10.17953/A3.6553

Pan-Indianism and Authenti(city): Refusing Colonial Borders

Sydney Beckmann

> "Pan-Indianism is recognized as one of the most salient sociopsychological results occasioned by the immigration of Native Americans to urban areas."
>
> —Shirley Fiske[1]

> "The imposition of labels and definitions of identity on Indigenous people has been a central feature of the colonization process from the start."
>
> —Taiaiake Alfred[2]

As a concept, pan-Indianism is ambiguous and controversial. There is confusion about what the concept means, where it comes from, and what purposes it serves. Some scholars describe resistance as the core tenant of pan-Indianism, focusing on the historical intertribal alliances formed to fight colonial powers. Others express apprehension about how it homogenizes Indigenous cultures and perpetuates stereotypes and cultural appropriation. Despite these discrepancies, pan-Indianism remains consistently associated with urban spaces. Rather than take this connection for granted, this article explores the association between the two. It traces the association to a specific area of scholarship known as acculturation studies. This area of scholarship was a subfield of anthropology in the 1950s and 1960s. It relied on theories of cultural evolution and the assimilative policies of the US government at the time. It was this subfield that first used and defined the concept of pan-Indianism, specifically by imposing assimilative ideologies through the association of pan-Indianism with urbanization. Through examining pan-Indianism in its historical and scholarly context, this article expounds on its various meanings by focusing on its association with urban spaces as well as how it continues to inform contemporary understandings of the relationship between urban life and indigeneity.

Pan-Indianism in Scholarship

The concept of pan-Indianism remains controversial and ambiguous in part because of the nature of scholarship on the topic. Apart from acculturation studies in the 1950s

and 1960s, which will be discussed in more detail below, subsequent scholarship is limited. Given the large time span elapsed since acculturation studies, relatively few sources address pan-Indianism as the object of study. Most of these sources focus on the origins of pan-Indianism, locating it in two regions. The first is the Plains region.[3] These sources often credit the introduction of horses and the Plains tribes' subsequent mobility as proliferating pan-Indianism.[4] The second origin is Oklahoma/Indian Territory.[5] These sources focus on the consequences of forced removals to Indian Territory and argue that the forced relocation of multiple tribes to a new, shared area created the homogenization of those cultures. Both origins trace directly to acculturation studies and its scholarship on pan-Indianism. There are several problematic assumptions regarding these origin stories. The first of these problems assumes that there was no intertribal interaction prior to colonizing interference. The second and related problem assumes that any intertribal interaction, forced or voluntary, necessarily results in the homogenization of Indigenous cultures. These assumptions deny long-standing intertribal practices of Indigenous governance, diplomacy, and cultural practices of visiting.[6] They invoke colonial myths of purity and relegate authenticity to the past. Associating pan-Indianism with notions of authenticity and the "vanishing Indian" trope are common features of acculturation studies and demonstrate the continued influence of this scholarship on the concept of pan-Indianism.[7]

Most noteworthy of the sources discussing pan-Indianism is Hazel Hertzberg's book *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements*. Written in 1971, her research examines the time period from the beginning of the twentieth century to the early part of the New Deal Era and continues today to be the most comprehensive scholarship on pan-Indianism. She organizes pan-Indian movements into three categories. The first she calls "reform pan-Indianism" and focuses her analysis on the Society of American Indians. The second she calls "fraternal pan-Indianism," which describes the fraternal orders and social clubs popular in the United States during the 1920s. The final category she defines as "religious pan-Indianism," which she attributes specifically to the peyote movement and the Native American Church. Her book examines a particular period of history and the interaction of American Indians with US policies and dominant Euroamerican culture. Her categorization of pan-Indian movements helps to examine specific organizations and events in greater detail, but it also reinforces certain notions of authenticity and urbanization perpetuated by previous acculturation scholarship. For example, she writes, "It was among Indians with considerable experience in the ways of the dominant society that the new movement emerged, accommodative in character and clearly evidencing, in the nature of its ideas and organizational forms, the degrees to which its participants had become acculturated to the wider society."[8] Hertzberg distinguishes between the three pan-Indian categories, in part, based on the perceived relationships to urban spaces, i.e. the distance from reservations. For example, she writes that fraternal pan-Indianism's "view was much more strongly influenced by popular and romantic white attitudes toward the Indian than was reform pan-Indianism. No doubt this was due in part to its lack of contact with reservation life."[9] She similarly distinguishes religious pan-Indianism, which "at least partially transformed basic tribal institutions into

pan-Indian ones. Reform pan-Indianism had no such tribal institutions with which to work and had to rely much more heavily on non-Indian sources."[10]

