
The Changing Political and Economic Status of the American Indians: From Captive Nations to Internal Colonies

Author(s): C. Matthew Snipp

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Apr., 1986, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Apr., 1986), pp. 145-157

Published by: American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3486915>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*

JSTOR

The Changing Political and Economic Status of the American Indians:

From Captive Nations to Internal Colonies

By C. MATTHEW SNIPP*

ABSTRACT. *Resource development on American Indian lands* is bringing about a dramatic transformation of the political and economic status of *American Indians*. Recently, scholars observing this change have increasingly used *underdevelopment* theory to explain the nature of these changes. However, this discussion points out that as applied to *American Indians*, the perspective of underdevelopment theory is skewed in several important ways. Specifically, it fails to take into account the distinctive historical and political status of Indians in *American society*. A simple typology, *captive nations* and *internal colonies* is proposed for describing the *status of Indian tribes* before and after *development*.

I

Introduction

NO OTHER MINORITY GROUP in America can claim the sovereign legal and political status traditionally occupied by American Indians. This status stems from special agreements between American Indians and the Federal Government. The broader significance of these arrangements is seldom recognized by most social scientists. Even fewer are aware that the industrialized world's growing desire for inexpensive natural resources is moving Federal-Indian relations in significant new directions.

For sociologists interested in the global expansion of modern capitalism and its by-products, the changing status of American Indians graphically illustrates the processes related to political subjugation and economic exploitation. Against the background of two major themes in development literature, this paper

* [C. Matthew Snipp, Ph.D., is assistant professor of sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1984 meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society, Boston, MA. These ideas were originally formulated during the 1983 meetings of the Four Nations Conference on Community Development, Sheridan, WY. Support for this work was provided by the Russell Sage Foundation. Joane Nagel, Mary Olson, Gary Sandefur and two anonymous referees of this *Journal* furnished helpful comments on an earlier draft. Diana Smith of CERT also provided useful background information. As is customary, the author assumes responsibility for all errors and opinions.

American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 45, No. 2 (April, 1986).
© 1986 American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

sketches a simple typology for describing the changing political status of Indian tribes, and the redefinition of their role in the national economy.

An exhaustive review of the development literature relevant to this typology is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, a few key ideas are highlighted for the purpose of amplifying a concept advocated by historian D'Arcy McNickle and his colleagues.¹ They characterize the historic status of American Indians in law and public policy as "captive nations". This term describes the limited political autonomy of tribal governments, and reflects the relative isolation and detachment of Indians from the mainstream of American society and economic life.² As captive nations, tribes are subject to the higher political authority of the U.S. Government but in other respects, their lands are closed enclaves outside of American society.

Resource development on tribal land is reshaping the authority of tribal governments as they seek to control the flow of raw materials into the national economy. The relationship they have with American society is increasingly colonial and their insularity is steadily eroding. These changes signify a new political and economic status for American Indians as "internal colonies".

II

American Indians and Resource Development

THE ENIGMA OF AMERICAN INDIANS juxtaposes their low economic standing with their control of scarce and potentially valuable natural resources. In addition to large reserves of energy resources, American Indians also have substantial holdings in water, fishing, lumber, and pristine recreation areas.³ For instance, in 1974 commercial forests occupied 5.5 million acres of Indian land and produced nearly \$68 million worth of lumber.⁴ Yet the median family income of Indian households was \$13,724 in 1979 compared to \$20,835 for White households in the same year.⁵ Understanding how this situation came to exist, and what the eventual impact of development will mean for American Indians is complicated by their diversity. Vast differences exist between tribes in terms of their history, culture, views toward development, and sophistication in dealing with non-Indians. This diversity defies broad generalizations.

