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Sam Myers:
This is the second part of an interview with Mr. Lloyd Kiva New, Cherokee. Mr. New, we have reviewed your own background and how the school, the Institute of American Indian Arts, developed up to the present. Would you please go on?

Lloyd New:
Yes. In 13 years we've seen a lot of changes, and one is in the matter I referred to as self-determination, and the trend in the Bureau of Indian Affairs to turn over institutions to Indian management. So we have our own board, the Native American Council of Regents. (We have an Eskimo on the board) Members are selected from the ten major cultural regions of the United States, namely, the Southwest, Northwest coast, Eskimo, the Northeast, the Central Great Lakes woodlands area, and the Great Plains, Southern Plains, the Great Basin, and California. So now we have a very fine, well-equipped group of professional Indian people--two or three have doctor's degrees, one a law degree, so we have a well-balanced professional school board that could run the whole Bureau of Indian Affairs, as far as capability goes.

SM: A national board of trustees is unusual.

LN: Right. Among them are special educators, working craftsmen, artists, an Indian lawyer, and one gentleman, Dr. Will Antell, is the Associate Commissioner of Education for the state of Minnesota. Dr. Helen Redbird is in the graduate department of one of the Oregon colleges; and we have an alumnus on the board who is a very successful painter, who has just come back from artist-in-residency at Dartmouth. We have a man from New York, Mr. Duffy Wilson, who is a practicing entrepreneur, as well as a very fine sculptor, and works in arts and crafts, makes a very fine living that way. I'm leaving out some of the people—but just to give you some idea of the make-up of the board.
SM: You have the BIA as the governmental bureau, but then a new charter, and then under this charter this board runs the school?

LN: No, because as of this point the Bureau of Indian Affairs cannot grant national school boards active authority in the running of schools. It is advisory. People who wish as a tribal group to contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs may take over the running of a school, or portions of the program, they can even take over. Our regents are seriously considering—as a matter of fact they have a special grant from the Donner Foundation, to explore, up to a year with a full-time staff—the ins and outs of taking over and running this school. The Bureau policy as of the moment has mandated to its workers that they get at least 50 schools contracted to Indian groups in 1974. They've added some 15 more for 1975, so by then they're supposed to have 85 schools turned over to Indian groups. It's not working very fast. Indian people are not responding. They're not actually taking over, because they're quite skeptical about the feasibility. And, moreover, I think there is a great deal of suspicion that this is a termination process. "We will agree to give you, say, $2,000,000 to run your school with," and Indians take over and begin to run it, but the second year they're not sure they're going to get the $2,500,000 they will need for a growing institution, and, indeed, they may not even get the $2,000,000 that they had the previous year. This could be a way of just pulling the rug out from under government responsibilities to Indian people.

SM: With the termination policy in mind that's an understandable concern, isn't it?

LN: I think that's the prevailing skepticism that runs throughout the whole process, and slows down Indian groups contracting to run their own programs.

SM: Do you think that's what the BIA has in mind?
LN: I don't know. I think if I were to express my personal, life-long, skepticism about the relationship of Indian people and the federal government—I don't believe that the government will ever change its basic position towards them, notwithstanding all the talk about self-determination; because it's not easy to change. After all, Indian people constitute a very small, minority part of the United States structure, and I doubt if they will continue to be treated differently than other members of the big society, in which the power lies. I think it's natural that for the last 300 years, 200 years, 100 years, that the government willingly put up the money to set up the Bureau of Indian Affairs, because they were doing it on a very paternalistic basis, feeling they had all the answers, and that they knew what was best for Indians. "We're willing to put our energies and time and money into this, so long as you do it our way." And I am not sure that that attitude has really changed. So you see, I am also skeptical.

SM: In other words, if this self-determination idea, which is so attractive, really catches on, would a spin-off of that be a feeling of less responsibility?

LN: Yes, I think that if you allowed Indian people to be Indians, that eventually it would pose a threat to the basic American attitude that America is a melting pot (and it jolly well behooves everybody in it to toe the mark like everyone else). Indian people are uniquely different, uniquely stubborn, and four and three-quarters centuries after contact, they are going to be more Indian, if allowed to be, than they've been up to this point. Well, what does this mean? Are they going to be happy, normal constituents of America, or are they going to create a kind of lifestyle for themselves that somehow or other poses a threat to the basic worship of integration in this country?

