

13 'To Lead and to Serve': American Indian Studies in Virginia

SAMUEL R. COOK AND KARENNE WOOD

The publication of the edited volume *Native American Studies in Higher Education* by Duane Champagne and Jay Stauss (2002) marked a milestone in American Indian Studies (AIS). Not only does it commemorate the formal existence of programs focusing on this broadly defined field at various academic institutions for more than 30 years, but also the sheer fact that so many long-standing Native/American Indian Studies programs exist in North America is an indication that the academic canon has changed, if only slightly and stubbornly. While accounts of each program vary, all authors agree on specific guiding principles that make American Indian Studies programs legitimate endeavours – namely, that such programs must constitute holistic, praxis-oriented pursuits designed to serve and to work collaboratively with Indigenous peoples in ways that complement and enhance tribal sovereignty, and that recognize the legitimacy and value of Indigenous knowledge. This book understandably focused on those AIS programs that have endured the test of time and 'that have developed and deepened their philosophy about American Indian studies and their commitment to students, community, scholarship, and in many cases, traditional knowledge and language' (3).

In this chapter we offer a glance at a fledgling American Indian Studies program that has embodied the guiding principles of most salient AIS programs from the outset of its short existence. This program was born at Virginia Polytechnic Institute (Virginia Tech) in 1999, specifically at the request of some of the state's Indigenous peoples, and it has been guided by a collaborative mandate ever since. It is important to chronicle and report on such programs in the early stages, because these are the points at which some of the greatest obstacles to development

present themselves, as do some of the most creative innovations for overcoming such obstacles and for nurturing and sustaining programs. While hindsight may provide a better perspective from which to glean generalized models and observations, it does not provide the best vantage point from which to observe the critical nuances and realities of what it takes to develop an American Indian Studies program in the face of localized institutional idiosyncrasies and peculiar, if not hostile, political climates.

History

American Indian Studies programs that exist at land grant institutions (which, in the United States, have a legal mandate to serve communities within their home states) are theoretically well-situated to gain institutional support as service-oriented programs. The irony is that those involved in such programs find themselves continually evoking the land grant mission and philosophy in attempts to stir up university support (Albers et. al., 2002: 149; Stauss, Tippeconnic Fox, and Lowe, 2002: 84–6). In the case of Virginia Tech, which was established as a land grant college in 1872 (Kinnear, 1972: 1), it proved to be a critical factor in setting the gears in motion for developing our AIS program.

In June of 1999, the tribal council of Virginia's Monacan Indian Nation sent a letter to then-Virginia Tech president Paul Torgersen and several other key administrators and state legislators suggesting that Virginia's land grant institution consider establishing an American Indian Studies program. In that letter, the Monacans provided a basic blueprint for a program that would not only educate the general public on American Indian history, cultures, and issues in a culturally sensitive way, but one that would – first and foremost – exist in service to Indigenous peoples. They envisioned a program that would not treat Indians as subjects, but as partners and colleagues in collaborative efforts to develop curricula that would engage the state's Indigenous communities in joint ventures designed to bolster their cultural, political, and economic autonomy, and would create a wider awareness and space in the academic canon for the legitimacy and value of Indigenous knowledge (Virginia Tech American Indian Studies Steering Committee, 2000).

In order to realize the full significance of the Monacan letter, it is necessary to place their request and the subsequent development of the program in historical context of Indian and non-Indian relations in Virginia. Following the 1677 Treaty of Middle Plantation between the

Colony of Virginia and most of the tribes within its boundaries, Virginia Indians faded from the limelight of political significance in the eyes of European – and, later, Euro-American – sovereigns. The 1677 treaty technically reduced Virginia Indians to the nebulous status of 'tributary Indians' (Robinson, 1959), which subsequently meant that they were neither militarily nor territorially powerful enough to draw the political interest of the American government following the Revolution. Concomitantly, Indians were not distinguished legally from other persons of colour in Virginia until 1866, when the General Assembly passed a law stating that 'Every person having one-fourth or more Negro blood shall be deemed a colored person, and every person having one-fourth or more Indian blood will be deemed an Indian' (Commonwealth of Virginia, 1866: 84–5). Unfortunately, prior and subsequent renderings of Virginia miscegenation law seemingly negated the 'Indian' portions of this statute, beginning with a 1705 colonial Virginia law which declared that the offspring of an Indian and any person of African ancestry 'should be deemed, accounted, held, and taken to be mulatto' (Henning, 1823: 252).

