Up for the Fight: Success and Shortcomings in the Movement to Eliminate Native American Sports Mascots and Logos in American Colleges and Universities, 1970-1978.

Eugenia Pacitti
(Monash University)

Abstract: *Following the prominence of African American civil rights activism in the 1960s, the 1970s saw several important protests by the Native American community, commonly known as the "Red Power" movement. This article examines a part of this movement that has not received widespread attention: the effort between 1970 and 1978 to eliminate Native American sports mascots and logos from colleges and universities in the United States. Although there were significant achievements made by the activists involved, who considered these representations to be demeaning and false, there are still over one thousand such mascots and logos active today. This article focuses on five major US universities and colleges, and considers the successes and shortcomings of the movement to eliminate Native American mascots at each of them. These reasons include a lack of unity amongst Native American students, a lack of support from the wider Native American community, strong opposition from college and university alumni, and an inability to gain the support of local or national politicians or Native American activists for the cause. The unique nature of sports such as baseball, basketball and ice hockey within American college and university culture is also taken into consideration. This article adds to discussions about racial appropriation within American sporting culture, and considers the movement to eliminate Native American sports mascots and logos within a narrative of the "Red Power" movement, positing as to why the movement was only partially realised.*

Keywords: *mascot, logo, Native American, American Indian, Red Power, activism, sports history, American sporting culture*

It is midway through the final innings on a warm July afternoon in 1972. The Atlanta Braves are leading the game five to four. Braves batter up. The ball is pitched—contact! The Braves' mascot, Chief Noc-A-Homa, watches the fly ball from a tepee on a platform in the bleachers. Home run! The Chief emerges from his tepee, clad in buckskins, moccasins and war paint. He begins jumping and dancing around the platform, his Plains Indian eagle-feathered headdress trailing behind him in flight. He sets off smoke signals into the air, and concludes his celebratory dance with a final, flourishing leap. The crowd cheers.

During the 1990s, the controversial use of Native American mascots and logos in sport was a popular talking point in schools, colleges and professional teams. It was a debate with roots in the 1970s, when crowd-pleasing mascots like Chief Noc-A-Homa, and team logos depicting stereotyped Native Americans, were commonplace in American sporting teams. Although the Chief's moniker was intended as a humorous play on 'knock-a-homer (a home run), many Native Americans were not amused by his name, attire or role during Atlanta Braves matches. In 1972, Native American students, prominent activists and local residents rallied against his use. One protester claimed that The Chief depicted the Indian "to the larger segment of American society as something to be laughed at and not taken seriously and therefore not due respect".[1] Conversely, those who supported the use of the mascot deemed that it commanded respect for Native Americans by symbolising positive traits such as bravery, strength, and skill, as well as honouring local Indian history.

In the 1970s, there were five notable cases that resulted in the elimination of mascots and logos from colleges and universities, including the retirement of "Little Red" at The University of Oklahoma, "Willie Wampum" at Marquette University, Stanford University's "Prince Lightfoot", as well as mascots at Dartmouth College and Syracuse University. These five cases in question were widely covered in university publications, and some received the attention of mainstream press. These documents shed light on the challenges faced by the movement and its leaders.

[1] "Indian Movement Out To De-Indianise Braves," *The Washington Post*, 19 January 1972.

Whilst significant research has been undertaken regarding this use of Native American mascots and the push to eliminate them, this has mainly focused upon attempts to abolish Indian imagery at schools from the 1980s onwards, and the psychological effects of these images on Indian students.[2] Less has been published on the origins of the movement to abolish the imagery in higher-level institutions and even less attention given to the shortcomings of those movements.

Before discussing the movement itself, it is first necessary to gain a grasp of the cultural climate of civil rights action in which it occurred. When one thinks of prominent mass protest movements against racial discrimination in the United States, it is usually the Civil Rights movement of the African American population that comes to mind. Although it has received significantly less attention than this movement, there is indeed a developed literature on Native American activism in twentieth-century United States. Much of this suggests that this activism, coined the "Red Power" movement, began in earnest in November 1969, when 89 urban-based American Indians began an occupation of Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay.[3] The nineteen-month-long occupation garnered a great deal of media and celebrity attention, drew attention to the struggles faced by American Indians, and captured the imagination and energy of young Indians.[4] Despite the prominence of this act, recent scholarship has tended away from the idea of the occupation of Alcatraz as the 'genesis or ground-zero' of the movement. Instead, it finds its roots in a longer history of Indian activism that dates to the early twentieth-century.[5] Bradley Shreve ascribes the origins of the movement to the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) which first met in 1961, whilst Charles Wilkinson looks more generally to the climate of the post-war era as the beginning of what he considers to be a major civil rights

[2] See: C. Richard King and Charles Fruehling Springwood, eds., *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascots Controversy*, (USA: University of Nebraska Press, 2001); C. Richard King ed., *The Native American Mascot Controversy,* (USA: The Scarecrow Press, 2010); Lawrence R. Baca, "Native Images in Schools and the Racially Hostile Environment," *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 28:1, (2004): 71-78; D. Stanley Eitzen and Maxine B. Zinn, "The Dark Side of Sports Symbols," *USA Today Magazine*, 129, 2668 (2001): 48-51.

[3] Alvin M. Josephy, Troy R. Johnson, and Joane Nagel, eds., *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom*, 2nd ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 1. Activist Clyde Warrior coined the term "Red Power" in 1966. For a discussion of its origins, see Bradley Glenn Shreve, *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011), 8.

[4] Paul Chaat Smith and Robert Allen Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee* (New York: New Press, 1996), 38.

[5] Ibid., 37.

movement in American history.[6] Others look back even further to activism of Native Americans in early-to-mid twentieth-century progressive organisations to begin the narrative of the movement.[7]

The movement has not only proved difficult to locate temporally, but also to define in the scope of its aims and actions. Some provide a loose definition that includes participants involved in both militant activism and moderate lobbying, such as the "fish-ins" that began in the 1960s. Others have focused more on the violent nature of many of the protests led by the American Indian Movement (AIM), likening the group to the African American revolutionary organisation: the Black Panthers.[8] Bradley Shreve suggests that rather than attempt to define the movement in relation to others before it, we should look much closer at and adhere to the definitions of Red Power that Native American activists and lobbyists of the 1960s and 1970s made for themselves.[9] Despite differences in scope and approach, the literature is underpinned by a characterisation of American Indian activism in the twentieth-century as a long struggle for self-determination and representation, often emphasising the nature of intertribal politics, and the conflict between urban and reservation Indians. This activism set a firm foundation and provided students with inspiration needed to engage with the issue of Native American mascots and logos in sport.