SM: There is another side of that that has been developing. It's the sort
of separatism or pluralism in the society as a whole, and that's kind of an "in" thing too now.

LN: I think pluralism is a worldwide movement, but I'm not sure really how well it is understood in America. Look at what's happening to the blacks. You'd think that under a move toward pluralism we'd not be having the big issue about forced busing and all that kind of thing. And so, I think pluralism is a growing institutional concept that might make it possible for Indian people to exist in this announced policy of self determination; but a few years ago it would not have been possible. No one was saying then that the idea of cultural differences is valuable. Even 13 years ago when this school opened, when we talked about cultural difference of Indian people as a valuable asset to the nation, we were really a little ahead of the times and out on a limb.

SM: A lot of people said that's not sound at all.

LN: True, when we began there were no Indian culture studies. The whole business was the old format of training Indian people cognitively how to function in a white American society. I could do two tapes on what I think is wrong with the educational system that Indian people are in right now, because it's not changing very fast from what it has always been, in spite of the fact that we now have Indian cultural studies in most every school including ours and other colleges where Indians go, and all that. But the basic curriculum is still designed for non-Indians. A tremendous psychological destructiveness takes place when you run an educational system for a group of people who do have unique cultural roots, and who think differently than the mass of American people, and who are never dealt with in terms of their psychological or emotional needs or their identity needs. They just keep being jammed, jammed, jammed, into the system that totally ignores their special needs. There isn't any office in the Bureau of Indian
Affairs (and there never has been) that is devoted to trying to figure out who is an Indian, how does he react, how does he feel, and what his receptivity patterns are. They ignore it. There is no such thing as a cultural affairs office, staffed with Indian people (or anyone else for that matter) to research the human response on the part of the Indian group they're working with. They've always dealt with them as if they were just any one, when they're very definitely Indian. And I predict that if someone doesn't get on to this and really start figuring out what fits Indian people--instead of having the 50%, 60% of educationally disfunctional people in the Indian population, it's going to go even higher.

SM: I was thinking in terms of the schools where new native American studies or American Indian studies programs have been begun, some of them quite extensive programs, largely staffed by Indian people, teaching the language, the culture, the religion, and I thought that out of this would come a recognition and an acceptance of everybody for his own worth.

LN: These are mostly cognitive concerns that are being dealt with in these programs for Indians. Now, as an American, I do need to know how to run a typewriter, how to use the telephone, how to read and write the language of the country, and all that. I need a lot of facts, a lot of skills, in order to sit at this desk and operate successfully. But as a human being I am also an emotional creature, and if I don't have pride and a sense of self-worth, and a sense of confidence, what it ultimately adds up to, I'm not going to function very well no matter how much mathematics I've learned, or how well I can speak the English language, or how many science experiments I've done, you know, such as in an up-dated, good program in an Indian school, if in the process something is happening that allows me to feel neglected, or that I am being manipulated in a direction that goes against my basic emotional grain, and no one is concerned that what I want to be is an
Indian; that there is a kind of schizophrenia setting in with me, it will come out in all sorts of compensatory ways. I don't think that Indian people are alcoholics just because, I don't know . . . whatever they attribute it to. I think many Indian people are alcoholics because they don't have a good sense of self-worth, and they don't have a sense of confidence about how to function in the situation that they're in. Now what I'm talking about, of course, is the affective domain. Who deals with my needs as an Indian person, in the specialized way that's required if I insist on being Indian, generation after generation, and I am reluctant to give up being Indian to become a white man? We know that the trend now is to support cultural differences, but the system is not catering to it very effectively, in that it is producing people with an expectation that the typical American curriculum is going to equip them to be successful members of the large society. It very often frustrates the person involved, leading to drink or to all kinds of negative social behavior. And when you get down to it, putting in Indian cultural studies is still dealing in the cognitive area for the most part. There is a certain amount of emotional support in this--I am Indian, and I have my own special courses in this college, it is taught by my own people--but what about those things that have to do with identity that need the same emphasis in an educational pattern as that given to the cognitive thing? From the very beginning, the time an Indian kid enters a Head Start program, someone should have thought out how to deal with him as a product of the particular family background from which he comes, and the 30,000 year-old cultural heritage, which somehow he has, through the cultural genes, say. They're there. Most Indian children at Head Start level, even from acculturated families, have different approaches to their lives than non-Indian people. Each group has its own, and I think Indian people are unique in their resistance to leave their cultural base--else how do you account for being able to walk out of this building, and within ten miles of here run into pure cultural situations that are very much like they were
three hundred years ago. Now if people don't recognize that, and just constantly keep trying to jam Indians into a different mold, and being disappointed that they don't perform very well in it, and if they don't stop and examine the curriculum and the educational propensities of these people who insist on behaving like this, and try to figure out what will fit them, then I think we're just going into another generation of confusion, disappointed that Indian people don't respond as quickly as they should.