The rising tide of the eugenics movement in the late nineteenth century made it imminent that many prominent Virginians would launch a legal vendetta against the state's Indigenous peoples for their alleged (and often unsubstantiated) violation of miscegenation laws. Among those prominent citizens was Walter A. Plecker, the state's registrar and director of vital statistics from 1912 to 1946. An internationally known eugenicist, Plecker devised a policy of 'documentary genocide' (Smith, 1993) in which he identified all surnames listed as anything other than 'White' on vital records dating back to the Civil War, and issued a mandate among county clerks, medical doctors, and midwives stating that anyone bearing these surnames should thereafter be classified as 'colored.' Because many Indians had been forced to register as free people of colour prior to the Civil War, this left them with little recourse in asserting unique tribal identities in the eyes of the law. As this policy became codified under the 1924 Virginia Racial Integrity Act, Plecker became more determined to eradicate Indians from the record in Virginia. This policy, in turn, was subject to some rather creative and discriminatory interpretations where Indians were concerned, especially in the context of county political economies. Thus, Virginia Indians were systematically denied access to public schools into the 1960s. For most tribes, church-operated mission schools offering up to a sixth-grade education (on an irregular basis) provided the only option for

formal schooling (Rountree, 1990: 219–424; Cook, 2000: 84–114). Even after public school integration in the early 1960s, Indians found it difficult to access meaningful education for years to come. For instance, in Amherst County, Indians were integrated into public schools in 1963 (although African Americans had been accepted earlier, and the county then proposed a bond issue to build a separate school for Indians), but the first Monacan did not graduate from public high school until 1971 (Cook, 2000: 114–16).

Although social, political, and economic conditions have improved significantly for Virginia Indians since the 1960s, the aforementioned policies of 'racial integrity' and their peculiar manifestations created a formidable obstacle to Indian education in the state, one that continues to pose problems. It is worth mentioning that until recently no Virginia institution of higher education had formally reached out to the state's Indigenous population since the College of William and Mary closed its Brafferton Indian School with the inception of the American Revolution (of course, the Brafferton fund originated in England, not Virginia). Some Virginia tribes, including the Pamunkey, Mattaponi, and Chickahominy, were able to send students to federally funded Indian schools in North Carolina (Cherokee), Kansas (Haskell), and Oklahoma (Bacone College) during the mid-twentieth century, largely through the advocacy of anthropologist Frank Speck (Rountree, 1990: 168–70). Hence, these tribes have seen a significant number of members attain degrees in higher education since the 1950s. Tribes such as the Monacan, however, have had a longer road to travel in adjusting to changing political economic conditions, and have just begun to see a few members matriculate through institutions of higher education on a regular basis. In either case, the state of Virginia did not make a solid commitment to Indians in the realm of education.

Birth of Virginia Tech's Program

There are currently eight state-recognized tribes in Virginia: the Chickahominy, Eastern Chickahominy, Mattaponi, Upper Mattaponi, Monacan, Nansemond, Pamunkey, and Rappahannock. None of these tribes is currently federally recognized, and only two – the Mattaponi and Pamunkey – have official reservations, established through colonial treaty. The total population of these tribes is approximately 4,500 (compared with a statewide population of about 45,000 American Indians and Alaskan Natives of all tribes), according to the latest census

estimates.¹ Thus, compared to most states with institutions hosting salient AIS programs, our Indigenous constituency is small. Interestingly, the development of Virginia Tech's program has paralleled, and in some ways worked in concert with, important political movements from within Virginia's Indian community.

In the 1999 letter that spurred the development of Virginia Tech's program, the Monacan tribal council expressed two broad sets of interests that set the tone for future dialogue: (1) we would like to foster an affiliation [with Virginia Tech] in order to educate our young people, and other Indian students, in Native American Studies so that they would be well prepared for positions of tribal leadership, and would be educated in the issues facing Native people today; and (2) we believe that through such affiliation, we would be better able to develop tribal programs that would serve our members in the areas of tribal economic development, agriculture, land management, and social programs' (Monacan Indian Nation, 1999). The Monacans did not simply rehash the land grant mission, but insisted that such a program must be based on true collaboration and partnering with Indigenous communities.