Proximity to the reservation not only refers to the physical spaces of reservations but also includes the degree to which movements incorporated non-Indian influences. For example, Hertzberg further distinguishes religious pan-Indianism, writing, "Religious pan-Indianism, the most 'Indian' of the movements, welcomed whites as occasional participants in or observers of the ceremonies, but in only a very few instances did whites play an important internal role."[11] Her analyses of the different forms of pan-Indianism create degrees of proximity to reservations and, by extension, authenticity. She states this explicitly: "One of the most critical aspects of pan-Indian movements lay in the members' conceptions of the reservation and their relationships to it."[12] While these categories provide the opportunity for more thorough examinations, and Hertzberg approaches her analyses with nuance and detail, distinguishing categories in this way reinforces racial-assimilative ideologies that create a dichotomy of authenticity between reservation spaces and urban spaces. As will be shown in the following section, these ideologies, in part, come directly from acculturation studies' scholarship on pan-Indianism. Despite the perpetuation of these assimilationist ideologies, Hertzberg's scholarship is the first and only source of its kind to extensively discuss pan-Indianism. That it remains the leading text on pan-Indianism more than fifty years later is both a credit to her scholarship and an indication of the dearth of scholarly attention on the topic.

Apart from these limited sources, most scholarship that invokes the term pan-Indianism assumes its meaning and offers little or no explanation of its meaning or its use. Rather than ascribe specific origins to pan-Indianism, the term is most often attributed to different time periods, places, movements, organizations, and practices, with no reference to other scholarship on pan-Indianism or the term's different meaning. Consequently, contemporary scholarship in which pan-Indianism appears includes a wide range of topics: art;[13] boarding schools;[14] religious practices (most commonly peyote and the ghost dance);[15] the early formation of the United States;[16] specific historical figures such as the Shawnee chief Tecumseh;[17] organizations like the Society of American Indians; the National Congress of American Indians; the American Indian Movement;[18] and specific legislation and policies such as the Dawes Act and the Relocation Program.[19]

While the topics are wide-ranging, there tend to be two overarching understandings of pan-Indianism. One end of the spectrum refers to pan-Indianism as intertribal coalitions. For example, Dennis Kelley describes pan-Indianism as a process of resistance, "in that Indians have taken advantage of their collective identity to preserve rights and traditions."[20] Similarly, other scholars have noted the association of pan-Indianism with intertribal associations devoted to resistance of colonial powers in various contexts: the late eighteenth century;[21] the Allotment and Assimilation Era;[22] the Termination Era;[23] and the Red Power movement.[24] In contrast to the theme of resistance, however, other scholars express concern for how pan-Indianism homogenizes and appropriates Indigenous cultures, often through the invocation of stereotypes. For example, writing in response to Kelley, Duane Champagne asks,

"What is the difference between a new ager and a pan-Indian? This issue may become increasingly important for the future of Indian affairs in the U.S."[25] Not only does Champagne question the participation of pan-Indianism in appropriation, he also emphasizes the significance of this question for the future of Indigenous communities.

This tension regarding the nature of pan-Indianism remains unresolved and indicates the deficient and erratic scholarly discourse on the topic. Despite the multiple origins, associations, and contradictions, the common thread running through scholarship on pan-Indianism is its association with urban contexts. This association is so thoroughly solidified that pan-Indianism and the urban milieu are regularly used synonymously, and the association is taken for granted. Yet, this association with urban life sits in tension with other limited scholarship on pan-Indianism, which locates the origins of pan-Indianism in non-urban locations, namely the Plains region and Oklahoma. The predominance of this association with urban contexts is neither a coincidence nor an accident but instead is a direct consequence of the continued legacy of acculturation scholarship.