For the most part, the literature on Native American activism does not feature the movement to eliminate Native American sports mascots. Instead, it has focused on more prominent events that attracted strong media interest, such as the Alcatraz occupation and the takeover of the Bureau of Indian Affairs building in 1972, as well as changes in policy and law that has affected Native Americans.[10] At the same time, scholarship on the attempts to abolish these mascots does not explicitly place the

[6] Bradley Glenn Shreve, *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011), 3; Charles F. Wilkinson, *Blood Struggle: The Rise of Modern Indian Nations*, 1st ed. ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2005).
[7] Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*; Daniel M. Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America: The Struggle for Sovereignty* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008); Daniel M. Cobb and Loretta Fowler, eds., *Beyond Red Power: American Indian Politics and Activism since 1900* (Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research, 2007); Nicolas G. Rosenthal, *Reimagining Indian Country: Native American Migration and Identity in Twentieth-Century Los Angeles* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 130.
[8] Wilkinson, *Blood Struggle: The Rise of Modern Indian Nations*, 130. For more on the "fish-ins" of the mid-1960s see: Wilkinson, *Blood Struggle*, 150-173.
[9] Shreve, *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism*, 7.
[10] See: Shreve, *Red Power Rising.;* Josephy, Johnson, and Nagel, eds., *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom*.

actions of students at American colleges and universities within the larger history of twentieth-century American Indian activism. There are several similarities however, that link the push to eliminate Indian mascots and logos with the wider Indian activism of the 1970s. This article situates the movement to eliminate Native American mascots and logos in American sport within the longer narrative of Indian activism. By identifying some characteristics of this wider movement, such as disunity amongst activists and between activists and other Native Americans, I suggest some reasons why the student-led movement to eliminate Indian mascots and logos in five American colleges and universities between 1970-1978, faced difficulties and had shortcomings. As well as the characteristics above, I also consider the barrage of criticism aimed at the activists by university alumni, and the sentiment that minorities are not always right, which pervaded some higher-level institutions in 1970s USA. This will contribute to a broader understanding of Native American activism in the mid-late twentieth century, beyond the much-discussed events, such as the protests at Alcatraz and Wounded Knee, and will also consider how popular representations of Indians can be understood within this narrative.

The Significance of Mascots and Logos

One may ask why the crowd-entertaining mascot who spent five minutes on the baseball pitch created so much outrage? Why did a tiny logo on a football helmet result in vehement protest that continues today? To answer this, it must first be established that mascots are not trivial. They are neither flat nor static, rather they are dynamic signifiers that "project certain symbolic connotations".[11] These connotations include the physical image of Indians depicted on logos, as well as the image and behavioural actions of a team mascot. More than a tag or label, the mascot comes to define the institution that it represents. Mascots and logos create a sense of community and solidarity between athletes, fans, the college community and the public.[12] While their intention is to energise the crowd and provide a focal point for fans, these symbols can also project a false or offensive image to the spectator. This became particularly problematic in the 1970s because many of the

[11] Frank Nuessel, "Objectionable Sports Team Designations," *Names: A Jounral of Onomastics* 42, no. 2 (1994): 101-19, 08.
[12] D. Stanley Eitzen and Maxine Baca Zinn, "The Dark Side of Sports Symbols," *USA Today (Magazine)* 129, no. 2668 (2001): 48.

mascots and logos seen in American colleges and universities were not accurate portrayals of American Indians nor their culture, but rather the creations and symbols of "Indianness" as imagined by non-Indians.[13]

It is also important to consider the use of the image of Native Americans rather than any other race. There are no American teams nicknamed the Jews or the Negroes, so why Native Americans? Since the arrival of Christopher Columbus in 1492, the relationship between European-Americans and Native Americans has been fraught. Many conflicts saw Indians considered uncultured savages–sometimes noble, sometimes not–which led to loss of life and land, and ultimately their severe marginalisation. Throughout the centuries, the American Indian has been constantly persecuted and controlled predominantly by white Americans. This led to them becoming the most ignored, and virtually invisible population in the United States.[14] Despite their relative invisibility, historians such as Phillip J. Deloria and Jay Mechling have identified an American proclivity for 'playing Indian'.[15] Non-Native Americans have been "playing Indian" from those who disguised themselves as Mohicans at the Boston Tea Party, to boy scout camps and meetings of "Red Men" societies built around Indian lore that encouraged non-Indian children and adults to dress up and act in a way they perceive to be "Indian".[16] The over-culture's affinity for "playing Indian" over hundreds of years is based on a will to embody positive qualities associated with Native Americans, such as bravery, strength, nobility, and "authenticity".[17] Native American-inspired sports team names, mascots, and logos also supposedly embodied 'pride, competition [and] tradition', rather than specific racist connotations.[18] The use of Native American images in sport, therefore, can be understood as part of a broader narrative of non-Indian people appropriating Indian culture.

[13] For detailed discussion on the history of the persistent tradition of "playing Indian" in American culture, see: Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
[14] Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*, 279; Lee Sigelman, "Hail to the Redskins? Public Reactions to a Racially Sensitive Team Name," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 15, no. 4 (1998): 317-25, 23.
[15] Deloria, *Playing Indian*, esp. 62-120.; Jay Mechling, ""Playing Indian" and the Search for Authenticity in Modern White America," *Prospects* 5 (1980): 17-33, 18.
[16] Deloria, *Playing Indian*, esp. 62-120.; Jay Mechling, ""Playing Indian" and the Search for Authenticity in Modern White America," *Prospects* 5 (1980): 17-33, 18.
[17] Fergus M. Bordewich, *Killing the White Man's Indian: Reinventing Native Americans at the End of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 17.
[18] C. Richard King, *Redskins: Insult and Brand* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2016), 69.

Additionally, and importantly, these symbolic mascots are placed within one of the most influential arenas in American society: sport. In the 1970s, as today, sport was an integral part of American life. Baseball, football, basketball, hockey, these favourite spectacles for Americans brought people together to revel in displays of skill and athletic ability. Sports were also a central aspect of colleges and universities across the country. American historian Richard Davies posits that "the American system of higher education [was] unique for its commitment to athletic competition".[19] The competing teams were not only important to the staff, students and alumni of their respective institutions, they also gained support from the wider community. Attendance at college football matches averaged around 10,000 people in the early 1970s.[20] Team mascots became pivotal in energising the crowd, building the core narrative of the team, and creating a sense of solidarity.[21] Many had a large following and fans eagerly awaited their dance at half time and after a touchdown or home run. The admiration of mascots meant that misrepresentations of Indians were viewed widely and the sports field became a ground for fostering these images. Mascots and names are key to the narrative of a team and its fans, so those who supported the use of Native American mascots and logos felt strongly that they had something worth fighting to retain.