Virginia Tech officials responded surprisingly fast to the letter, perhaps reacting in part to increased media coverage concerning public scrutiny of diversity at state universities in Virginia. Whatever the case, then-provost Peggy Maeszaros contacted key administrators and heads of departments with potential interests, or faculty with expertise in American Indian issues, to determine what resources were available for the development of such a program and which department or academic unit should house the program, if it were developed. The group had very little difficulty in determining that the program should be located in the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies (CIS, reorganized as the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies in 2003), a unit within the College of Arts and Sciences that serves as a home for several ethnic studies and humanistic interdisciplinary programs.

The next step was to determine the parameters of the prospective program. Accordingly, Dr Maeszaros convened a meeting of all administrators, deans, and faculty who might be potential affiliates with this program, and representatives from the Monacan Indian Nation, in the fall of 1999. Monacan Council Chief John L. Johns and then-tribal director of social and economic development (and co-author) Karenne Wood attended the meeting and elaborated on the earlier letter, explaining that any AIS program must deal holistically with Native issues, and must not only

be concerned with educating the general public but also with bolstering the presence of Indians in the academy and with serving Indigenous communities in ways that would enhance tribal sovereignty. They summed up university tribal relations in one word: diplomacy. Significantly, Johns and Wood insisted that a legitimate AIS program must provide a conduit through which Indigenous knowledge would be seen as relevant. The administration was quite receptive to this proposal and encouraged the further development of the program, with one major caveat: the program must be developed *without* requiring additional resources.

On paper, we were to develop an academic minor under the auspices of the Humanities program at the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies. In practice, we knew we must develop a more holistic entity from the outset, one that operated in service to, and relied on input from, Indigenous people statewide (and ultimately nationwide). Then-associate dean of arts and sciences Myra Gordon oversaw the development of the program, relying on a core group of faculty from various departments who comprised an internal steering committee, and on sustained input from Monacan tribal representatives. During the first year, each faculty member developed proposals for curricula and the minor according to respective fields of expertise. These we then subjected to scrutiny from Monacan tribal council members, although we realized at the time (as discussed below) that future scrutiny would have to include rigorous input from representatives of all Virginia tribes. In the fall of 2000, proposals were refined and submitted through departmental and college review processes. At that point, Sam Cook (co-author) became the official coordinator for the program, thus assuming the first and only full-time position reserved exclusively for American Indian Studies.

Program Accomplishments

In the fall of 2002, the minor program became official. Course offerings have included: Introduction to American Indian Studies, Oral Tradition, American Indian Literatures, American Indian Languages, American Indian Spirituality, Indigenous Peoples and World Politics, and a variety of courses under the Special Topics designator, including American Indian Cultures and Societies, American Indian Law and Policy, American Indians in Film, American Indian Arts, and Native Peoples of the Southeast. While the courses and requirements may seem peculiar compared to those of other AIS programs, it is important to realize that

we had to develop this minor with no additional resources. Thus, we had to streamline the proposal by limiting the number of new courses, restructuring existing courses (as in the case of the oral tradition course), and including more specialized courses under the heading 'Special Topics.' These courses have been and will continue to be developed through increasing collaboration with Virginia's Indigenous peoples, and eventually with other tribes in the region. This collaborative spirit, in fact, has been at the heart of all other initiatives. However, these developments have not come without major obstacles and challenges from various directions, nor without great sacrifices on the part of Virginia Tech faculty and tribal representatives.

Challenges

Not surprisingly, our greatest challenge in developing Virginia Tech's AIS program has been financial. The administrative mandate to develop the program without drawing on additional resources remains in place. The only permanent funding for the program is the director's salary, which means that Sam Cook has spent many hours soliciting funds from internal and external sources in order to support our public and outreach programs. Likewise, there is only one tenure-track faculty line and a more recent – albeit tenuous – full-time instructorship. For the first four years of the program's development, affiliated faculty – particularly Jeff Cornassel (Political Science) and Harry Dyer (English) – devoted a disproportionate amount of time towards seeing the program become a reality. Fortunately, Harry Dyer was transferred full time to American Indian Studies, although his instructorship remains non-tenured. This situation has been complicated by a prolonged financial crisis in the state of Virginia that impacted Virginia Tech in profound ways. The possible advantage that the American Indian Studies program has had – one that differentiates our program from any other on campus – is that our Indigenous constituency is quite willing and able to mount formidable political pressure on the university. This was made clear during our most recent budget-related crisis, when Harry Dyer's position was targeted for possible elimination in response to an impending 5 per cent budget cut statewide. The potential termination of the only American Indian faculty member employed in Virginia Tech's American Indian Studies program was met with a swift bombardment of letters from our Indigenous constituency and supporters across North America. For the moment, Dyer's position has been secured, but

we have taken this event as yet another reminder that complacency is never an option when trying to sustain the rights of Indigenous peoples within and without the academy.