Acculturation Studies and the Creation of Pan-Indianism

While contemporary scholarship on pan-Indianism remains sporadic, acculturation studies created a specific discourse around the topic. Acculturation studies was a subfield of anthropology in the 1950s and 1960s. It solidified in reaction to the increased immigration into the United States and the growing interest in explaining the differential rates of assimilation between various racial and ethnic minority groups.[26] This area of scholarship first introduced and defined the term pan-Indianism.[27] The subfield's primary focus concerned tracking the extent to which Indigenous people and communities had integrated into dominant American society. Much of the scholarship included ethnographic work on Indigenous cultural and religious practices—especially the ghost dance, powwows, and peyote—and how these practices indicated cultural loss. Far from neutral observation, these sources demonstrate problematic assumptions regarding the superiority of Western culture. In her work on Native American DNA, Kim Tallbear explains that anthropology as a discipline is not neutral or unbiased. As she writes, anthropologists do not "gaze from outside the cultural processes they represent; they are part of those very processes."[28] Tallbear argues that anthropology as a discipline has historically exerted tremendous influence by framing discussions around unacknowledged biases. As a subfield of anthropology, acculturation studies was deeply influenced by social Darwinism and theories of cultural evolution, which implicitly and explicitly value Western culture. Commenting on the history of anthropology, Lee Baker writes that "culture was synonymous with civilization, and groups like the Kiowa and Navajo were identified as having achieved a certain stage of culture on the road to civilization that began as savagery, traveled through barbarism, and finally ended at the apex of culture: civilization."[29] Anthropology has a long and problematic history of studying Indigenous peoples through the use of evolutionary theories and scientific racism, and these Western biases influenced acculturation studies' scholarship on pan-Indianism.

United States policy was another important influence on this scholarship. The subfield coincided with the Termination Era of federal Indian policy. During the 1950s and 1960s, Congress enacted legislation to erode and eventually eliminate the trust relationship between the federal government and tribal nations. This policy era was officially initiated by House Concurrent Resolution 108, passed on August 1, 1953. More than terminating its relationship with individual tribes, HCR 108 and supplementary termination policies established a new course for federal Indian policy. Historian Laurie Arnold writes that proponents of the termination policy "believed that they had ushered in a new day for Indians and for the US government."[30] This new policy direction had two mutually reinforcing goals. The first goal concerned severing the federal government's trust relationship with tribal nations. The second goal attempted to assimilate American Indians into dominant American society. In response to Congress' termination bill in 1953, the Bureau of Indian Affairs created the Relocation Program to facilitate the government's assimilation efforts. This program encouraged American Indians, often coercively, to leave reservations and relocate to urban areas, directly serving termination efforts to expedite the full integration of American Indians into American society. As colonial policies, termination and relocation reinforced one another. By terminating reservations and relocating American Indians to cities, the federal government attempted to assimilate American Indians and acquire their lands. Referencing the nineteenth-century removal policies, historian Donald Fixico describes the Relocation Program as the "second removal."[31] This second removal is distinguished from the nineteenth-century removal policies by the key element of urbanization. The federal government promoted assimilation specifically through the rhetoric of urbanization and through the removal of American Indians to cities. In creating the concept of pan-Indianism, acculturation studies drew from the contexts of anthropology and US policy during this time period, specifically their emphases on the superiority of Western culture, the need to assimilate Indigenous people, and the use of urbanization to achieve that goal.

In reaction to this context, the association of pan-Indianism with urban contexts and assimilation is fundamental to this body of scholarship. For example, one acculturation scholar, Joan Ablon, noted this connection, stating, "This recent influx of large numbers of Indians into metropolitan areas represents the formation of a new urban ethnic group that holds special research interest for the anthropologist."[32] More than just an interest, Robert Thomas expressed concern for the growing phenomenon of pan-Indianism in urban contexts, viewing it as a threat to tradition and tribalism.[33] Taking a more paternalistic viewpoint, other scholars defined pan-Indianism as an adaptive social mechanism. As James Hirabayashi, William Willard, and Luis Kemnitzer wrote, "One of the most important adaptive social mechanisms for easing the transition from rural reservation communities to urban centers was the formation of a pan-Indian social network."[34] Further describing pan-Indianism as a social adaption, Gertrude Kurath similarly wrote, "Very much like the Mexicans who congregate at their fiestas, the Great Lakes Algonquins find in the powwow a release from their often drab everyday life and an immersion in a glamorous and beautiful activity which is truly theirs."[35] Despite the obviously problematic verbiage and paternalistic condescension, these sources described

any urban intertribal activities as an adaptive strategy. They asserted that Indigenous people in urban settings engaged in pan-Indian activities out of necessity, having no other way to retain their unique cultural traditions in cities.