SM: It seems that these changes of the last few years have been sort of an opening up and an opportunity, admittedly however, that the Indian person could continue as he wishes, as he chooses, as he feels he should, from his own cultural background, and then take what he wants from this other. But does that produce this schizophrenia, this frustration, or can a person go along and succeed in this dominant society role and still go home and be a thorough-going native American?

LN: Yes. What you're speaking about, in its totality, is a very complex set of behavioral patterns. Now I happen to be a half-breed Indian, and I have a certain viewpoint of the world, but it's highly conditioned by the fact that I'm half Indian. My whole life has been motivated by the fact that I'm Indian, and I've had to work out certain things for myself. I told you I was extremely introverted. It was because I was very self-conscious growing up about all the things that you read and see and hear in the movies—the position you're placed in as a minority cultural member in this country, but there's no use you dwelling on that, you know what I mean. That created a kind of pall over me, and in a sense, a kind of handicap, so long as I was not able to see through it, reconcile it, and convert my Indian-ness into pride; which I eventually did. And so now I am a self-confident person, I think you can sense that. By now I think I can lick the world.
SM: Can you recognize where that happened?

LN: Yes, I know exactly.

SM: Then maybe you can help these other young people.

LN: Yes, I think I could. But why should it all fall on me? Why isn't the system concentrating on this problem? Why don't they get a lot of people like me together, and say, "Let's sit down and begin to worry about what is happening to Indian people. Are we continuing to do this to them? Do we think we've solved the problem by introducing a few Indian cultural studies programs or not?" Because I think it's much deeper than that. The need, as I said, starts with what the system does to an Indian child at Head Start. How much of his training, his development, is related to his Indianness, and must be provided, or else risk splitting him in half, and creating problems for him, and what are the vehicles for strengthening confidence—meeting his affective needs. We don't talk about these things enough.

SM: This Pine Point school with all Indian instructors and Indian teacher aides and Indian students too, and the director a man who has been through the institutional schools, including Harvard, and is back there now running it on an experimental basis. Is something like that going to help?

LN: We're on the ragged edge, I guess, of some kind of progress. We've had Rough Rock, we have Ramah, we have a number of other schools, that have had a few years of being run by Indian people, but they're paying the penalty for being in the vanguard, the experimental group. They're not all successful. One of the strange things that I've observed is that when you turn over a school, especially if it's to a lay group of Indian people, to run, their first approach to the problem of improving the program for their children is to try to make the old
system work better than those BIA people who failed. And they will say, "The reason my kid doesn't learn, or turns out to be a wild one, is because those people didn't do a good job." And so when they come in, they try to hire better and more effective teachers to carry out the old program's style of methodology. But, this is not to exclude those people who are also saying, "We must run it on an Indian basis." And so you get a new spectrum of problems, everyone is still feeling their way in the dark. I just recently talked to a Navajo who said, "This school board says that we're going to concentrate on the cultural development of our students, and de-emphasize the cognitive." They believe that if their children get a good background in Navajo-ism, that they will find success in life; that other learning, kinds of learning will follow. Or you'll find the other school board who says, "We're not going to be Navajo at all. That's a waste of time. We're going to true up the standard process; we want our kids to learn to read, write and do arithmetic." What I'm pointing up is that there are some bright spots here and there, but they're bagatelles in the whole history of Indian education.