The Origins of Native American Imagery in College Sport

The use of Native American imagery in college sport started in the late-nineteenth century when sports journalists began to assign Native American nicknames to their local teams and the language of American-Indian Wars entered into sports coverage.[22] The development of these nicknames into symbols and mascots went largely unchallenged, including by those they purported to characterise, and the opposition that existed was far from united.[23] An association

[19] Richard O. Davies, *Sports in American Life: A History* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 62.
[20] "NCAA Division 1 Football Records (Attendance Records)," *NCAA,* (2010), 2, accessed 2 August 2016, http://fs.ncaa.org/Docs/stats/football_records/DI/2010/Attendance.pdf
[21] King, *Redskins: Insult and Brand*, 64.
[22] J. Gordon Hylton, "Before the Redskins Were the Redskins: The Use of Native American Team Names in the Formative Era of American Sports, 1857-1933," *North Dakota Law Review* 86 (2010): 879-905, 895.; King, *Redskins: Insult and Brand*, 20.
[23] C. Richard King discusses the origins of the use of the term "Redskins" for the Washington D.C-based baseball team, pointing to historic anxieties over white masculinities, and the differences in

developed between Native Americans and athletic prowess, and the use of Native American names was supposed to reflect their positive attributes and convey respect, rather than be disparaging.[24] This changed, however, in the late 1960s when small groups of student activists pressured their institution's administration to abolish the Indian mascot or logo. The movement spread across the country from the University of Oklahoma, to Marquette University, Stanford University, Dartmouth College and Syracuse University. These institutions met the students' request and all eliminated their Indian symbols. For the most part, these students achieved their goal: a campus free of symbols that made them feel unwelcome and disrespected. Although this article discusses some of the limitations of the movement, the significance of their achievements cannot be overlooked or understated.[25]

Disunity Amongst Indian Students

Although Native American mascots were eliminated at five major institutions throughout the 1970s, the effort to achieve this had several shortcomings that can be understood by situating the movement within a wider narrative of Indian activism in the 1960s and 1970s. Perhaps the foremost of these issues is the lack of unity amongst Indian students, which has also been described as a feature of the "messy, disorganised" action undertaken at Alcatraz.[26] From its inception to its abolishment as the official university mascot, Indian students were divided over the Little Red at the University of Oklahoma. An Indian mascot is said to have first appeared at The University of Oklahoma (OU) in the 1940s when student Jack Redbird led "the band onto the field…in full Indian costume" at football matches.[27] Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, other Native students Dick West and Philip Waller facilitated the mascot's evolution into Little Red: a dancing Indian in a "satin shirt, buckskin

popular uses and understandings of Native American imagery compared to other racial groups, such as African Americans. King, *Redskins: Insult and Brand*, 11-28.

[24] Hylton, "Before the Redskins were the Redskins," 891-902.

[25] C. Richard King and Charles Springwood have both written about several success stories in which Indian mascots and logos were eliminated in United States schools and universities. See: King and Springwood, *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascot Controversy*.; King, *The Native American Mascot Controversy: a handbook*.

[26] Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*, 64.

[27] Boyce Timmons, "A Matter of Individual Choice," *The Sooner Magazine,* October 1970, accessed 22 June 2016, https://digital.libraries.ou.edu/sooner/article_info.asp?articleID=10867&issueID=511&period=October&year=1970&volume=44&issue=1

leggings, and an eagle feather bonnet".[28] (Figure 1) It became clear however that not all Native American students at OU supported Little Red.

In 1969, a group of students, who were members of OU's chapter of the National Indian Youth Council, staged a daylong sit-in to oppose the use of Little Red. They also delivered a petition with 32 signatures to the president of the university, J. Herbert Holloman.[29] It stated that the mascot "serve[d] as a symbol of the physical oppression and cultural degradation" faced by American Indians in the past.[30] Their protest did not persuade all other Indians on campus to unite for the cause. Instead, these Indian students decided to use the mascot as a way to show all on campus that "college was a place for Indians".[31] Kirke Kickingbird, who was Little Red in 1969, told the University's student-produced newspaper that his family and tribal chairman encouraged him to use the role to gain more understanding for Indians.[32] Many Indians did not support the mascot elimination movement, and some like Kickingbird even actively pushed for its retention.

The OU chapter of the NIYC assisted the push to eliminate Little Red as the university's mascot, and in doing so, a connection developed between this action and "Red Power" activism of the 1970s. Their use of sit-ins as a form of protest also mimicked earlier "fish-in" efforts of the NIYC in the 1960s. Although OU students had support from the NIYC, their lack of organisation contributed to the unsuccessful movement to eliminate Little Red. By October 1970, even the president of the OU chapter of the NIYC Dave Poolaw described the mascot issue as a "circus situation" that had got wildly out of hand.[33] He said that the group had lost sight of its aims: the creation of an Indian Studies program, scholarships and help for Indian students. The students lacked experience in campaigning for Indian rights and their strategies for enacting change were not always effective, meaning that the movement was left without a unified front or clear direction. Without strong organisation and adherence

[28] S. Matthew DeSpain, ""Little Red Died for Your Sins": Playing Indian at the University of Oklahoma and the Rise and Fall of Little Red," *Native Matters: The Journal of Native American Studies* 2 (2012): 12-20, 12.
[29] "OU Indian Group Asks Mascot Ban," *The Oklahoman*, 22 November 1969.
[30] DeSpain, ""Little Red Died for Your Sins": Playing Indian at the University of Oklahoma and the Rise and Fall of Little Red," 20.
[31] Ibid., 17.
[32] Oklahoma Daily, 14 November 1969.
[33] Dave Poolaw, "Not Everyone Loves Mascots," *The Sooner Magazine*, October 1970, 21-22, accessed 22 June 2016, https://digital.libraries.ou.edu/sooner/article_info.asp?articleID=10867&issueID=511&period=October&year=1970&volume=44&issue=1

to an established goal, OU student's efforts lost momentum and Little Red reappeared on the sporting field in the following decade.