Tribal differences are especially critical because they provide the context and limiting conditions for statements about the changing status of Indians. In relation to natural resource development, three important distinctions include (1) the type of resource to which a tribe has access; (2) the scale of development, especially in capital intensity and, (3) the historical period in which development occurs. It would be a serious mistake to expect that all reservations are equally endowed with the same resources, or that the extent of development is consistent

across reservations. Indeed, some tribes have consciously resisted development in favor of a more traditional lifestyle.

In recent years, federal bureaucrats, the popular press, academics, and some major U.S. corporations have taken an especially ardent interest in tribal affairs. This attention from disparate quarters of American society is primarily directed at a small group of tribes known for their reserves of energy resources. These tribes are frequently referred to as "energy resource" tribes and are represented by an organization known as the Council of Energy Resource Tribes (CERT) through a loose cartel agreement. They control vast amounts of energy-related resources such as coal, oil, gas, shale, and uranium. Some estimates suggest that 23 tribes control 33 percent of the nation's strippable low sulphur coal, 80 percent of U.S. uranium reserves, and between 3 and 10 percent of domestic reserves in gas and oil.⁶ Only a small fraction of these reserves is being actively developed, and among these twenty-three tribes are some of the poorest segments of the Indian population, the Navajo and Cheyenne for example.⁷

Another important consideration is that Indian tribes do not share equally in resource development and exemplify a state of uneven development. In terms of development, some tribes have opted for actively exploiting their resources while others have acted with more restraint.⁸ In absolute value, some tribes have resources which are larger or more valuable than others; a barrel of oil is worth more than a barrel of water. Likewise, some tribes have one type of resource while other tribes are rich in another type, and some have none at all. For example, the tribes in the plains and mountain states have energy related resources while most lumbering and fishing is limited to a few groups in the Pacific Northwest. For example, fourteen reservations collect 96 percent of all Indian timber revenues.⁹

Many studies of Indian resource development, especially those concerned with energy resource tribes,¹⁰ operate within a narrow historical focus; often limited to a single tribe or a short time period. This is misleading because it creates the impression that the discovery of energy resources on Indian land is recent. The scale and scope of development is relatively new but energy development on Indian land has been on-going since the turn of the century. A small coal lease was negotiated with the Uinta of Utah in 1941 and earlier, in 1911, large reserves of petroleum were found on the Osage reservation of Oklahoma. As early as 1884, the Cherokees of Oklahoma unsuccessfully tried to develop petroleum leases on their land.¹¹

III

American Indians and Models of Development

A COMPLETE REVIEW of development theory is far afield but two models are especially pertinent because they have been used to analyze the impact of social

change on American Indians. The early literature on Indian development is dominated by cultural diffusion models emphasizing acculturation and assimilation.¹² Cultural diffusion models embrace themes found in the literature on modernization or “convergence” theory.¹³ Recent analyses adopt “critical” or neo-Marxist perspectives that are heavily indebted to the development theories of Baran and Frank.¹⁴ Modernization and critical perspectives both strive to (1) explain the impact of development on Indian tribes; (2) anticipate the likely changes among tribes seeking to become part of this process and, (3) predict the eventual status of tribes lacking resources or declining to develop them. As accurate guides for predicting the effects of development on American Indians, the achievements of the older development theories are dismal and the prospects for the newer theories are uncertain.

Convergence theory postulates a growing similarity between developing and developed nations as an inevitable outcome of economic advancement. As lesser developed societies expand and diversify their economies, they will increasingly resemble more highly industrialized nations in other facets of their social organization—the “melting pot” on a global scale. Cultural diffusion models embrace this idea by viewing economic development as an irresistible force of acculturation and assimilation. In this perspective, western cultural practices are an accoutrement of economic advancement and material well-being.