SM: Is it that you are concerned that now Washington has said self-determination is the thing, that they're just going to drop it there? In other words they haven't gone ahead to try to implement this?

LN: I think they're coping out. They're saying, "We couldn't do it very well, now you take it over and see how well you can do it," without offering Indians the advantage of a long-standing, researched approach to human development in the areas we have been discussing.

SM: Is that the kind of thing we need, something like the Tucson experiment on a national scale, concentrated on this particular problem?

LN: In a way. I guess one way of making the point is--I don't see, for instance, why the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as it exists right this
moment, does not recognize this problem, and staff up to do something about it. It has staffing for roads and housing, and on-the-job training, and for promoting the old pattern of Indian education. But who is in there talking about, and has the responsibility (and is accepting it) for instigating new institutional approaches that will really get behind the problems that we're talking about?

SM: I would suspect that a lot of people don't realize that there's a problem, or haven't even thought about it.

LN: I guess they don't, or they'd have done something about it.

SM: Maybe it's going to be that some people like you and Ada Deer and John Buckanaga and some of the people who have managed to see this and overcome problems will acquaint those in authority with the problems.

LN: What I think about all of this is that there is just a big gaping hole in the system that needs to be filled. I believe the missing link is this: Like in the major society, if you have social problems that bother people and need to be worked out, there is a massive system and a massive payroll that goes into collecting the best minds to work day in and day out, seeking solutions—the university system, in other words. People who are working on what kind of education is needed for the society. If there are bi-lingual problems, there are people who are paid good salaries, specialists, who keep concentrating on them, conducting research. And they run experimental programs, and they have seminars, and all sorts of things. Another way of putting it is, if you want to create, as they do in the American system, millionaires and great economic specialists, you send them to the Harvard School of Business.

SM: Of course, we've solved problems in space, but we haven't solved problems of housing for our own average person, so we've failed there too.
LN: But I daresay it's being solved better for the majority culture than it is for the minority culture. There are no equivalent programs to help Indian people solve their housing problems. While we're on that, that's another little pet peeve of mine. To observe here in the Southwest a cultural continuity that goes back for hundreds of years, in a rather dignified way, in the evolution of architecture, as say, in Tesuque, where you will see adobe architecture that's organic; it's human, it has earth qualities and good design. It's a part of nature; it's not an eyesore; it fits with the philosophy of the people and the way they've lived for hundreds of years. All of a sudden you have two things going. You get an acceleration on the part of Indian people to drive more pick-up trucks, participate in the material styles of their neighbors, and, at the same time, you're getting an opposite interest on the part of Indians in being more Indian. And these, being opposing forces—what you're going to get, if somebody doesn't sit down and determine how to make these two directions compatible, it's going to tear people apart even more so. In the matter of architecture—when an an Indian person says, "I have the same rights as everybody else in this country, I want a bungalow and I want a carport, and I want a pick-up truck, or maybe two pick-ups, and I want an avocado green refrigerator and a matching bathtub, because that's my right. Sure, I'm Indian, but that's my right too." And yet he's living in Tesuque, where there is a renaissance movement to revive old Indian dances, to revive ceremonial structures and Indian ways that they had been neglecting a generation ago. You've got a paradox taking place, culturally and architecturally. There's a need for people to find a way to restore their ceremonial plaza, which is crumbling down—go out and take a look at it and you'll see what I mean—and yet culturally unique activities in the plaza are being built up by the people themselves. People are moving out and away into HUD-conceived dwellings, and so, what you're doing is you're creating... I don't know what the proper word is... dichotomy that takes a person this way on one hand, and this way in another.
Now it seems to me that architecture is a very powerful force—it has been in the lives of all people. Culture produces a certain kind of architecture. It can reflect, it can enhance, or it can destroy culture. In this case I think it's destroying cultural continuity, creating unnecessary confusion for the people. Now, you approach from another point of view, and if you're talking to a Pueblo person he might say, "Who are you to tell me that I have to have a very high-falutin' approach to architecture? If I want a HUD cottage and can get it for $14.00 a month, that's what I'm going to have, it's none of your business." But I'm saying that if there were a trained group of young Indian people who emotionally identify with that village, but who have the advantage of M.I.T. training too, and somebody's worked the system out how you make these things work together, that same young man, in the next generation or so, can stop this destructive thing, and he indeed might be able to evolve an architectural form for the Tesuques that would effect a sureness about cultural evolution.