At the height of the issue, Indian students like Kirke Kickingbird who brought Little Red to life, were not happy with fellow students' attempts to eliminate him. Nor were they convinced that the mascot racially demeaned them or should have been retired. Over a decade later in 1984, one of the first Little Reds Philip Waller attempted to revive the mascot by appearing on the sidelines at a football match dressed in full Indian attire.[34] Waller was sanctioned for his actions, but demonstrated that the issue was not buried and Indians were still willing to fight to retain their beloved mascot. Waller's demonstration confirms that unity between Indian students was never achieved at OU. Little Red came to exist because of Native American students who felt that he honoured Indians on campus. In the same manner—at the hands of Native American students—he met his demise. Without the unanimous support of Indian students, there was little hope that the mascot would lie down quietly.

A similar situation of student disunity arose at Marquette University. Their mascot, Willie Wampum,[35] was described in *The Marquette Tribune* as a "grinning, tomahawk swinging Redskin", with a huge fiberglass head, who "spent his time chasing the mascots of opponents and entertaining the fans".[36] After eleven seasons on the basketball court, the buzzer went on Willie Wampum in early 1971 when the Student Senate voted 16-9 to "retire him as soon as possible".[37] His abolition though was not proposed by a unified group of Indian students, but by the activist Milwaukee priest, Father James Groppi. Editor of *The Marquette Tribune* Patrick Deady reported that controversy was stirring over the mascot in January 1971, but that this concern was not dominant among the Native American student population. Indian student Bernard Vigue said that seeing caricatured images of their race was "just

[34] Beth Powell, "Little Red's Return Irks Some Indian OU Students," *The Oklahoman*, October 24, 1984.
[35] It is Marquette University policy to not publish images of Willie Wampum. The author instead directs readers to the following search link should they wish to view images of the mascot. See: http://cdm16280.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/search/collection/p4007hilltop!p4007coll14!p4007coll18!p4007coll22!p128701coll1!p128701coll5!p128701coll6!p16280coll1!p16280coll3/searchterm/%22willie%20wampum%22/field/all/mode/all/conn/and/cosuppress/0
[36] ""Willie Wampum" Is Warrior Mascot," *The Marquette Tribune,* 15 November 1961, Box 16, B-2.2, Indian Symbol/Mascot 1977-1990, Marquette University Raynor Memorial Libraries.
[37] John J. Gilmore, "Willie Wampum: almost everybody's friend," *The Marquette Tribune*, 3 April 1974, Box 16, B-2.2, Indian Symbol/Mascot 1977-1990, Marquette University Raynor Memorial Libraries.

one of those things that Indians experience all the time".[38] Whilst this could be considered something that should be rectified, Vigue considered it "nothing really to worry about".[39] He also extended this feeling of apathy to the five other Native American students he knew on campus. This suggests that Indian students were used to being trivialised on campus and it did not really distress them. The article also noted that one Native American student they contacted had never even heard of Willie Wampum.[40] These examples do not depict Indian Marquette students actively attempting to keep Willie Wampum alive. Instead they show that Native American students on campus were just not overly concerned with their caricatured mascot, and certainly not concerned enough to form a group dedicated to its abolishment. The prevalence of inauthentic "Indian" symbols in the media can explain student indifference to these caricatured depictions of Native Americans. Romanticised images of Indians were rife, particularly in films, which may have led Indian students to simply accept their portrayal as part of a wider societal acceptance of inaccurate imagery, and even participate in and perpetuate it.[41]

Lack of Representation on Campus

The fact that there were very few Indian students at college campuses in the 1970s is another key reason the push to eliminate Indian mascots did not proceed smoothly. Without strong numbers, the movement struggled to depict a sense of solidarity that would attract the attention of college administration or the wider public. Dartmouth College was founded in 1769 with the local Native American population in mind. This is reflected in the college charter, which states the university's aim of "civilising…Christianising, and instructing the Indian natives of [the] land".[42] In the college's first two hundred years however, only sixty Native American students attended.[43] Despite the lack of student representation, the Indian was ever-present

[38] Patrick Deady, "MU mascot called offensive," *The Marquette Tribune* 55:31, 27 January 1971, Box 16, B-2.2, Indian Symbol/Mascot 1977-1990, Marquette University Raynor Memorial Libraries.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Deady, "MU mascot called offensive."
[41] Rosenthal, *Reimagining Indian Country: Native American Migration and Identity in Twentieth-Century Los Angeles*, 43-47.
[42] "Dartmouth College Charter," *Dartmouth College Rauner Library*, accessed 1 July 2016, http://www.dartmouth.edu/~library/rauner/dartmouth/dc-charter.html?mswitch-redir=classic
[43] Colin Calloway, "Long Time Coming," *Dartmouth Alumni Magazine,* July/August 2010, accessed 1 July 2016, http://dartmouthalumnimagazine.com/long-time-coming/

on campus through the university's logo that featured the head of a Native American. The choice of this logo was grounded in a desire to adhere to the commitment of this original charter. A statement by the College Trustees noted that in 1970, there were only three Native American students enrolled at Dartmouth.[44] Over the next four years, the college actively recruited Indian students in an effort to be committed to its original prime reason for being: Indian education.[45]

The four students who demanded the Indian head logo be changed in 1968 certainly did not feel welcome on campus. They felt that if the college was committed to becoming a centre for Native American people, it was necessary to remove a mascot that "nourished only a romantic notion of being an 'Indian'".[46] They also believed that Dartmouth's sudden commitment to recruiting Indian students appeared "designed to assuage a national feeling of guilt" rather than really try to aid their plight.[47] This was said in light of a commitment in the 1970s by institutions like Dartmouth to admitting more students from racial minorities.[48] To be sincere in its devotion to Indian education, it seemed that Dartmouth would have to remove the Indian head logo. As the college never officially adopted the logo, the committee that deliberated over the issue concluded that there was "nothing to repeal".[49] They did, however, recognise that the logo was inconsistent with the institutional and academic objectives of the college, and encouraged individuals to make conscious decisions over their personal use of it.[50] According to the Alumni Council Report, many factions of the university voluntarily did away with Indian imagery and terms. This included the college's undergraduate newspaper, radio station, the alumni magazine and those who used stationery and letterheads bearing the Indian logo. Whether it