As a result, acculturation scholars defined pan-Indianism as the intermediary step between savagery and full assimilation. For example, writing in 1955, W. W. Newcombe stated, "Pan-Indian society is a loosely knit, formally unorganized grouping of Indians, who, having partially lost their old cultural orientation, but not being fully assimilated into white society, have joined forces and are participating in and sharing a number of intertribal customs and institutions."[36] As a concept, pan-Indianism represented the diminishment of culture, tradition, and authenticity. Urban spaces were automatically considered spaces for pan-Indian activity because they are often intertribal. This connection between pan-Indianism and urban locations was not formed based on empirical evidence but rather based on assumptions and a determination to prove the superiority of Western civilization. For example, in reflecting on his research of pan-Indianism in Los Angeles, John Price wrote, "Although only one-fifth of our respondents are socially active in pan-Indian associations, the great majority of Indians in the city clearly are ideologically and emotionally affiliated with pan-Indianism."[37] Price's own research failed to prove that Indigenous people were engaging in pan-Indian activities in a significant way, yet he simply asserts that Indigenous people in Los Angeles were emotionally and ideologically affiliated with pan-Indianism. Far from the objective research they espouse, acculturation scholars like Price created the very criteria and categories used in their research to fit their preconceived conclusions, simply asserting that pan-Indianism was a growing phenomenon that proved the increasing rates of American Indian assimilation.

Despite the clear biases informing acculturation scholarship on pan-Indianism, this body of scholarship shows the limitations of its assimilative ideologies. Acculturation scholars were forced to note the failure of urbanization and its intended goals for assimilation. For example, Evon Vogt wrote, "By the mid-twentieth century, it has become apparent to social scientists studying the American Indian that the Indian population of the United States is markedly increasing and that the rate of basic acculturation to white American ways of life is incredibly slower than our earlier assumptions led us to believe."[38] Vogt attributes pan-Indianism as a contributing factor to this slowing rate, writing, "The significance of this pan-Indianism in general terms is that it provides a social and cultural framework within which acculturating Indian groups can maintain their sense of identity and integrity as Indians."[39] According to Vogt, full integration into white American society was inevitable, but pan-Indianism served as a temporary coping mechanism that prolonged the liminal state between savagery and full assimilation. In this way, acculturation scholarship on pan-Indianism demonstrates the failure of assimilative structures and policies as much as it represents their success. When faced with the reality that assimilation efforts were not effective to the extent predicted, acculturation scholars like Vogt did not interpret this evidence as Indigenous resistance to assimilation. They did not reconsider their assumptions that Indigenous cultures would inevitably disappear. Instead, they used pan-Indianism in a contradictory way, explaining why acculturation rates were slower than expected while

also using it as proof that acculturation was ongoing and inevitable. Acculturation scholars and their specific, constructed notion of pan-Indianism remain the primary voices informing the concept today. These scholars not only defined pan-Indianism but also defined urban life and solidified its relationship to indigeneity as mutually exclusive. What results is a clear disconnect between the lived experiences of Indigenous people and the discourse around urban indigeneity. Though Indigenous people historically and contemporarily continue to live, thrive, and produce meaning from within urban spaces, pan-Indianism as a discourse carries with it the baggage of acculturation studies and assimilative ideologies. As a framework, it limits interpretation to notions of assimilation and homogenization, excluding possibilities of Indigenous resistance.