SM: It's a great problem isn't it?

LN: Well, these are crazy dreams. I think what drew me into this whole scene 13 years ago was the hope that we could establish an effective educational institution that would do whatever needs to be done, and Lord knows I don't pretend to know all the answers, I don't think anyone does. But what if we were able to put together an institution that would train young Indian architects in effective ways so that they could have a real effect upon community planning, cultural continuity problems, all the things that come under the heading of vernacular architecture in relation to social development? What if we had a program that effectively dealt with the projection of Indian music forms into tomorrow, instead of cutting them off when grandmother stops singing them? Some of the sons and daughters will learn them anyway, perhaps, and what if in the next generation nobody knows them
because they don't fit today? Those songs evolved because there was a need for them in the old days. O.K., there must be an Indian form that will fit today also. But where is it? Who is working to find it? Fortunately, there are a few people who are.

SM: Your institute is working on this now?

LN: Well, we're half-assed about it. We'd like to. What about Indian thought, and . . . I've forgotten the German word for it. Welt-an-shau-ung, the special eye-view of the world that could come out in Indian literature? Now in the 13 years we've been here we've been amazed at the number of kids who have, I think, tremendous writing skills. Students and graduates have managed to publish a few books, hard-bound books . . . Doubleday's done a book of poetry. A couple kids have done hard-backed biographies, one thing or another, a play or two. But we know that there's a tremendous potential outpouring of very valid literature by young Indian people. It's teen-age stuff in many cases, but a lot of it is very distinctive, because the kid who is writing it feels like an Indian feels in 1975, and he's the only person that can put it that way. So what we need is the $50,000—it's as simple as that—to set up the kind of program that we need in this school, to staff it with two or three expert instructors to deal with the different levels, from the introductory level of awakening creativity to the polishing off and the professionalism at the end. This means a few IBM typewriters, a quiet place to work, a program, a department. You'd be amazed at how many adult Indian creative people in the field of what we could call Indian literature there would be 30 years from now when they would have reached maturity, as opposed to the number there will not be because we didn't do this now. What about drama, theatre, dance? There is a tremendous, exciting contribution that Indian people will be able to make soon, or a hundred years from now, that's going to be needed because this pluralism thing, I think, is going to take hold, and cultural differences will be even more
precious in the future than they are now or have been in the past. And if we do not lay some kind of institutional connecting link, a lot of the traditional cultural stuff that we need to have in our resource bank to use generation after generation after generation is just not going to be there. There needs to be a lot of experimentation, because Indian society, I think, is somewhere along the same place that Greek society was at one stage, when religion became ritual, and ritual became theatre. Indian religion today in its pure form, is really based upon making things grow, and propitiating animals. Well... I don't know how loud to make this statement, because it's offensive to Indian people who still believe in the old way who are satisfied with their religion. But a religion whose whole form is based upon getting a deer to come near for survival reasons and all of that, when that's not the way Indians live any more, is on the ragged edge of some kind of basic change. How fast religions change, how they change, is a very complex subject. How much has Catholicism changed? We know in the last few years it's changing pretty darn fast, but it also has many things that go back to the very beginnings of Christianity that's still intact and work for the people. Well, the same thing is happening to Indian people. What I'm saying is that religion, one of these days--I don't know when--is going to transition- alize from the form it's taking now. And one of these days the same job is going to be done by an art form, just as Greek religion changed to Greek theatre, and Greek theatre still affects the whole world. Greek literature, theatre, has affected your life and mine, more so than pure Greek religion. Now who's working on that? There should be a university approach where there would be crack, young, trained Indian people experimenting in contemporary drama forms, deciding what is valid, what fits 1975, what is not, what religion-wise you must not touch, what you can touch, in the matter of evolving Indian theatre. We have Indian theatre in an embryonic stage--there are a couple of groups. There was one in New York, and now there's one in Washington (and probably some struggling groups elsewhere) but the theatre form
that they're delving in is sort of contemporary--social theatre, you know--Indian writing about Indian causes or Indian themes, but not in an Indian format. What is an Indian format? I don't think anybody knows, but I think if you got a group of Indian people together, young, creative minds, working on the problem--standing alongside them some good consultants and the old Indian people who have the secrets yet, the old medicine and so forth--if those people were working together, you get a valid new thing going that would serve people a hundred years from now, more effectively than maybe the media serves us now. Either we will or we won't. And what we do about it, I think, will make that determination. I can go on down the list, adding many other things that we should be working on for Indian people. When any person does something he knows how to do out of his Indian-ness, he does it very easily, and he gets ego satisfaction, pride and usually, economic support. Like this Navajo rug. As an art form this Navajo rug is going through a strange transitional period, it's sort of going both ways now, traditional and innovative. But it's due for some kind of flip-flop in the next 50 years. I daresay that this particular form of Indian rug will be replaced to an extent by some new form with new technology. Indian people seem to glom on to certain things they won't change, and other things they do change very fast, but eventually everything changes, so that art forms, religion, the whole social structure of Indian people is going to change. But who is thinking about it who could bring it about with a certain degree of smoothness, or are we going to just stand off and say the problem doesn't exist, and let the devil take the hindmost? That's what's happening now.