[44] 'Trustees of Dartmouth Re-Affirm College Policy Supporting Native American Program, Discourage Use of Indian Symbol," *Dartmouth College News Services,* 30 October 1974, Box 1473, File 16, Records of Dartmouth College Trustees Collection DA-1.
[45] Rosenthal suggests that this can be viewed as part of a nation-wide effort to increase the participation of Native Americans and other students of colour in higher education during the late 1960s. Rosenthal, *Reimagining Indian Country: Native American Migration and Identity in Twentieth-Century Los Angeles*, 132.
[46] "Policy Statement and Recommendations from Native Americans at Dartmouth on The Dartmouth "Indian" Symbol," 1972, Box 1473, File 18, Records of Dartmouth College Trustees Collection DA-1, Dartmouth College Archives.
[47] "Report and Recommendations of the Indian Symbol Study Committee — Dartmouth Alumni Council," 15 June 1972, Box 1473, File 18, Records of Dartmouth College Trustees Collection DA-1.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid.
[50] 'Trustees of Dartmouth Re-Affirm College Policy Supporting Native American Program, Discourage Use of Indian Symbol," *Dartmouth College News Services,* 30 October 1974, Box 1473, File 16, Records of Dartmouth College Trustees Collection DA-1, Dartmouth College Archives.

was due to their recruitment program or a more welcoming environment with fewer images of the Indian logo, the number of Native American students rose in the following years.[51] In the 1970s at least, there were too few Indians on campus to initiate official condemnation of the college logo. With more student representation, perhaps there would be stronger support on campuses nowadays to campaign against Indian imagery.

Lack of Support from the Local Indian Community

In addition to their own internal disunity, the Native American student population did not receive strong support from the local Indian community. This ultimately added to a sense of disorganisation and a lack of solidarity with their cause. Charles Springwood states that one can "hardly expect unanimous opinion from any single cultural community", and Paul Chaat Smith and Robert Allen Warrior denote that "Indian leadership was rarely united" during the "Red Power" movement because their demands and wants were not the same.[52] These statements ring true when considered as a reason why the push to eliminate Indian mascots did not receive strong support from the wider Indian community. It was reported in the student newspaper of Syracuse University, *The Daily Orange,* that the "Onondaga reservation Indians consulted had no objection" to the mascot's use, "as long as it was done in a dignified manner".[53] Student Ron Hill emphasised this in his letter to the editor of *The Daily Orange*. He advised that there was "no need for alarm" on campus because the "Indians who live on the reservation south of Syracuse [would] not unite and sweep down on the…campus, raiding and burning down buildings".[54] Some of the university population doubted the ability of the campaign to truly disrupt the current use of Indian imagery, and considered it valid to try to keep the issue of mascots an internal university matter. With low Indian student numbers on campus though, the lack of community support meant that the movement did not receive the attention it needed to prevent the Warriors nickname being retained.

[51] Calloway, "Long Time Coming".
[52] Charles Fruehling Springwood, ""I'm Indian Too!" Claiming Native American Identity, Crafting Authority in Mascot Debates," *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 28, no. 1 (2004): 56-70, 57.; Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*, 57.
[53] Brian O'Neill, "Mounts, Indians discuss warrior symbol," *Syracuse Daily Orange,* 10 November 1977, accessed July 22, 2016, http://dailyorange.com/archives/
[54] Ron Hill, "Letter to the Editor," *Syracuse Daily Orange*, 21 February 1972.

At Marquette, the university's American Indian Counsellor Maxine Smallish sent an open letter to the local Indian community in 1978 asking if they favoured or opposed the introduction of a new "Warrior" mascot. The letter stipulated that the new mascot would in no way resemble the old Willie Wampum. Instead it would be a "salute to the American Indian students at Marquette and of the state of Wisconsin".[55] The result was 85 people in support, 19 opposed and three who were indifferent.[56] The fact that only 107 responses were received from 1500 mailed out letters, conveys that the American Indian community of Milwaukee was not overly concerned with the issue. Some Native Americans in the Milwaukee area wrote letters voicing their anger at the dismissal of Willie Wampum. They were particularly bewildered that it was a non-Native American who initiated his removal. Chippewa Indian Ruth Braeger asked, "who gave Father James Groppi the right to assume [himself] a spokesman for the American Indian on the matter?".[57] Clarence Reil added that the "mascot [was] not harming the Indian's image", and that if Indians were offended by it, they could do their "own speaking and fighting".[58] The Indian community did not like being spoken for by a white priest and only a small group of students. Just as the occupation of Alcatraz Island had been considered an exercise done by "privileged, misguided youth", the work of students at OU too fell victim to the misguided behaviour of optimistic student[s.59] Director of Indian Programs at OU, Boyce Timmons, stated that the students' biggest mistake was to make themselves "self-appointed Indian spokesmen for the Indians of Oklahoma without ever asking the Indians of Oklahoma anything about it".[60] College-educated students who felt entitled to speak on behalf of a community clashed with others in the community who did not share their perspective about the matter. The resulting resentment and lack of agreement between Indians on campus and the wider Indian community meant that the students did not add legitimacy to their cause with this broader support. Without this support, the apparent importance of their campaign as benefitting a wider Indian community was diminished and it achieved only partial success.

[55] Maxine Smallish, "Open Letter to the Indian Community," January 1978, Box 16, B-2.2, Indian Symbol/Mascot 1977-1990, Marquette University Raynor Memorial Libraries.
[56] Smallish, "Open Letter to the Indian Community."
[57] Ruth Ann Braeger, "Willie Wampum Welcome," *The Milwaukee Journal,* 3 February 1971.
[58] Clarence Reil Jr., "Indians Walk Alone," *The Milwaukee Journal*, 3 February 1971.
[59] Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*, 87.
[60] Boyce Timmons, "A Matter of Individual Choice," *The Sooner Magazine,* October 1970.