A similar problem is the fact that those faculty most directly involved in the development of our program find themselves serving as the de facto agents for outreach and recruitment in Indigenous communities and as the providers of services for Indigenous students. As M. Annette Jaimes (1987: 3–4) has argued, this can potentially cause faculty to compromise scholarly activity. Indeed, most participating faculty were aspiring towards tenure during the first years of the program and were expected to fulfil a base research requirement. It is safe to say that they put in more time on the university clock than many other colleagues who were junior faculty, simply because of the integrated, holistic nature of the program. Faculty members dealt with this in creative ways – namely, understanding that work on this program might be incorporated into a research agenda. Faculty members have also been concerned with the mission of nation-building, and for scholars such as Jeff Cornassel, work with Virginia's Indian nations on this and other programs opened a new dimension of scholarly activity and collaborative research (see e.g., Cornassel and Cook, 2002).

Finally, in spite of the initial enthusiasm that seemed to brim from Virginia Tech's administration when the Monacans sent their query, we have experienced certain political obstacles to the development of the program, some of which reflect state and local controversies that are not devoid of racial overtones. First, certain officials in the administration have expressed concerns that our program is developing in conjunction (rather than simultaneously) with a current campaign among six of Virginia's Indian nations for federal recognition through joint legislation. The initial concern reflected opposition from several state lawmakers and religious and social organizations that such recognition would open the doors to casino-style gaming in the state (see e.g., Hardin, 2000). While many AIS faculty members endorsed the federal recognition project, these concerns from within the university seem to have subsided with the current bill, which has a specific provision prohibiting tribes from engaging in gaming activities without state approval (an unnecessary reiteration of the 1988 Indian Gaming Regulatory Act that the six tribes were willing to live with in order to bolster political support).

Nonetheless, we continue to contend with bureaucratic implications that our program and curricula are over-politicized. For instance, the

minor proposal and most of the courses would probably have matriculated much faster through the various layers of curriculum committees had certain individuals on the Arts and Sciences Committee not suggested that our program was too closely aligned with local politics – specifically, with a movement to change the Blacksburg High School Indian mascot to something non-offensive to Natives. Indeed, many faculty members did speak in favour of a mascot change (including Virginia Tech's vice-president for multicultural affairs), but our immediate response to this scrutiny of our professional integrity was to point out the contradiction in the anonymous critic's implication – namely, that such a claim implied a disturbing possibility that the college curriculum committee had itself become a caucus for local (partisan) political interests. Fortunately, the chair of the committee and Dean Myra Gordon tactfully reminded the committee of the proper parameters of its duties.

Our greatest loss came in December of 2002, when Jeff Corn tassel accepted a position as co-director of the graduate program in tribal governance at the University of Victoria. We fully supported his decision because his research and activism became globally oriented, and that was the place where Dr Corn tassel is going to make the greatest impact in the field of American Indian Studies. His loss, however, was one we still feel in terms of his commitment to the program.

Developing a Collaborative Model

The title of Duane Champagne's article, 'American Indian Studies is for Everyone' (1998), bears volumes of wisdom for those who understand the nature of our field. American Indian Studies programs do not exist in a vacuum, nor should they. Such programs are necessarily about cross-cultural interactions as much as they are about inter-and intra-cultural affairs. However, whether students, faculty, or other university representatives are American Indians or not, there is always a responsibility to the institution's prospective Indigenous constituency, which, if unfulfilled, nullifies any legitimate claim to holism that an institution might make. At Virginia Tech, we have tried to meet such obligations by keeping the state's Indigenous peoples involved in our program at every step of development. Our approach builds on certain existing collaborative models emphasizing research methods (see, generally, Mihesuah, 1998; Lassiter, 2000, 2005) as we seek to transform not only scholarly approaches within the field, but the very academy of which we are a part.