SM: I didn't realize the problem was quite as acute as you've described it.

LN: I think I have a tendency to overdramatize things, and everyone can sense that and make up their own minds about it, but I think to make
points you almost have to. I think the most important thing that I'm saying in this whole interview is that we need more attention paid to the development of new institutions that really get on to the problem that Indians are facing, instead of just assuming they don't exist. Now we work on alcoholism of Indian people, we work on housing needs of Indian people, we work on the job training of Indian people; we have a very elaborate educational system for Indian people, whether it's public schools or Indian schools, but the question is, how effective are we? Maybe instead of working on alcoholism we should put a lot more thought into preventive kind of education. And when you trace that concern back, it may have some bearing in what we're talking about. And so, if we don't attack the problems as they come out of the ground, so to speak, there isn't much you can do about them when they get way up to one's neck. So this paper sort of drops a short summary of what we think the problem is, and in terms of this institution, what we would like to do. We would like to have a kind of a university approach, run by Indians (but I hope with enough sense to pull in non-Indian expertise where it is needed) to develop a really effective, growing, developing approach to the arts and humanities. Indian people run the risk these days of turning out to be cultural isolates, you know, if you carried this thing too far, and we do need to get back to a study of man along with what I suppose is going on in Indian cultural studies programs, drawing parallels--this is what's happening to Indians and this is what happened to others. I think very often we don't. We're doing it in a very chauvinistic way in many cases, which may be creating problems for Indian people. It's according to how really balanced the message is delivered in these programs. You can create problems for Indian people by saying, "You're great, you're great," because Indian people will really have the same problems to face as everybody else. Just being Indian doesn't make you a superman. So, again, there should be a university-type program that concentrates on the humanities, and one that really studies contemporary social problems of Indian people. I think we need a department on languages that
would, of course, deal with English, but also tribal languages, foreign languages; and I think we should include foreign travel. I see nothing wrong with having 150 kids in Europe every summer, learning French and Italian, or up in the Yakima Reservation learning Yakima. I mean, if there's any advantage to a second language, why not see that they get it? I think there is a tremendous task that's not being met anywhere, in the training of cultural animateurs, cultural specialist teachers, who know how to teach Indians in reference to the cultural strengths that the youngster they're dealing with brings with him. They say the reason the BIA is staffed mostly with non-Indian people, is that trained Indian people cannot be found, but even trained Indian people you'd find very often are not skilled in cultural aspects. They're trained in the other system, and they're just aping what's been done by non-Indians. In communications there needs to be a department that concentrates on writing, basic communication skills. I think it should be mandatory that every Indian person should get out of high school knowing how to read at a normal high school level. And reading deficiencies be corrected way down the line. We need to create Indian poets, Indian authors, who could become technical writers, textbook writers, tribal historians, all those people. We need journalists, we need playwrights, we need film, radio, T.V., photography specialists, and so forth . . . all under the heading of communications specialists. Certainly in the fine arts we need some great sculptors, just as we've had great potters and weavers and tepee builders, what have you, in the past. We need painters, graphic specialists; we need a lot of training in the entrepreneurial area, because there are a lot of very talented people who don't know how to do business. What could Indian people really do to satisfy themselves and others and make a good living at it? For example, what if we really went all-out in the development of metals? I'll show you a handsome piece on the door out here, maybe you noticed it when you came in. It's an indication of what Indian designers could do, far beyond making a bracelet or a necklace, not