The Need for Support from Local Leaders

By the early 1970s, Indians had seen over a decade of African American-led civil rights activism, and "felt a yearning for the same kind of attention".[61] Differences in aims and approaches however, meant that the two movements for civil rights had a complicated relationship.[62] Charles Wilkinson has noted that despite these differences, the African American civil rights movement "put wind beneath the wings" of the Indian movement and allowed them to take up the fight to take control of their own representation in the early 1970s.[63] Yet C. Richard King brings to light the divergent interests of the two groups, and suggests that racial thinking in the United States has come to "pivot around the interface of blackness and whiteness" to the disadvantage of Native Americans.[64] Seemingly, the climate was right for real change to occur on campuses across the United States, but the push to eliminate Native American mascots and logos struggled for wide success from the outset. The movement's inability to acquire the support of any prominent American Indian leaders was a contributing factor. This left it without the impact of other Indian civil rights action such as the occupation of Alcatraz, the takeover of the Bureau of Indian Affairs building (1972), and siege at Wounded Knee (1973), which had the support of prominent leaders such as Vine Deloria and Russell Means. This is not to say that Indian leaders were not interested in the issue of mascots in sport. The case of the Braves' Chief Noc-A-Homa did gain the attention of prominent AIM member Russell Means. He declared the fight to abolish The Chief the beginning of a "national effort to change the stereotype of the American Indian," his next opponent was the Cleveland Indians' Chief Wahoo logo.[65] His optimism did not, however, translate to the removal of the mascots. Chief Noc-A-Homa remained part of the Braves' fixture until 1986 and Chief Wahoo is still grinning today. Perhaps on the smaller scale of colleges and universities, the presence of an ambassador for Indian rights–such as Russell Means–would have projected the cause further. The students did not

[61] Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*, 58.
[62] Wilkinson, *Blood Struggle: The Rise of Modern Indian Nations*, 129.
[63] Ibid., 130. Raúl Tovares has also noted the influence of the African-American civil rights movement on the beginnings of increased action by the American Indian population. See: Raúl Tovares, "Mascot Matters: Race, History, and the University of North Dakota's "Fighting Sioux" Logo," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 26, no. 1 (2002): 76-94, 86.
[64] King, *Redskins: Insult and Brand*, 78.
[65] William M. Carley, "Is Chief Noc-A-Homa Racist? Many Indians Evidently Think He Is," *The Wall Street Journal,* 27 January 1972.

capitalise on the well-known Indian leaders of the time and the general atmosphere of protest-based activism, leaving their cause lacking in impact.

Non-Indian Barriers

In addition to limitations on the Native American's part, non-Indians also put up significant barriers to the removal of Indian imagery in sport. Since the early twentieth century, predominantly white sports teams have incorporated Native American imagery into their sports mascots, logos and designations. These were justified as invoking positive attributes like strength, ability and bravery, which were desirable traits on the sporting field. In his article on the use of Indian team names in the formative era of American sports, J. Gordon Hylton establishes that the "attachment of a Native American name to a baseball club was intended to emphasise the 'American' nature of the game".[66] At least in the early part of the story, the use of Indian imagery in sport does not appear to have been derogatory. At Marquette, great effort was made to ensure that mascot who replaced Willie Wampum was respectful and dignified. They employed and paid Native American woman Lila Blackdeer a large sum to craft the "magnificent regalia" for new mascot; The First Warrior.[67] By commissioning an Indian woman to make the outfit, Marquette did not simply create another 'white man's Indian', but one that was authentic in appearance. Despite protests, the university believed that it could have an Indian mascot that commanded respect and honour and the Indian students found it difficult to convince the generally white leaders of the university that this was not the case.

A further 'white barrier' developed from another distinct group within college communities: the alumni. Some members of this powerful group took it upon themselves to protect the symbol of their alma mater. One particularly perseverant campaign was that of Dartmouth Class of 1928 alumnus, Jack Herpel. His advertisement in the college alumni magazine in 1979 asked fellow graduates to respond with whether they wanted a "dignified Indian symbol" or "no Indian symbol"

[66] Hylton, "Before the Redskins Were the Redskins: The Use of Native American Team Names in the Formative Era of American Sports, 1857-1933," 896.
[67] James H. Scott to Lila G. Blackdeer, 8 February 1980, Box 16, B-2.2, Indian Symbol/Mascot 1977-1990, Marquette University Raynor Memorial Libraries.

at Dartmouth.[68] Of the 500 responses received, 90.5 per cent wanted the symbol restored. Nearly two thirds even donated money to the cause.[69] Interestingly, upon analysing Herpel's graphs of the results, it so happened that alumni of classes between 1970 and 1978 provided the fewest responses, but were also most divided over the issue.[70] The figures dictate that there was heavy support amongst older alumni for the reinstatement of the Indian logo—people often with the money and authority to influence their alma mater. That more recent graduates were less inclined to support the mascot, reflects changing perceptions over racially discriminate images. Herpel's campaign did not bring about reinstatement of the mascot, but did, however, bring forward the disgruntled voice of an influential group at the college.

Much of the backlash from the college community and alumni came about through the widespread attitude that minorities are not always right. In an era when African Americans had demanded their civil rights through forms of public protest, some of the white population appears to have grown tired of minority groups claims of discrimination. This brought about a broader simmering of resentment and backlash to a perceived sense of entitlement by minority groups. Students and alumni voiced this opinion, as did some mainstream press publications. In a satirical piece, Marquette student Charles Pierce wrote that to appease those in opposition to Indian mascots, the National Collegiate Athletic Association should "require all schools to name their teams the Wildcats", as it would "run little risk of offending anyone".[71] This reveals the sentiment that minorities were just being hypersensitive. Alumnus John Barchilon similarly questioned the ability of a "t-shirt and mascot" to really transmit and develop serious attitudes about minority groups. If they can do so he writes, then Indians have "discovered the two most potent propaganda tools in history".[72]

The belief that minorities were not always right also brought about a discernible unwillingness in some institutions to rid their schools entirely of

[68] Jack Herpel, "FADDIS (For a Dignified Dartmouth Indian Symbol) Report," June 1979, Box 1473, Records of Dartmouth College Trustees DA-1, Dartmouth College Archives.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid. Responding alumni from classes 1930-1939 voted 70 for and 2 against, whereas those in classes 1970-1978 voted 30 for and 14 against. In the intermediate years, support for the mascot continually declined.
[71] Charles P. Pierce, "The Wampum cover-up story," *The Marquette Tribune*, 3 April 1974.
[72] John Barchilon, Letter to the Editor, *Dartmouth Alumni Magazine*, July 1972, accessed 1 July 2016, http://archive.dartmouthalumnimagazine.com/issue/19720701#!&pid=2

disparaging Indian imagery. In some cases, the mascot or logo was retired but other depictions of Indians remained. Painted on the walls at Dartmouth College's Thayer Dining Hall (later known as the Hovey Grill) are the Hovey Murals. The murals depict college founder Eleazar Wheelock sharing "five hundred gallons of New England rum" with various American Indian characters.[73] The fifth panel portrays seven semi-nude Indian women posing in a sexualised manner. The murals project and propagate an image of the Indian as perceived at the founding of Dartmouth in the eighteenth century. Although the murals have value as artworks, the image they portray of Indians as primitive and uncultured could be seen as equally demeaning and harmful as some thought the Indian head logo to be. The murals remained prominent in the dining hall and were not covered until 1983. They are still occasionally unveiled for educational purposes.[74] Dartmouth discontinued its Indian logo, but the Hovey Murals' importance as artworks overcame the Indian minority group's insistence that they were offensive. By keeping the murals, the college did not grant Native American students a campus fully free of offensive imagery.