Cultural diffusion models further stipulate that prolonged contact between distinct cultural groups will eventually result in the adoption and diffusion of cultural practices. Over time, distinct groups become increasingly similar until they are no longer distinguishable as separate cultures.¹⁵ For American Indians, a version of this model posits that cultural exchanges are asymmetric, and over time, they will be absorbed by the dominant White culture. Prolonged contact with White society ordains the disappearance of Indian culture,¹⁶ as its loss facilitates higher levels of social development. The ethnocentrism of this view hardly needs mentioning. Berkhofer¹⁷ notes that it discounts the possibility of cultural adaptation. Once exposed to White society, Indians are expected to adapt their own culture by discarding it.

For decades, this model dominated theoretical anthropology, and for decades, anthropologists awaited the eventual demise and disappearance of American Indians.¹⁸ To their surprise, American Indians did not disappear. Studies repeatedly showed that they retained a strong attachment to traditional values and lifestyles, even in otherwise alien urban environments.¹⁹ This instigated a theoretical crisis, causing one frustrated anthropologist to question “our earlier expectations concerning the rate of American Indian acculturation and why full acculturation to White American ways of life is not occurring in the contemporary American scene.”²⁰

The persistence of American Indian culture eroded the influence of cultural diffusion models as guides for understanding the impact of development. Besides their inability to explain cultural persistence, cultural diffusion models invited criticism by neglecting the role of social conflict, colonial relations of domination and subordination, and struggles for political power and other societal resources.²¹ In their place, development models with an explicit interest in social conflict have become popular. These models posit the existence of two discrete social systems. Initially, these bodies are culturally, economically, and politically distinct. The development of social relations between these groups creates the opportunity for one group to dominate and exploit the other. Colonial relations, for example, are expressly established for domination and exploitation. In this situation, the powerful seek out the weak for their own enrichment.

The growing interest in colonial relationships does not signify a radical departure from the intellectual concerns expressed in cultural diffusion models. Differences between highly developed urban societies and the traditional, or "folk" social structures of native populations once dominated the interests of anthropologists.²² A focus on colonialism pays less attention to the differences between more and less developed nations, in favor of a much stronger emphasis on the exploitation and inequality in their relationship. Baran's²³ analysis of neo-colonial relations has influenced several contemporary anthropologists.²⁴ He argues that the developed nations sustain their advantage in the world economy through an asymmetrical exchange of resources with less developed societies. Resources essential for economic production in western nations are extracted from less developed countries that in return, gain few benefits from their exports. In this manner, developed nations grow richer by depleting the resources of weaker countries.

To describe the structure of colonial relationships, Andre Gunder Frank coined the terms "satellite" and "metropolis".²⁵ According to Frank, less developed societies are economic satellites dominated by the influence of colonial powers, the "metropolis". As Jorgenson,²⁶ points out, it is important to notice that the "satellite-metropolis" typology does not readily imply a rural-urban distinction. Jorgenson explains that "the term 'metropolis-satellite' is used here rather than 'urban-rural' in a characterization of political economy because the latter implies a city, a locational unit filled with people. 'Metropolis' implies *the concentration of economic and political power and political influence*. 'Urban' and 'metropolis' are not, of course, completely independent . . ."²⁷

In his analysis of western capitalism and its impact on Latin America, Frank argues that Latin America is a satellite of capitalist interests in metropolitan North America and western Europe. In his words, this relationship has led to the "development of underdevelopment" in Latin America. The satellite-me-

tropolis relationship not only fosters underdevelopment in the satellite; the growing impoverishment of the satellite also forces it to become increasingly *dependent* on the metropolis, especially for economic assistance. Dependency theory is also responsible for another idea: internal colonialism. Besides its global character, underdevelopment and dependency also occur between regions and locations within nations. When one area is exploited for the benefit of another, the exploited area is deemed an "internal colony."²⁸

Internal colonies, also called periphery areas, are created when one area dominates another to the extent that it channels the flow of resources from the periphery to the dominant core area. Periphery economies are heavily concentrated in extractive or agricultural production that serves the development of the core area, especially by providing raw materials. Hechter²⁹ adds that ethnocentrism plays a role in the underdevelopment of periphery areas by offering a rationale for cultivating the disadvantaged status of periphery populations.