only to their own advantage, but to that of others. And what could they do if we really had an all-out professional program in fibers, in the development of wearing apparel, interior fabrics, in constructed and printed fabrics, and all of that. I happen to know a lot about the textile arts; I made my living in the field for a number of years. What about clay? What could Indian people really produce in the way of pottery and ceramics beyond what they're doing now? What about the artist in business? He needs to know production, promotion, sales, accounting and all those things. Graphic arts. The Indian people themselves are going to need brochures, logos, emblems, all the things that create unification and articulation of tribal needs as they become sophisticated people dealing in business, developing their reservations, and all those things. They're going to need all these things, they are what makes societies go. Indian people did it in strange ways then. There are new forms they need to know about in order to make their societies work today. Museum training. There's a whole tremendous area of neglect now in the Indian world in the availability of museums. Indian people have a right to know what their cultural background is so they can position themselves today and project themselves into the future. You do that with a sound foundation of knowing who you are, where you came from. Most of the available, usable, cultural material is not at the disposal of Indian people. The great art of Indian people seeps out in the form of some very fancy books that get published occasionally, on a few repeated pieces of great Indian art. The bulk of the material culture of Indians lies back in the Heye Foundation in N.Y.C., the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C., or on research shelves in some university repository. It's not in the hands of young Indian people who really need it. I'm on the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, and that's our new big project. We're going to try to marshall Indian opinion about what each of us in our various settings needs in the way of cultural heritage exposure. And just economically speaking, jobs for Indians... if suddenly all Indians say, "We want this for our children," where would you find
preparators, curators, exhibition art specialists, public relations persons, publication persons, or museum administrators? They're not available. We would like to set up a program to train them. Design center, home furnishing, package design, Indian product design. What would an Indian designer do to a chair if you turned that over to him? He might do something really exciting, something with rough leather and fur or rawhide and beadwork, lord knows what! And we might get a very handsome new contribution in the way of a chair. Like the famous Charles Eames chairs, or the Barcelona chair. Vernacular architecture, community planning, landscape planning, industrial design, interior design; performing arts, dancing, music; preparational theatre, drama, technical theatre, play-writing, theatrical management, professional theatre, touring companies; lectures . . . all to interpret to the world about Indians, so it will know them as contributors and can cease thinking of them as social problems. Indians have a tremendous amount to offer themselves and to the world, but nobody knows what the potential is. There're not many Indian people trained who are interested in going out and telling what it is. There needs to be a whole independent studies unit where young people can work on problems of their own choosing, whether it is social problems back home or what. There needs to be a special department in behavioral science, group dynamics, counselling, mental health, Indian psychology, and so forth. There needs to be a department of social science, related to the particular needs of the American Indian. The Indian may turn out to be a very special person, you know, the way things are going, in relationship to his memories of basic ecological truths that modern man seems to be forgetting. What about social patterns, cross-cultural relationships? What do we think about our non-Indian neighbors? What must we do to proceed maximally in the improvement of inter-race relationships? Philosophy, religion, not just Indians', but what about others? Science and the arts. Science and Indians, and so forth.

SM: At least you've mapped out the question and how to start reaching for
the solutions. Was that written for the school here?

LN: One day several years ago the director of Indian education said, at a meeting that I attended of school officials, Bureau administrators, "Each of you should lay out the future for your institution, because unless you have a valid plan for the future, you'll find yourself in this trend of forced integration and a growing belief in some quarters that there's no need for Indian schools, and so forth. Answer the question, 'Is there going to be a need for your institution ten years from now?'" This paper covering much of the issues we just covered addresses the problem fairly lightly.

SM: This has been a valuable experience talking with you, listening to you. I do appreciate it.