The Indian symbol at Stanford University continued to resurface despite being banned in 1972. Almost every year since, there have been campaigns to bring the logo back and students still dress in Indian logo jumpers, headbands, and don war paint at sports matches. This occurs especially around the time of the "Big Game" between Stanford and rivals from The University of California, Berkeley.[75] When Native American students first petitioned to remove the logo, ombudsman Lois Anderson wrote of the "simplicity of the remedy" to the situation.[76] The remedy—to "permanently discontinue" the symbol—has proven to be far from simple.[77] Many students are unwilling to let the Indian symbol go, and so have asked for the introduction of a nobler looking Indian that would appease Native Americans who were offended by the old one.[78] This request has been repeatedly denied, but it

[73] Robert McGrath, "American Bacchanal: Myth, Memory, and the "Hovey Murals," in *The Hovey Murals at Dartmouth College: Culture and Contexts*, ed. Brian P. Kennedy (Hanover: University Press of New England, 2015), 19-44, 21.
[74] "Hovey Murals," *Hood Museum of Art,* accessed 23 July 2016, http://hoodmuseum.dartmouth.edu/collections/overview/artoncampus/hovey.html
[75] "The Removal of the Indian Mascot of Stanford," *Stanford Native American Cultural Centre*, accessed 24 July 2016, http://nacc.stanford.edu/mascot.html
[76] Lois S. Anderson to Richard W. Lyman, 3 February 1972, File 8655, Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries.
[77] "Petition Presented to the Ombudsman of Stanford University," January 1972, File 8655, Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries.
[78] Ibid.

demonstrates the allegiance felt to the old symbol. Loyalty to the university and its heritage has kept the Indian symbol alive, and the sense of solidarity created by the logo means that many at Stanford have been reluctant to submit to Indians' requests to eliminate it. Many students have remained loyal to this aspect of the university's heritage at the expense of Native Americans who feel insulted by the symbol. This prioritising of the desires of sports fans over those of the Native American minority, has meant that at Stanford the Indian head logo has unofficially remained ever-present on the sporting field.

At Syracuse, the mythology of the Saltine Warrior led to such popularity that it was difficult to abolish entirely. The class of 1884 named the student yearbook *The Onondagan* "in honour of the tribe and the beautiful valley" in which they lived, and ties felt with the Onondagan tribe led to the creation of the university's mascot.[79] The Saltine Warrior developed from a story published in the university's humour magazine in 1931. The story reported that during an excavation, workers had come across a "tribal house of the early Onondagans" from the sixteenth century and the portrait of an "early Onondagan chief" named *O-gee-ke-da Ho-schen-e-ga-da* or, the Salt Warrior.[80] It was revealed to be a hoax some forty-five years later, but by then the Saltine Warrior had become the Syracuse mascot. The class of 1951 even commissioned a bronze statue of the mythological figure, which still stands proudly outside the Carnegie Library at the university.[81] There have been no calls to remove it. Therefore, while some Indian iconography such as mascots could be eliminated, others could not. Without commitment to the full removal of Indian symbols on campuses, the overall achievement of the movement was limited. Although one aspect of Indian imagery had gone, others still existed that propagated the same stereotypes that students were trying to eradicate.

[79] Donald M. Fisher, "Chief Bill Orange and the Saltine Warrior: A Cultural History of Indian Symbols and Imagery at Syracuse University," in *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascots Controversy*, ed. C. Richard King and Charles F. Springwood (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 24-45, 27.
[80] "The True Story of Bill Orange," *Syracuse Orange Peel,* October 1931, File on Syracuse University Traditions – Saltine Warrior, Syracuse University Archives.
[81] "Syracuse University Mascots," *Syracuse University Archives*, accessed 30 July 2016, http://archives.syr.edu/history/mascots.html

No Government Backing or Legislative Action

The movement's efficacy was impeded due to a lack of support from any form of government, and absence of legislative action. This speaks to the legacy of the movement, the effects of which are still being played out today. In the 1980s, discussion over the use of Native American sports mascots continued although arguably not on the same level experienced during the burst of activity in the 1970s. The debate flared up considerably in the 1990s, with the focus turning to elementary and high schools. The legality of the use of these mascots, logos and symbols was also discussed. This was namely pertaining to the difficulty in balancing the right to engage in free speech, and the right of the Native American population to live free of discrimination.[82] The recent US Supreme Court ruling that the law used by the US Patent and Trademark office to prevent the Washington Redskins from registering trademarks using the word "Redskins" as unconstitutional, not only paves the way for Indian logos and names to remain, but also enters into important discussions about who decides what is discriminatory and offensive.[83] The movement has also turned to deploring the use of team designations and logos in American professional sports teams. In 2001, the United States Commission on Civil Rights released a statement calling for the end to the use of Native American images and team-names in schools.[84] This did not however extend to professional teams, which meant that still, Indian imagery was not ubiquitously condemned. In October 2013, United States' President Barack Obama weighed in on the topic. Referring to the Washington Redskins football team, he stated that if he were the owner of a team whose name was "offending a sizeable group of people, [he would] think about changing it".[85] After the President's statement, Redskins team owner Daniel Snyder promptly confirmed that the name would not be changed. Although Obama's backing of the movement has not yet brought change to the Redskins name, it refuelled discussion on the issue.

---

[82] Scott R. Rosner, "Legal Approaches to the Use of Native American Logos and Symbols in Sports.(Braves or Cowards? Use of Native American Images and Symbols as Sports Nicknames)," *Virginia Sports and Entertainment Law Journal* 1, no. 2 (2002): 257-75, 58.

[83] Alex Swoyer, "Supreme Court ruling against censoring The Slants' name bolsters Washington Redskins case", *The Washington Times*, 19 June 2017.

[84] "Statement of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on the Use of Native American Images and Nicknames as Sports Symbols," *USCRR,* 13 April 2001, accessed 22 July 2016, http://www.usccr.gov/press/archives/2001/041601st.htm

[85] David Nakamura, "Obama: 'I'd think about changing' Washington Redskins team name," *The Washington Post,* 6 October 2013.