Consequences Today

Acculturation studies as a sub-discipline began to dissolve in the 1970s and completely disbanded by the 1980s. The concept of pan-Indianism, however, continues the subfield's legacy. Beyond the continued use of pan-Indianism, acculturation studies remains relevant to contemporary discussions of urban indigeneity and colonialism. The subfield's research on pan-Indianism was the first instance of an academic discipline conducting formal research on the experiences of Indigenous people in urban spaces. In examining anthropology's relationship to other disciplines in the twentieth century, Lee Baker notes that disciplines differentiated themselves based on racial and geographic considerations. As he explains, anthropology as a field focused on "out-of-the-way Indigenous peoples" on reservations, whereas sociology and psychology focused on race relations, often in urban areas.[40] Indigenous people in urban spaces transgressed the racial and geographic norms of these academic disciplines. In his work on settler colonial urbanisms, Kyle Mays argues that these disciplinary boundaries persist today, writing, "The connection between indigeneity and urban spaces remains on the margins of urban studies and Indigenous studies, even as the majority of Indigenous people in the United States live in cities."[41] Through this disciplinary marginality, pan-Indianism has become one of the main frameworks for understanding urban indigeneity since its creation in acculturation studies, which relied on settler colonial ideologies of assimilation, modernity, and progress. Recently, however, scholarship on urban indigeneity has increased and often pushes back against colonial ideologies that maintain the mutual exclusion between urban life and indigeneity.[42] For example, in *Indian Cities*, editors Kent Blansett, Cathleen Cahill, and Andrew Needham write that "cities have become new frontlines in the struggle against colonization, oppression, and exploitation," and that "urban history and Indigenous history are incomplete without each other."[43] As the study of urban indigeneity continues to grow, the uncritical connection between urban life and pan-Indianism is an important part of addressing the history of colonialism and the disciplinary marginality of urban indigeneity.

The lack of contemporary scholarship on pan-Indianism perpetuates acculturation scholars and their assimilative biases. The consequences of this scholastic dominance move beyond academic discourse. Pan-Indianism functions as what Reid Gómez calls a grammar of colonialism. She writes, "Colonized peoples are affected as linguistic and

languaged subjects: language is neither transparent, innocent, nor history free."[44] By defining pan-Indianism, acculturation scholars created a language that reinforced the paradox of urban indigeneity and reinforced assimilative ideologies. They intentionally created the concept of pan-Indianism to gauge levels of assimilation and then used the concept as a tool to police authenticity. This grammar of colonialism does not only define Indigenous people and their relationship to authenticity. It also defines land and the relationships people maintain with it. Like Gómez, Mishuana Goeman pushes forward the concept of a settler colonial grammar of place as a way "to expose the specific spatial logics at work within settler colonialism and the certain conditions it sets up for Native communities and peoples."[45] The constructed relationship between pan-Indianism and urbanization inadvertently defines what land is considered Indigenous and what land belongs to the settler nation-state. The uncritical association between pan-Indianism and urban life only makes sense when one assumes that cities are settler spaces of civilization to which Indigenous people move as part of the inevitable process of assimilation.

The significance of pan-Indianism as a legacy of acculturation studies moves beyond the discussion of semantics. Since acculturation studies, the term has been used to describe different contexts. In some cases, these uses perpetuate assimilationist ideologies to different degrees, while other uses reject these ideologies. Rather than debate the term's "true" meaning, it is more important to understand these different meanings and how they continue to affect scholarship and Indigenous people more broadly. In addition, simply rejecting the term risks overlooking the history of colonial influence through academia and government policies as well as the Indigenous resistance to assimilation, which acculturation scholarship unintentionally documents. It is not the term itself but the colonial logic at work that needs addressing. As Goeman explains, "Foundational to normative modes of settler colonialism are repetitive practices of everyday life that give settler place meaning and structure. Yet space is fluid, and it is only in the constant retelling and reformulating of colonial narratives that space becomes place as it is given structure and meaning."[46] Pan-Indianism has become a colonial narrative of urban space that reinforces the structure and power of the colonial nation-state. For this reason, it is significant that contemporary scholarship takes the concept of pan-Indianism for granted. Without a sustained and critical discourse, pan-Indianism will continue to function as a normative mode of settler colonialism. As Harsha Walia writes, "The reinforcement of physical and psychological borders against racialized bodies is a key instrument through which to maintain the sanctity and myth of superiority of Western civilization."[47] The uncritical use of pan-Indianism reinforces physical and conceptual borders around indigeneity. Conceptually, it dictates indigeneity through notions of authenticity and assimilation. Physically, it imposes borders around Indigenous people and land, determining what spaces are considered Indigenous and in what spaces Indigenous people can exist. As a settler colonial grammar of place, pan-Indianism not only imposes borders, it is itself an imposed term on Indigenous people that, without more research and attention, will promote Indigenous erasure by insisting on the mutual exclusion of urban assimilation and indigeneity. More scholarship needs to be done on pan-Indianism and urban indigeneity,

but it is clear that it must start by addressing the historical and academic roots of the concept within assimilative ideologies and policies. Future scholarship must reflect the lived experiences of Indigenous people rather than promote their erasure.