The philosophy behind such a model is at the very essence of the initial mandate for our program as outlined in the letter from the Monacan Tribal Council. However, we realized early on that we had to get all of the tribes in Virginia involved as partners and colleagues in the program, and, eventually, to move out in concentric circles and involve other tribes in the same manner.

Thus, in the spring of 2001 Virginia Tech hosted the first Virginia Indian Nations Summit on Higher Education (VINSHE). The purpose of this gathering was to break the ice – to dissolve barriers between our institution and the state's Indian nations, many of whom were openly suspicious of any state institution in light of Virginia's previously mentioned track record of dealing with Indigenous peoples. The AIS program invited representatives from each of the eight tribes to come to our campus at our expense and to engage in two days of informal and open dialogue. Although many tribal representatives were initially reserved, they were not afraid to express their concerns and to adopt a 'wait and see' approach.

The end result was overwhelmingly positive. We opened the summit with a powerful keynote from then-chair of American Indian Studies programs at the University of Arizona, Jay Stauss, who appealed to both tribal representatives and university administrators in his assessment of the obligation of land grant universities to Indigenous peoples. Dr Stauss's explicit emphasis on the obligation of Indian Studies programs (and the institutions that house them) to prioritize tribal nation-building offered an important diplomatic catalyst that prompted many tribal representatives to feel confident in venting their concerns thereafter. In fact, an important component of the summit, one that became an ongoing part of this annual gathering for several years, was a public forum called 'What It Means to be a Virginia Indian in the 21st Century'. During this session, tribal representatives were invited to speak from the heart about their lives, cultures, and histories, and to convey to the general public what they thought was truly important to know about Virginia Indians and Indigenous people in general. This forum gradually evolved into a frank conversation between tribal representatives and audience members, and constituted a remarkable interactive platform in which the Indigenous speakers were able to convey their realities on their own terms while engaging the audience in a fluid and non-threatening manner.

The first VINSHE yielded two other important and very positive results. First, we established a standing tribal advisory board consisting of

representatives from all of the tribes in the state, as well as a few 'at-large' members from other tribes. Members of the advisory board serve as liaisons between their respective nations and Virginia Tech while exercising a certain degree of oversight in monitoring activities directed by the American Indian Studies program. Champagne (2002) and others have commented on the difficulty in sustaining such community advisory groups, especially where institutional, financial, or infrastructural support is lacking, while the demand for research and publication does not lessen for the sake of community interests. To be sure, it has not been easy to 'sponsor' this group and the joint initiatives that we have pursued with our advisors, especially since most of our funding has come from external grants or from hard-sought, internal 'soft monies.' Yet all of the tribal advisors have devoted a tremendous amount of their time, energy, and money to our program. They see the development of this program as complementary to, and part of, their larger political agenda. The pressure these advisors have exerted – as a group and as individuals – on university officials has constituted a crucial element in sustaining the program thus far. Indeed, without their support the program would be nothing more than a struggling academic minor at best.

A second important initiative stemming from the first VINSHE is the Virginia Indian Pre-College Initiative (VIPCI). At that first summit, tribal representatives expressed a qualified enthusiasm for seeing more of their youth enter higher education. The main concern was that while higher education may empower individuals, as with Western education in general, it had historically been a primary means of destroying Indigenous communities. The representatives at the summit insisted that if Virginia Tech and other state institutions work with tribal communities in promoting higher education, they should do so in a manner that recognized the importance and legitimacy of Indigenous knowledge. By the same token, representatives were concerned that while some of their students needed long-term guidance in preparing for college, all should be encouraged to make the most of whatever education they receive, regardless of whether they attend college or not. Thus, the VIPCI emerged as a two-tiered mentoring program in which Virginia Indian youth in grades eight through twelve are invited to our campus two weekends each year, along with parents and elders, to take part in specific programs that exhibit the possibilities afforded through education. Such programs have included tours of our university's state-of-the-art virtual reality facility, natural resource management hikes at a remote wildlife preserve maintained by Virginia Tech, and an

Indigenous art exhibition. The presence of elders is crucial to this program, because their presence conveys a message to the youth – namely, that the university values their knowledge and input. Indeed, these elders have been both enthusiastic participants and substantive critics of our program.