Conclusion

The movement to eliminate Native American mascots in sport provides one of the first instances of Indian students taking control of their own representation on campus. Rather than face imagery they felt demeaned and offended them every day, they attempted to capitalise on an atmosphere of protest created by the "Red Power" movement and end the legacy of racism that had haunted their people for generations. The actions of students did not occur in isolation, but as part of a broader movement for Native American civil rights, and this article has sought to acknowledge them as such. In the way of the complete realisation of the movement's aims stood obstacles such as the conviction that the symbols honoured Indians, and an overwhelming attitude that minority demands did not necessarily always have merit. The students' own lack of representation and organisation on campuses in the 1970s, as well as their lack of support from the Native American community, that itself had non-uniform opinions and priorities, also impeded the movement from moving forward with pace and lasting efficacy. By acknowledging the similarities between these limitations and those of the "Red Power" movement in a broader sense, we can better understand the difficulties faced by Native American activists to control their representation in the 1970s.

The legacy of those who first brought the issue into the field has been long lasting and their successes should not be understated. Native Americans still receive the lowest education and lowest income of any ethnic group in the United States and face high levels of alcoholism and unemployment. But without the enthusiasm of students in the 1970s and those they inspired, the image of the Indian may have been forever condemned to that of the stereotyped 'Injun Joe'. Estimates suggest that over two thousand Native American symbols, mascots and logos have been retired in schools and colleges across the United States.[86] One thousand remain. The week after President Obama's statement, the Redskins lost heavily to the Cowboys.

[86] "Anti-Defamation & Mascots," *National Congress of American Indians,* accessed 30 October 2013, http://www.ncai.org/policy-issues/community-and-culture/anti-defamation-mascots

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Dartmouth College Archives, DA-1.

Marquette University Raynor Memorial Libraries, B-2.2

Stanford University Libraries Special Collections.

Syracuse University Archives.

University of Oklahoma Archives and Special Collections.

"Dartmouth College Charter." *Dartmouth College Rauner Library*. http://www.dartmouth.edu/~library/rauner/dartmouth/dc-charter.html?mswitch-redir=classic

"Hovey Murals." *Hood Museum of Art.* http://hoodmuseum.dartmouth.edu/collections/overview/artoncampus/hovey.html

"NCAA Division 1 Football Records (Attendance Records)." *NCAA.* (2010). http://fs.ncaa.org/Docs/stats/football_records/DI/2010/Attendance.pdf

"The Removal of the Indian Mascot of Stanford." *Stanford Native American Cultural Centre*. http://nacc.stanford.edu/mascot.html

"Statement of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on the Use of Native American Images and Nicknames as Sports Symbols." *USCRR.* 13 April 2001. http://www.usccr.gov/press/archives/2001/041601st.htm

Humphrey, Walter Beach. *Hovey Murals*, 1937-1939, http://hoodmuseum.dartmouth.edu/collections/overview/artoncampus/P939195.html

Dartmouth Alumni Magazine. 1972-2010

Marquette Tribune. 1961-1974

Milwaukee Journal. 1971

Oklahoman. 1969, 1984

Oklahoma Daily. 1969

Sooner Magazine. 1970

Syracuse Daily Orange. 1972-1978

Wall Street Journal. 1972

Washington Post. 1972-2013

Washington Times. 2017

Secondary Sources

Cobb, Daniel M. *Native Activism in Cold War America: The Struggle for Sovereignty*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008.

Cobb, Daniel M., and Loretta Fowler, eds. *Beyond Red Power: American Indian Politics and Activism since 1900*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research, 2007.

Davies, Richard O. *Sports in American Life: A History*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

DeSpain, S. Matthew. ""Little Red Died for Your Sins": Playing Indian at the University of Oklahoma and the Rise and Fall of Little Red." *Native Matters: The Journal of Native American Studies* 2 (2012): 12-20.

Eitzen, D. Stanley, and Maxine Baca Zinn. "The Dark Side of Sports Symbols." *USA Today (Magazine)* 129, no. 2668 (2001): 48-51.

Fisher, Donald M. "Chief Bill Orange and the Saltine Warrior: A Cultural History of Indian Symbols and Imagery at Syracuse University." In *Team Spirits: The Native American Mascots Controversy*, edited by C. Richard King and Charles F. Springwood, 25-45. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.

Hylton, J. Gordon. "Before the Redskins Were the Redskins: The Use of Native American Team Names in the Formative Era of American Sports, 1857-1933." *North Dakota Law Review* 86 (2010): 879-905.

Josephy, Alvin M., Troy R. Johnson, and Joane Nagel, eds. *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom*. 2nd ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.

McGrath, Robert. "American Bacchanal: Myth, Memory, and the 'Hovey Murals.'" In *The Hovey Murals at Dartmouth College: Culture and Contexts*, edited by Brian P. Kennedy, 19-44. Hanover: University Press of New England, 2015.

Mechling, Jay. "“Playing Indian” and the Search for Authenticity in Modern White America." *Prospects* 5 (1980): 17-33.

Nuessel, Frank. "Objectionable Sports Team Designations." *Names: A Jounral of Onomastics* 42, no. 2 (1994): 101-19.

Rosenthal, Nicolas G. *Reimagining Indian Country: Native American Migration and Identity in Twentieth-Century Los Angeles*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Rosner, Scott R. "Legal Approaches to the Use of Native American Logos and Symbols in Sports.(Braves or Cowards? Use of Native American Images and Symbols as Sports Nicknames)." *Virginia Sports and Entertainment Law Journal* 1, no. 2 (2002): 257-73.

Shreve, Bradley Glenn. *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011.

Sigelman, Lee. "Hail to the Redskins? Public Reactions to a Racially Sensitive Team Name." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 15, no. 4 (1998): 317-25.

Smith, Paul Chaat, and Robert Allen Warrior. *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*. New York: New Press, 1996.

Springwood, Charles Fruehling. ""I'm Indian Too!" Claiming Native American Identity, Crafting Authority in Mascot Debates." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 28, no. 1 (2004): 56-70.

Tovares, Raúl. "Mascot Matters: Race, History, and the University of North Dakota's "Fighting Sioux" Logo." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 26, no. 1 (2002): 76-94.

Wilkinson, Charles F. *Blood Struggle: The Rise of Modern Indian Nations*. 1st ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 2005.