Since its introduction, the term internal colony has been applied to conditions in developing and developed nations. Applied to the U.S., it has been used to describe the plight of minority populations, especially Blacks.³⁰ In the last ten years, it also has become popular for describing the situation of native populations. Andre Gunder Frank³¹ was one of the first scholars to apply this framework to indigenous societies in his analysis of the status of South American Indians. He argues that the regions they inhabit are internal colonies. These Indians are caught up in the larger forces affecting Latin American underdevelopment, except they suffer disproportionate hardships because they reside within the underdeveloped areas of underdeveloped societies.

Following Frank's example, the concepts of internal colonialism and underdevelopment have found popularity among students of North American Indians.³² Most of these applications are used for describing the impact of resource development, especially energy resources, on Indian reservations. Analyzing conditions on reservations, these discussions closely follow the standard themes of underdevelopment theory. The underdevelopment perspective makes three points about the status of North American Indians. First, reservations are the exploited satellites and American society is the exploiting metropolis. Second, the relationship between the tribes and the Federal Government has nurtured underdevelopment and dependence in Indian communities. Third, resource development is an invitation for yet greater exploitation and underdevelopment.

This perspective emphasizes that the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) has been instrumental in perpetuating the subordinate, colonized status of Indian reservations. The BIA is blamed for actively cultivating Indian dependencies and for being a willing accomplice to their economic exploitation.³³ Amid these accusations, Nafziger³⁴ suggests that the BIA is merely an instrument for carrying

out policies that serve the interests of the dominant culture in general, and industrial capitalism in particular.

At first glance, models of underdevelopment are appealing explanations for the conditions on Indian reservations. The exploitation of American Indians and their dependence on federal authorities are well known and widely documented. The extraction of natural resources from Indian lands for the greater benefit of the U.S. economy fits especially well with underdevelopment models. However, a closer examination of this perspective reveals that it does not neatly fit the circumstances of American Indians³⁵. An overarching problem is that the historical specificity of underdevelopment theory limits its generality from one setting to another. Underdevelopment theory was constructed around the events leading to the conquest and exploitation of Latin America. As useful as these insights may be, they bear no necessary relation to the circumstances of North American Indians. In particular, the differences between North and South American Indians are sufficiently large that facile comparisons should be discouraged.

Frank³⁶ locates South American Indians in the periphery of Latin American national development because this population traditionally has been a cheap source of labor. As plantation and factory workers, Latin American Indians share with the peasants—the family and subsistence farmers—the exploitation which accompanies development. As Frank points out,³⁷ since the arrival of the Spanish, the Indian population of Latin America has provided a valuable source of labor either as slaves or as easily exploited peasants. Unlike their South American counterparts and especially compared to European immigrants, there is little to suggest that the labor of North American Indians, either as farmers or factory workers, made an important contribution to the development of American capitalism. After an analysis of historical data, Jacobson³⁸ concludes that “In the United States the corporations who benefited from colonization benefited for the most part from the exploitation of Indian lands rather than Indian labor.” The mismatch between the original context of underdevelopment theory and the unique historical and political status of North American Indians can be improved by recognizing three special considerations.

IV

Some Amendments for Underdevelopment Theory

IN ITS PRESENT FORM, the literature dealing with underdevelopment and colonialism has a number of shortcomings in its view of American Indians. In part, these liabilities arise because the special circumstances of North American Indians were never considered in the original discussions of this theoretical perspective. The mismatch between the original context of underdevelopment the-

ory and the unique historical and political status of North American Indians can be improved by recognizing several special considerations.