Conclusion

Pan-Indianism is a complex concept that remains contentious and ambiguous, yet one way to begin addressing these complexities is to place the concept within its historical and academic contexts. Critically examining pan-Indianism's association with urban spaces enables us to critique ongoing colonial structures and open the door to new scholarship on pan-Indianism, which no longer perpetuates acculturation scholarship and its assimilationist agendas. By extension, we also address the relationship between indigeneity and urban living, which are so often viewed in opposition to one another. In this way, future scholarship on pan-Indianism offers the opportunity to decolonize the concept of urban life itself.

Notes

1. Shirley Fiske, "Intertribal Perceptions: Navajo and Pan-Indianism," *Ethos* 5, no. 3 (1977): 358.

2. Taiaiake Alfred, *Peace, Power, and Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifest* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 108.

3. Robert Thomas, "Pan-Indianism," *Midcontinent American Studies Journal* 6, no. 2 (1965); Anita Herle, "Dancing Community: Powwow and Pan-Indianism in North America," *Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 17, no. 2 (1994); James Howard, "Pan-Indianism in Native American Music and Dance," *Ethnomusicology* 27, no. 1 (1983); Joe R. Feagin and Randall Anderson, "Intertribal Attitudes among Native American Youth," *Social Science Quarterly* 54, no. 1 (1973); Patricia Barker Lerch and Susan Bullers, "Powwows as Identity Markers: Traditional or Pan-Indian?" *Human Organization* 55, no. 4 (1996); Marc Fonda, "On the Origins and Spread of Pan-Indian Spirituality in Canada," *Studies in Sciences Religieuses* 45, no. 3 (2016); Frank Rzeczkowski, *Uniting the Tribes: The Rise and Fall of Pan-Indian Community on the Crow Reservation* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2012).

4. While not directly relevant to the topic of this article, another problem concerns the long-standing critique from Indigenous peoples regarding their relationships with horses. Indigenous oral traditions have always contradicted assertions that Europeans introduced horses to North America. See Kelsey Dale John, "Rez Ponies and Confronting Sacred Junctures in Decolonizing and Indigenous Education" in *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View*, eds. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Eve Tuck, and K. Wayne Yang (New York: Routledge, 2019); Lyla June Johnston, Indigenous Scientists Honored in France for Horse Research," *Indian Country Today*, April 3, 2023, https://ictnews.org/news/indigenous-scientists-honored-in-france-for-horse-research

5. Herle, "Dancing Community;" Feagin and Anderson, "Intertribal Attitudes."

6. Justin Gage, *We Do Not Want the Gates Closed Between Us: Native Networks and the Spread of the Ghost Dance* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2020); Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2014), 15–31; Tom Holm, *The Great Confusion of Indian Affairs: Native Americans and Whites in the Progressive Era* (Austin: University of Texas Press), 51; Robert Warrior, *The People and the Word: Reading Native Nonfiction* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 182; Jane Carey and Jane Lydon, eds., *Indigenous Networks:*

Mobility, Connections and Exchange (New York: Routledge, 2014). For the concept of visiting specifically, see Eve Tuck, Haliehana Stepetin, Rebecca Beauline-Stuebing, and Jo Billows, "Visiting as an Indigenous Feminist Practice," *Gender and Education* 35, no. 2 (2023); Dylan Robinson, *Hungry Listening: Resonant Theory for Indigenous Sound Studies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2020); Janice Cindy Gaudet, "Keeoukaywin: The Visiting Way—Fostering an Indigenous Research Methodology," *Aboriginal Policy Studies* 7, no. 2 (2019).

