steady migration by

Indians looking for work on their own or being moved to Chicago by the relocation program, that the next major step in development of community self-advocacy occurred. This step involved the founding of the All Tribes American Indian Center and its break from the BIA in the 1950s. The AIC provided a platform for community members to develop a voice to speak out on behalf of community needs and also provided a *place* in which Indians could feel comfortable coming together in the community. It became the social and social service center of the community for decades and to this day remains the place in which community members may feel safe in coming together to resolve conflict.

Finally, after the death of Robert Rietz, the community blossomed and a variety of organizations developed to meet more specific and specialized needs of the community. Disorganization, turmoil, and opportunity were all part of this growth, and this was resolved with the holding of CAICOC, which set the future direction of Indian organizations in Chicago. For the first time, the community's direction, especially in an organizational sense, was controlled largely by its own membership.

When the community was smaller, individuals such as Montezuma and Peters were able to provide effective direction. As it grew after the war, organizations took this role, first the American Indian Center and then a plethora of more specialized organizations. Continued growth demanded that the organizations find a mechanism to work together, which they did through CAICOC. Though the community continues to struggle, it now does so under the notion of this model of working together for the common good, of overcoming individual and tribal differences to advocate for a healthier community. Even in the most difficult of times, this model provides a hope for healing and improved community health.

The Indian community in Chicago has long been active in advocating on its own behalf, both in terms of self-definition and in terms of meeting the needs of its members, primarily in the social welfare arena. The welfare of the community and community members are the highest priority of leaders within the community. As the population grew it reached a critical mass that enabled community members to truly control direction and to advocate to the larger community with their own voice. That development of voice has been a long, difficult process, one that is still continuing.

N O T E S

- 1 The 2000 census showed that 34 percent of American Indians were under eighteen, while only 23 percent of the white population fit in that category. The relative youth of the population indicates a significant increase in population size. Between 1990 and 2000

- the Indian population rose from 2.015 million to 2.476 million, a 22.9 percent increase (1990 U.S. Census, CD ROM 3A, 3C, and EEO records; Census 2000 Summary File 1, Detailed Table P12A, "Sex by Age," and Detailed Table P3, "Race").
- 2 See Russell Thornton, Gary D. Sandefur, and Harold G. Grasmick, *The Urbanization of American Indians: A Critical Bibliography* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982); Biloine Whiting Young and Melvin Fowler, *Cahokia: The Great Native American Metropolis* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999); and Claudia G. Mink: *Cahokia: City of the Sun: Prehistoric Urban Indian Center* (Collinsville, Ill.: Cahokia Mounds Museum Society, 1992).
 - 3 In Green Bay, Wisconsin, for example, between 1740 and 1756, in twenty-two of the twenty-seven households, "one or both parents were at least one-eighth Indian" (Jacqueline Peterson, "Ethnogenesis: The Settlement and Growth of a 'New People,' in the Great Lakes Region, 1702–1815," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 6, no. 2 [1982], 51).
 - 4 Kenneth R. Philp, *Termination Revisited: American Indians on the Trail to Self-Determination, 1933–1953* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 3, 68–88; Larry W. Burt, *Tribalism in Crisis: Federal Indian Policy, 1953–1961* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), 4.
 - 5 For a discussion of the policies leading up to termination, see both Philp, *Termination Revisited*, and Burt, *Tribalism in Crisis*.
 - 6 The 1990 census counted the population of American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts at 1,959,234. Of these, 1,100,534 were classified as urban, and 437,358 were counted as living in American Indian or trust lands (1990 *Census of Population General Population Characteristics, United States*, 1990 CP1-1, table 9, p. 13; 1990 *Census of Population General Population Characteristics, American Indian and Native Alaska Areas*, 1990 CP1-1A, table 1, p. 1). The numbers of American Indians counted varied slightly in different reports from the 1990 census. For a discussion of termination and relocation, see Donald L. Fixico, *Termination and Relocation: Federal Indian Policy, 1945–1960* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986). See also Elaine M. Neils, *Reservation to City: Indian Migration and Federal Relocation* (Chicago: Department of Geography, University of Chicago, 1971).
 - 7 Virgil J. Vogel, *Indian Place Names in Illinois* (Springfield: Illinois State Historical Society, 1963), 24–25.
 - 8 Virgil J. Vogel, "The Tribes," in *Indians of the Chicago Area*, 2d ed., ed. Terry Straus (Chicago: NAES College Press, 1990), 3–17.
 - 9 Helen Hornbeck Tanner, *Atlas of Great Lakes Indian History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 159; treaties may be found in Charles J. Kappler, ed., *Indian Treaties, 1778–1883* (New York: Interland Press, 1972).
 - 10 See articles 3 and 4 of "Treaty with the Chippewa etc., 1829," in Kappler, *Indian Treaties*, 298–99.
 - 11 "Last Pottawatomies [sic] Win a 20-Year Fight," *Chicago Times*, September 19, 1941. Descendants of Alexander Robinson retained forest preserve property ceded to him by President Tyler in 1843, according to the article. A map by Virgil J. Vogel, "Former Indian Reservations in Cook County Forest Preserves," includes land ceded to Robinson, Billy Caldwell, and Claude LaFromboise in 1829 ("Indians, Treaties, and Claims" folder, Clip Files,