First, American Indian tribes have a unique status as political sovereigns within the framework of the U.S. political system; no other ethnic minority group in the U.S. enjoys a similar status. Originally, tribal sovereignty was granted in recognition of American Indians as credible military threats. As this threat diminished over time, the authority of tribal governments became embedded in law through treaty negotiations and in federal case law. The authority granted by tribal sovereignty has waxed and waned since the early 19th century but it remains an accepted legal doctrine closely embraced by tribal governments and their supporters. This authority is subordinate to federal powers, but it grants tribal governments with control over reservation development and the power to enter negotiations with non-Indians on behalf of the tribe³⁹.

Second, the political separation of American Indians has been reinforced by the geographic and social isolation of Indian tribes from American society. One result of this isolation is that, historically, there has been very little American Indian participation in the U.S. economy. In the 19th century, Indians were viewed as obstacles to progress and removed to isolated reservations away from the mainstreams of economic activity.⁴⁰ The cession of tribal lands made the expansion of American capitalism possible but only recently have many tribes and reservations had a role in the American economy, making their satellite status relatively new.

Third, developing Indian lands for the purpose of industrial production confronts Indian people with potentially profound changes in their traditional lifestyles. Before they were subjugated by European powers, American Indians practiced a lifestyle based on hunting and subsistence agriculture. Yielding to the political authority of the United States did not mean that this lifestyle was abandoned. Instead, it was relocated and adapted to the confines of reservations on Indian territory, as in Oklahoma; sometimes in the face of steep opposition from authorities. More recently, resource development poses a difficult dilemma for many tribes as they struggle to reconcile desires for traditional lifestyles with demands for the economic benefits offered by resource development. The interests of traditionalists, reinforced by traditional religious beliefs about the sanctity of nature, are served through the preservation of open land and especially pristine wilderness areas—often the same sites targeted for development. This conflict has been instrumental in slowing the rate of development on several reservations.⁴¹

Fourth, conquest and removal did not bring revolutionary changes in the economic base of many tribes; most American Indians continued hunting and agriculture for their livelihood. However, developments in the 19th century

brought about major changes in their political status. Prior to economic development and their appearance in the periphery of the U.S. economy, American Indians practiced their traditional lifestyles in the face of an increasingly complex political environment affecting their right of self-government and notably, control over the use of their land. Unlike many colonial situations, military conquest and subsequent occupation of their land did not immediately lead to economic development. Instead, many tribes spent an earlier interregnum period during which they were quarantined from White society and made dependent on the agents of the Federal Government, especially the Bureau of Indian Affairs. During this period, there was a wholesale redefinition of the political status of American Indians which established the scope of control of federal authorities over Indian land, and especially how it eventually would be developed.

This earlier phase of development in Indian-White relations is important because it foreshadows the present satellite status of the tribes involved with resource development. For these tribes, the era preceding the development of their resources is critical because it describes the antecedent political conditions that facilitate existing economic relationships between Indian satellites and nonIndian metropolises. This also reveals a significant gap in underdevelopment theory in so far as it offers few insights about the structure of Indian-White relations preceding any satellite-metropolis configuration.

There is a conceptual element needed in the underdevelopment vocabulary to express the pre-colonial status of American Indians. In this respect, a simple typology for describing the transition of Indian reservations from their isolated pre-development origins to their developing status as periphery regions fills an important gap in the conceptual framework of underdevelopment theory. Thoroughly exploring the implications of this typology is not possible in this brief discussion. However, the goal of this typology is to broadly outline how Indian-White relations are being altered by developing natural resources on tribal lands.⁴²

Tribal land development, especially natural resource exploitation for consumption outside the reservation, signals a new era in tribal history and marks the end of an old one. This transition is significant because it represents a basic restructuring of the tribe's relationship with the U.S. economy. Framing this transition, the terms "*captive nations*" and "*internal colonies*" are a pair of simple, though heuristically useful categories for delineating two major stages of tribal development. The expression "captive nations"⁴³ defines the status of American Indian tribes prior to the development of tribal resources for nontribal consumption. For those tribes without resources or development, "captive nationhood" reflects their existing relationship with nonIndian society. For tribes in the midst of development, their situation can be plausibly compared with

the conditions associated with internal colonialism. The term “internal colony,” in its conventional usage, is a new status for many tribes as the resources they harbor become more valuable and sought after.