7. Howard, "Pan-Indianism in Native American Music and Dance," 71. (In his work, James Howard attempts to address these critiques by differentiating between "intertribal diffusion" and pan-Indianism. He describes the former as involving "a formal exchange between two distinct tribal groups, donors and borrowers," which "took place at a large gathering, and each group was represented by its headsmen." He describes pan-Indianism as involving "the appropriation of selected elements from a stock of generalized 'Indian' culture by individuals or groups." The issue with his distinction is not so much the differentiation itself but rather determining which description should be applied to a given situation. Within the majority of scholarship on pan-Indianism, those determinations have been made, problematically, by scholars outside of communities and not Indigenous people themselves.)

8. Hazel Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1971), 299–300.

9. Ibid., 215.

10. Ibid., 301.

11. Ibid., 318.

12. Ibid., 313.

13. Nancy Marie Mitho, *Our Indian Princess: Subverting the Stereotype* (Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, 2008).

14. Feagin and Anderson, "Intertribal Attitudes;" Wendell H. Oswalt and Sharlotte Neeley, *This Land Was Theirs: A Study of Native Americans* (Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1999); John Bloom, *To Show What an Indian Can Do* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000).

15. Oswalt and Neely, *This Land Was Theirs*, 48; Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*; Donald Fixico, *The Urban Indian Experience in American* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000).

16. Robert M. Owens, *Red Dreams, White Nightmares: Pan-Indian Alliances in the Anglo-American Mind, 1763–1815* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015); Tom Holm, *The Great Confusion in Indian Affairs* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005); Fonda, "On the Origins;" Gregory Dowd, *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745–1815* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); Harry M. Ward, *The War for Independence and Transformation of American Society* (New York: Routledge Press, 1999).

17. Owens, *Red Dreams*; David R. Edmunds, *Tecumseh and the Quest for Indian Leadership* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1984); David R. Edmunds, *The Shawnee Prophet* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983); Robert Lawrence Gunn, "John Dunn Hunter, Tecumseh, and the Linguistic Politics of Pan-Indianism," in *Ethnology and Empire: Languages, Literature, and the Making of the North American Borderland* (New York: New York University Press, 2015); John Sugden, "Early Pan-Indianism: Tecumseh's Tour of the Indian Country, 1811–1812," *American Indian Quarterly* 10, no. 4 (1986).

18. Ashton Dunkley, "Hidden in Plain Sight: The American Indian Movement and the Revival of the Nanticoke Lenni Lenape, 1969–1982," *Perceptions* 5, no. 1 (2015); Renée Ann Cramer, "US Governmental Policies, Indian Activism, and the Politicization of Indian Identity," in *Cash, Color, and Colonialism: The Politics of Tribal Acknowledgement* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005); Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*; Gregory D. Smithers, "The Soul of Unity:

The Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians, 1913–1915," *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 25, no. 2 (2013).

19. David A. Chang, *The Color of Land: Race, Nation, and Politics of Land Ownership in Oklahoma* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010); Jason Black, "Pan-Indianism and Decolonial Challenges to Allotment," in *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2015); Michelle R. Jacobs, *Indigenous Memory, Urban Reality: Stories of American Indian Relocation and Reclamation* (New York: New York University Press, 2023).

20. Dennis Kelley, *Tradition, Performance, and Religion in Native America: Ancestral Ways, Modern Selves* (New York: Routledge, 2015), xvi.

21. Owens, *Red Dreams*; Dowd, *A Spirited Resistance*.

22. Black, *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal*.

23. Cramer, *Cash, Color, and Colonialism*.

24. Dunkley, "Hidden in Plain Sight."

25. Duane Champagne, "New Agers and Pan-Indians: What is the Difference?" *Indian Country Today*, revised September 13, 2018, https://ictnews.org/archive/new-agers-and-pan-indians-what-is-the-difference.