- Chicago Historical Society [hereafter CHS] Library).
- 12 "Some Indians of the Old and New Times in the United States," and Eugene M. Pharo, "Two Indians Kill German Officers with Hand Bombs," *Philadelphia Press*, January 5, 1919. Carlos Montezuma is identified as "the third most eminent stomach specialist in the country." His picture accompanies the articles. Carlos Montezuma Papers, Ayer Modern Manuscripts, the Newberry Library, Chicago.
 - 13 Hazel W. Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1971), 79–81.
 - 14 *Ibid.*, 136–37.
 - 15 Introduction, *Wassaja* 1, no. 1 (April 1916): 1.
 - 16 *Ibid.* The three mastheads may be viewed in the two microfilm collections of the Montezuma Papers: John William Larner, ed., *The Papers of Carlos Montezuma, M.D.* (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1984), reel 4, which contains the entire collection of *Wassaja*; and *Carlos Montezuma Papers* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1974), which contains forty-two issues. They may also be viewed at the Community Archives of NAES College, which contains photocopies of sixteen issues of *Wassaja* from the State Historical Society of Wisconsin collection.
 - 17 Carlos Montezuma, "Against Indian Art Study," *Chicago Daily News*, April 5, 1907. Copy in Larner, *The Papers of Carlos Montezuma, M.D.*, reel 6.
 - 18 For a biography of Montezuma, see Peter Iverson, *Carlos Montezuma and the Changing World of American Indians* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982).
 - 19 Arthur C. Parker to Montezuma, March 31, 1913, in Larner, *The Papers of Carlos Montezuma, M.D.*, reel 3.
 - 20 Documentation from Larner, *The Papers of Carlos Montezuma, M.D.*, reels 1 and 2. On Jaxon, see Donald B. Smith, "Honoré Joseph Jaxon: A Man Who Lived for Others," *Saskatchewan History* 34, no. 3 (1981): 81–101.
 - 21 The three key sources of Montezuma's letters are the two microfilmed collections, *Carlos Montezuma Papers*, Larner, *The Papers of Carlos Montezuma, M.D.*, and the collection at the Newberry Library, Chicago. The latter contains approximately three hundred letters, and includes several letters regarding his meeting Indian people at a Chicago train depot, especially children on their way to or from Carlisle.
 - 22 Constitution, Indian Fellowship League, p. 2 (*Carlos Montezuma Papers*, box 9).
 - 23 *Ibid.*
 - 24 The program of the fourth annual convention of the Indian Fellowship League, U.S.A., September 20–26, 1922, in Chicago, Illinois, identifies Parker as "Pequad." Welfare Council box 246, CHS Manuscript Collections. Program also in *Carlos Montezuma Papers*, reel 6, frame 76–82. R. D. Parker is no relation to Arthur C. Parker.
 - 25 Senate Bill 238, June 28, 1919, *Laws of the State of Illinois by the Fifty-first General Assembly*, January 8 to June 30, 1919, p. 894.
 - 26 R. D. Parker to Montezuma, July 14, 1920; R. D. Parker to Montezuma, undated (Larner, *The Papers of Carlos Montezuma, M.D.*, reels 4 and 5).
 - 27 Montezuma to Pratt, October 4, 1922, in Larner, *The Papers of Carlos Montezuma, M.D.*, reel 5.