At least eight Virginia Indian students who have taken part in the VIPCI since its inception have entered (or will be entering) Virginia Tech, a rather impressive ratio given the small number of Virginia Indians and the historical odds they have faced in pursuing higher education. While some might argue that the VIPCI is an outreach program that belongs in a non-academic unit, we regard it as an integral part of the American Indian Studies mission, regardless of whether participants are involved in the minor program or not.

The academic minor received full and final approval at a time when the top university curriculum committees at Virginia Tech were tabling or refusing to approve many new courses and minors in light of budget and personnel reductions. Nevertheless, and other obligations notwithstanding, the tribal advisors along with several of the chiefs from Virginia's Indian nations have attended subsequent VINSHE meetings with full force and vigour, and they have openly expressed their praise and concerns during special sessions with university administrators.

Our latest initiative, one that was conceptualized during the second VINSHE, is referred to as 'Virginia Indian Nations 101' (VIN 101). This is a multifaceted project intended to provide various media through which Virginia Indians can educate both the general public and educators on Virginia Indian cultures, histories, and realities. As a result, the tribal advisory board has for the past three years held a series of summer symposia for schoolteachers in which Virginia Indians and other Indigenous representatives serve as the primary instructors, in collaboration with scholars who have worked closely with these tribes for years. We are now developing an on-line course based on these symposia that will be taught by Virginia Indians.

Currently, a smaller committee, including some VINSHE members, is working with the tribal leaders and the Virginia Department of Education to revise the state Standards of Learning for Social Studies, which public school educators are mandated to follow in teaching about Virginia and other American Indians. Another immediate goal is to develop a set of resource materials for schoolteachers at various levels, with sections for each tribe in the state containing information prepared in collaboration with (or by) members of each tribe.

Our annual VINSHE meetings have matured in several important ways. Four years ago, faculty and staff from the University of Virginia joined our meetings, and UVA began hosting annual Tribal Leaders' Summits as well as hosting VINSHE meetings in alternate years. Accordingly, we aligned the VINSHE meeting with the Virginia Festival of the Book in Charlottesville so that our advisors could attend panel discussions about the mythology surrounding Pocahontas, Jamestown, and other historical distortions concerning Virginia's Indigenous peoples and American national development.

As of this writing, the alliance between Virginia's Indian nations and the state's two most prominent academic institutions was reaffirmed as the summit once again convened at the University of Virginia. In 2008 the College of William and Mary provisionally joined the VINSHE alliance. The inclusion of this institution represents a cyclical transformation, since William and Mary was the first state institution to reach out to Indigenous peoples – albeit for the purposes of assimilation. Now the tide has turned to embrace Indigenous knowledge.

Conclusion

The year 2007 saw the first-ever Monacan student graduate from Virginia Tech, completing the circle we began in 2000. If we have done one thing right in developing our program, it has been to maintain an open line of communication with our Indigenous constituency and the students they send us, thereby fostering a true collaborative enterprise.

We honour the tribal advisors and their respective communities by acknowledging them as colleagues and not mere subjects of academic fascination. In return, they gift us with knowledge and values they have retained throughout their history, despite obstacles we cannot now imagine. This kind of knowledge is priceless. Through it we have learned to work together, to develop our relationships with one another and our larger communities, and to respect and trust one another as colleagues and friends.

REFERENCES

- Albers, Patricia C., Brenda J. Child, Vicki Howard, Dennis Jones, Carol Miller, Frank C. Miller, and Jean M. O'Brien. 2002. 'A Story of Struggle and Survival: American Indian Studies at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities.'