26. Richard H. Thompson, "Assimilation," in *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology, Volume One*, eds. David Levinson and Melvin Ember (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1996), 113. Colloquially, the terms *assimilation* and *acculturation* are often used interchangeably. However, disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, and psychology differentiate these terms in different ways. Some argue that *acculturation* refers to the mutual exchange of culture, whereas *assimilation* refers to the forced imposition of a dominant culture onto another. While this distinction is perhaps useful, within the context of colonialism it is necessary to recognize the asymmetrical power dynamics of cultural exchange. Distinguishing between *acculturation* and *assimilation* in this way risks overlooking the intentional efforts by academic institutions and the government to forcibly assimilate Indigenous people. Even though the subfield in discussion used the term *acculturation*, there was nothing neutral about this scholarship. One of the points of this article is to highlight the use of assimilative ideologies and colonial power dynamics in the creation of the concept of pan-Indianism. For these reasons, this article uses the terms *assimilation* and *acculturation* interchangeably. For more information about the use of *acculturation* and its potential uses in the future, see Peter J. Guarnaccia and Caroline Hausmann-Stabile, "Acculturation and Its Discontents: A Case for Bringing Anthropology Back into the Conversation," *Sociology and Anthropology* 4, no. 2 (2016): 114–124.

27. Rzeczkowski, *Uniting the Tribes*, 4; William K. Powers, *War Dance: Plains Indian Musical Performance* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1990), 87; Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*, 291.

28. Kim Tallbear, *Native American DNA: Tribal Belonging and the False Promise of Genetic Science* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 14–15.

29. Lee D. Baker, *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 5–6.

30. Laurie Arnold, *Bartering with the Bones of Their Dead: The Colville Confederated Tribes and Termination* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012), ix.

31. Donald L. Fixico, foreword to *American Indians and the Urban Experience*, eds. Kurt Peters and Susan Lobo (New York: Altamira Press, 2001).

32. Joan Ablon, "Relocated American Indians in the San Francisco Bay Area: Social Interactions and Indian Identity," *Human Organization* 23, no. 4 (1964): 296.

33. Thomas, "Pan-Indianism;" Terry Straus and Debra Valentino, "Retribalization in Urban Indian Communities," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 22, no. 4 (1998).

34. James Hirabayashi, William Willard, and Luis Kemnitzer, "Pan-Indianism in the Urban Setting," in *The Anthropology of Urban Environments*, eds. Thomas Weaver and Douglas White (Boulder: Society for Applied Anthropology Monograph Series, no. 11, 1972), 77.

35. Gertrude Prokosch Kurath, "Pan-Indianism in Great Lakes Tribal Festivals," *Journal of American Folklore* 70, no. 276 (1957): 181.

36. W. W. Newcomb Jr., "A Note on Cherokee-Delaware Pan-Indianism," *Anthropologist* 57 no. 5 (1955): 1041.

37. John A. Price, "The Migration and Adaptation of American Indians to Los Angeles," *Journal of American Indian Education* 8, no. 2 (1969): 25.

38. Evon Z. Vogt, "The Acculturation of American Indians," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 311 (1957): 137.

39. Ibid., 146.

40. Baker, *Anthropology*, 9.

41. Kyle T. Mays, "The Cities We Call Home: Indigeneity, Race, and Settler-Colonial Urbanisms," *International Journal of Urban Regional Research* 47, no. 1 (2023): 155.

42. See, for example, Mays, "The Cities;" Lindsey Claire Smith, *Urban Homelands: Writing the Native City from Oklahoma* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2023); *Indian Cities*, eds. Kent Blansett, Cathleen D. Cahill, and Andew Needham; *Urban Indigeneities: Being Indigenous in the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Dana Brablec and Andrew Canessa (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2023). Though not recent but still relevant, see also Reyne Ramirez, *Native Hubs: Culture, Community, and Belonging in Silicon Valley and Beyond* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007); and *The American Indian Urban Experience*, eds. Susan Lobo and Kurt Peters (Walnut Creek: Altamira Press, 2001).

43. *Indians Cities: Histories of Indigenous Urbanization*, eds. Kent Blansett, Cathleen D. Cahill, and Andrew Needham (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2022), 1–2.

44. Reid Gómez, "The Meaning of Written English: A Place to Dream as One Pleases," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 41, no. 2 (2017): 100.

45. Mishuana R. Goeman, "Disrupting a Settler-Colonial Grammar of Place: The Visual Memoir of Hulleah Tsinhnahjinnie," in *Theorizing Native Studies*, eds. Audra Simpson and Andrea Smith (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 236.

46. Ibid., 236–37.

47. Harsha Walia, *Undoing Border Imperialism* (Oakland: AK Press, Institute for Anarchist Studies, 2013), 40.