- 28 *Wassaja* (August 1922): 4.
- 29 The best analysis of the IFL is Rosalyn Rae LaPier, "We Are Not Savages, but a Civilized Race': American Indian Activism and the Development of Chicago's First American Indian Organizations, 1919-1934" (master's thesis, DePaul University, 2000) (hereafter LaPier, M.A. thesis).
- 30 LaPier, M.A. thesis, 18-27; minutes of Indian Fellowship League meeting, October 15, 1920, "Indian Fellowship League" folder, Welfare Council box 246, CHS Manuscript Collections.
- 31 The best analysis of the first decade of activities by the Indian Council Fire is also in LaPier, M.A. thesis.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 28-32.
- 33 Rosalyn LaPier, "We Are Not Savages, but a Civilized Race': Scott Henry Peters and His Attempts to Change the Image of Indians," paper presented at the Great Lakes History Conference, October 1992, p. 4; Reports of Work of the Indian Council Fire, May 1932 to February 1933, and May 1933 to February 1934, in Century of Progress, Indian Council Fire Papers, University of Illinois at Chicago Special Collections.
- 34 Willard LaMere, "History of Indians in Chicago," lecture in class at NAES College, October 9, 1979. Audiotape in NAES College Library, Chicago.
- 35 LaPier, M.A. thesis, 33-34.
- 36 Indians did not gain universal citizenship until 1924, although many became U.S. citizens in a variety of ways: for example, war veterans could be granted citizenship; allottees became citizens upon accepting their allotments or upon those allotments leaving trust status, depending on circum-
- stances; Indians in Oklahoma were made citizens as part of the law enabling statehood (personal communication with Richard A. Sattler, December 6, 2000). Nonetheless, Peters's point is valid: many Indians were not citizens of the United States during the First World War.
- 37 LaPier, M.A. thesis, 35-36; "Memorial of Grand Council Fire of American Indians," *Congressional Record* 69, part 8 (May 11, 1928): 8369.
- 38 The author participated in meetings in which this occurred during the spring and summer of 2000. The reading is part of the required reading list at NAES (Native American Educational Services) College, Chicago's American Indian college.
- 39 LaPier, M.A. thesis, 37-38.
- 40 For discussion of the 1961 American Indian Chicago Conference, see Nancy Oestreich Lurie, "The Voice of the American Indian: Report on the American Indian Chicago Conference," *Current Anthropology* 2, no. 5 (1961): 478-500; Sol Tax, "1961 American Indian Chicago Conference," March 27, 1985, talk before NAES College class, audiotape; and "The 1961 Conference," from "Language and Culture," audiotape 1, November 18, 1985, session hosted at the Newberry Library, Chicago, sponsored by NAES College. Both tapes in NAES College Library.
- 41 LaPier, M.A. thesis, 44-48.
- 42 *Ibid.*, 48-49. The later editions of Marion Gridley, *Indians of Today* (Chicago: Marion E. Gridley, 1936) are: 2d ed. (Chicago: Millar Publishing, 1947); 3d ed. (Chicago: Towerton Press, 1960); and 4th ed. (ICFP, 1971).
- 43 LaPier, M.A. thesis, 49-50.

- 44 LaMere, *History of Indians in Chicago*, October 9, 1979, personal correspondence between Virgil J. Vogel and the author, 1988–1990.
- 45 Rosalyn LaPier, "'To Emulate the Supreme Qualities of Indian Womanhood': First Daughters of America," unpublished paper, ca. 1993.
- 46 LaMere, *History of Indians in Chicago*, October 9, 1979. Also Chicago Oral History Project 009, interview of Willard LaMere by Clair Young, January 16, 1983; Chicago Oral History Project 016, interview of Susan Power by David R. Miller, September 26, 1983; both in the Newberry Library, Chicago, and the NAES College Library, Chicago.
- 47 Grant P. Arndt, "'Contrary to Our Way of Thinking': The Struggle for an American Indian Center in Chicago, 1946–1953," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 22, no. 4 (1998): 117–34; Willard LaMere, "History of Indians in Chicago," lecture in class at NAES College, Chicago, October 16, 1979 (audiotape in NAES College Library); Keith Wheeler, "War Drums on N. Halsted St.," *Chicago Times*, November 18, 1947.
- 48 The best analysis of the relocation program in Chicago is James B. LaGrande, "Indian Metropolis: American Indians in Chicago, 1945–1965" (Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1997).
- 49 Grant P. Arndt, "Relocation's Imagined Landscape and the Rise of Chicago's Native American Community," in *Native Chicago*, ed. Terry Straus and Grant P. Arndt (Saline, Mich.: McNaughton and Gunn, 1998), 114–27.
- 50 Merwyn S. Garbarino, "Life in the City: Chicago," in *The American Indian in Urban Society*, ed. Jack O. Waddell and O. Michael Watson (Boston: Little Brown, 1971), 196.
- 51 "Chicago Indian Center Starts After School Study Program," *Amerindian* 13, no. 2 (1964): 1; "Chicago Indian Center Has Boy Scout Troop," *Amerindian* 12, no. 6 (1964): 7. The *Amerindian* is in both the Robert Rietz Papers, Community Archives of NAES College, Chicago, and the Newberry Library Special Collections, Chicago. Sharon Hoffenberg, "First Day Camp for Indian Center," *Edgewater Uptown News*, March 10, 1964, in Welfare Council box 246, folder 14, CHS Manuscript Collections.
- 52 For documentation of Indian Center activities, see David Beck, *The Chicago American Indian Community, 1893–1988: Annotated Bibliography and Guide to Sources in Chicago* (Chicago: NAES College Press, 1988), 65–87.
- 53 Beck, *The Chicago American Indian Community*, 104–7; see also 267–70 for a chronological index of Chicago Indian community history before 1988.
- 54 Garbarino, "Life in the City: Chicago," 197–98.
- 55 Mary Merryfield, "'We Don't Want to Jump into the Melting Pot,' Chicago's Indians Talk Back," *Chicago Tribune*, June 26, 1966, sec. 5, p. 3.
- 56 "Chicago Indian Center Gets \$100,000 Bequest," *Amerindian* 14, no. 4 (1966): 2; "Chicago Indians Have Purchased Large Building for Their New Center," *Amerindian* 16, no. 3 (1968): 4; "Dedicate Indian Center, Program Outlined," *Chicago Tribune*, November 30, 1969; Social Service Agencies, American Indian Center, CHS Clipping Files; Ann Plunkett, "Indians Begin Fund Hunt in Earnest," *Chicago Tribune*, December 28, 1967; Ethnic Groups—Chicago—Indians, American, City of Chicago Municipal Reference Library Clip