- In *Native American Studies and Higher Education: Models for Collaboration between Universities and Indigenous Nations*, 145–64. Duane Champagne and Jay Stauss. Eds. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Champagne, Duane. 1998. 'American Indian Studies is for Everyone.' In *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians*, 181–9. Ed. Devon Mihesuah. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- 2002. 'American Indian Studies at the University of California Los Angeles.' In *Native American Studies in Higher Education: Models for Collaboration between Universities and Indigenous Nations*, 43–60. Duane Champagne and Jay Stauss. Eds. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Champagne, Duane, and Jay Stauss. Eds. 2002. 'Native American Studies and Higher Education: Models for Collaboration between Universities and Indigenous Nations.' Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- 2002. 'Introduction: Defining Indian Studies through Stories and Nation Building.' In *Native American Studies and Higher Education: Models for Collaboration between Universities and Indigenous Nations*, 1–16. Duane Champagne and Jay Stauss. Eds. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Commonwealth of Virginia. 1866. *Acts of Assembly, 1865–1866*. Richmond, VA: Commonwealth of Virginia Division of Resources and Supply.
- Cook, Samuel R. 2000. *Monacans and Miners: Native American and Coal Mining Communities in Appalachia*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Corntassel, Jeff J., and Samuel R. Cook. 2002. 'Federal Recognition Strengthens Native Communities – It Is Not a License to Gamble.' *Native American Policy Network Newsletter*, 17 (3): 2–4.
- Hardin, Peter. 2000. 'Group Opposes Sovereignty for Tribes: Elks, Petroleum Markets Cite Potential Economic Effect.' *Richmond Times-Dispatch* (5 November), B1–B2.
- Henning, William Walter. Ed. 1823. *Statutes at Large: Being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia*. Philadelphia: DeSilver.
- Jaimes, M. Annette. 1987. 'American Indian Studies: Toward an Indigenous Model.' *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 11 (3): 1–19.
- Kinnear, Duncan. 1972. *The First 100 Years: A History of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute Educational Foundation.
- Lassiter, Luke E. 2000. 'Authoritative Texts, Collaborative Ethnography, and Native American Studies.' *American Indian Quarterly*, 24 (4): 601–11.
- 2005. *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mihesuah, Devon. Ed. 1998. *Natives and Academics: Research and Writing about American Indians*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Monacan Indian Nation. 1999. Letter to Dr Paul Torgersen, president, Virginia Polytechnic Institute. 26 June.
- Robinson, W. Stitt. 1959. 'Tributary Indians in Colonial Virginia.' *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 67: 49-64.
- Rountree, Helen C. 1990. *Pochohontas's People: the Powhatan Indians of Virginia through Four Centuries*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Smith, J. David. 1993. *The Eugenic Assault on America: Scenes in Red, White, and Black*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University Press.
- Stauss, Jay, Mary Jo Tippeconic Fox, and Shelley Lowe. 2002. 'American Indian Studies at the University of Arizona.' In *Native American Studies and Higher Education: Models for Collaboration between Universities and Indigenous Nations*, 3-96. Duane Champagne and Jay Stauss. Eds. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2007. 'Profile of General Demographic Characteristics.' Accessed 3 August 2007 from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2006pubs/censr-28.pdf>.
- Virginia Tech American Indian Studies Steering Committee. 2000. 'A Proposal to Establish a Minor in American Indian Studies at Virginia Tech.' 6 June.

PART 3

Linking Theory and Practice

Theory can be a potent source of analysis for practice, and practice a wellspring for theoretical formulation. The authors in this section are academic-based researchers from different disciplinary bases, and their work in existing and emerging scholarship. Their gaze is fixed on ways in which theory can be useful for practice, and, at the same time, how practice can make theory relevant for re/envisioning relationships. Examples both in Canada and internationally are the focus for discussing the possibilities and limitations for partnership in political contexts.

Thierry Drapeau examines the Secwepemc Watershed Community struggle with the Sun Peaks Resort in their homelands near Kamloops, British Columbia. He introduces the concept of 'glocality,' which describes a political space created at the intersection of global and local forces, a space which is both circumscribed by its naming, practice through government and industry alliances, and incorporated into the global market economy. Such a space can be described not only as repressive forces it embodies, but also by the new opportunities for local/global alliances of resistance.

Lily Pol-Neveu critically examines normative theories of reconciliation and suggests that their pitfalls might be overcome by turning to the experience gleaned from practice; here, she shares her experiences as an intergenerational activist at Fort-Témiscamingue/Obadijwan, a national park co-managed by the Canada and Timiskaming First Nation. Beneesh Jafri documents the possibilities and tensions in developing alliances between Indigenous peoples and 'people of colour' through anti-racist work, and offers a case study of the National Secretariat Against Hate and Racism in Canada. Caitlyn Vernon analyses the conditions needed to achieve

EDITED BY LYNNE DAVIS

Alliances

Re/Envisioning Indigenous-
Non-Indigenous Relationships

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
Toronto Buffalo London

2010