- Files (hereafter MRL Clip Files), 1957–1970.
- 57 AIEDA, *Chicago Native American Demographic Profile, 1990* (Chicago: American Indian Economic Development Association, n.d.), 60, discusses Uptown's population trends. Approximately 42 percent of the Indian population of the Chicago area lives in the city, and 58 percent in the suburbs, according to the 2000 census (Census 2000, Summary File 1, Table P3, "Race, Chicago, and Chicago GMSA").
- 58 Beck, *The Chicago American Indian Community*, 246.
- 59 Natalia Wilson, "The Chicago Indian Village, 1970," in Straus and Arndt, *Native Chicago*, 155–62.
- 60 Plunkett, "Indians Begin Fund Hunt in Earnest"; "Indian Center Faces Facility Problem, Have Room Need Funds," *North Town News*, January 2, 1968, MRL Clip Files, 1957–1970; "Court Drops 7 from Indian Center Board," *North Town News*, November 28, 1971, MRL Clip Files, 1971; Jon Foreman, "Indian Center Aides Charge Exploitation," *Chicago Daily News*, December 15, 1972, MRL Clip Files, 1972–1974; "Indians Told to Unite," *Chicago Tribune*, February 16, 1973, sec. 1, p. 2; "Local Indians Divided," *Chicago Tribune*, March 3, 1973, *Chicago Tribune*, sec. 1, p. 3; Leonard Aronson, "Last Stand for Indian Center?" *Chicago Today*, March 13, 1973, MRL Clip Files, 1972–1974; "Indians March to Save Center" (photo and caption), *Chicago Tribune*, April 1, 1973, sec. 1, p. 4; "Indians Need Aid," letter to the editor by Stella Johnson, *Chicago Today*, November 21, 1973, MRL Clip Files, 1972–1974; Clarence Page, "Debts, Conflicts Face New Chief of Indian Center," *Chicago Tribune*, September 8, 1974, MRL Clip Files, 1972–1974; Bruce Wolf, "New Indian Center Head to Beat the Drum Softly," *Uptown News*, May 13, 1975, 1, 6.
- 61 Beck, *The Chicago American Indian Community*, 267–70.
- 62 Thomas A. Wilson, "The Community Board Training Project, NAES College, A Final Evaluation," especially "Part 1: Community Archives of NAES College."
- 63 Robert Archiquette and Louis Delgado, *Chicago American Indian Community Organizations Conference, Statement of Purpose*, June 25 and 26, 1981 (Chicago: NAES College Press, 1981).
- 64 CAICOC Retreat Action Plans, June 6–8, 1984 (Community Archives of NAES College).
- 65 Joye Brown, "New Era Seen for Indians in Chicago," *Chicago Tribune*, January 7, 1982, MRL Clip Files, 1980–.
- 66 CAICOC documentation and papers relating to the policy breakfasts are in the Community Archives of NAES College.
- 67 "Employee Educational Attainment Data Form—Survey 1998" and "Employee Educational Attainment Data: 3 year summary," in Community Archives of NAES College.