V

Discussion

EMPIRICAL DATA for documenting the transition from captive nation to internal colony is not readily available. By its nature, this process gradually occurs over long periods of time. For this reason, the rationale behind this typology is based on historical developments in the relationship between Indians tribes and the United States. These developments span a long period in American history beginning in colonial times and reaching into the present. In a subsequent article, I will review the major historical developments related to the emergence of internal colonies from captive nations. However, there are several key points to remember about this typology.

The first point is that the status of “captive nation” is defined mainly in political terms. Captive nationhood describes the limited amount of self-rule that Indian tribes exercised following their submission to the authority of the Federal Government. Prior to captive nationhood, many Indian tribes were fully independent of European powers. For example, tribes such as the Iriquois regularly maintained political alliances with the French and the English, and as recently as the Civil War, the Cherokee tribe established a formal alliance with the Confederacy. The redefinition of the political status of American Indians was accomplished through military and bureaucratic actions, yet the rights of political autonomy and self-government were not completely stripped. As a result, tribal authorities still enjoy a measure of political power that is highly circumscribed, not as independent nations but as captives. Some tribes such as the Creeks and Cherokees continue to refer to themselves as “nations”.

As American Indians gave up their sovereign political powers to become captive nations, they did not experience a comparable revolution in their economic life. However, the status of captive nation paved the way for internal colonization by making formerly self-sustaining Indian tribes dependent upon federal authorities. As a matter of stated policy, for good and bad reasons, American Indians were made “wards” of the State with federal authorities, primarily the BIA, assuming extensive oversight responsibilities for the management of remaining Indian lands. Since becoming federal wards, Indians have continued to rely heavily on activities such as hunting, fishing and subsistence agriculture for their subsistence. However, as the resources on their land have become

more valuable, many tribes are facing a revolution in their economic life unmatched since the redefinition of their political status in the 19th century.

The nature of this revolution is characterized by the changes which accompany the transition from captive nation to internal colony. The most profound change brought about by this transition is that American Indians are subject to entirely new forms of economic dominance, in addition to the older forms of political dominance exercised by the federal government. The types of economic relations associated with internal colonialism are a relatively new set of contingencies among people accustomed to relatively simple forms of economic activity. However, as resource development intensifies on Indian lands, internal colonization is almost certain to become more prevalent as the political dominance of earlier times gives way to newer and more complex forms of economic and political relations.

Notes

1. D'Arcy McNickle, Mary E. Young, and Roger Buffalohead, "Captives Within a Free Society," in American Indian Policy Review Commission (AIPRC), *Final Report of the American Indian Policy Review Commission* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977), Chapter 1, pp. 47–82.

2. McNickle, *et al.*, are not the first scholars to use the expression "captive nation." Political scientists also use this term to describe the satellite status of Eastern Bloc nations in relation to the Soviet Union.

3. Americans for Indian Opportunity (AIO), *Indian Tribes as Developing Nations; A Question of Power: Indian Control of Indian Resource Development* (Albuquerque, NM: Americans for Indian Opportunity, Inc., 1975), pp. 1–9; Sar A. Levitan, and William B. Johnston, *Indian Giving: Federal Programs for Native Americans* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1975), pp. 124–150; Sam Stanley, ed., *American Indian Economic Development* (The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1978), Chapter 1, "Introduction", pp. 2–14.

4. Levitan and Johnston, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

5. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Detailed Population Characteristics, United States Summary, Section A: United States* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984).

6. Joseph G. Jorgenson, Richard O. Clemmer, Ronald L. Little, Nancy J. Owens and Lynn A. Robbins, *Native Americans and Energy Development* (Cambridge, MA: Anthropology Resource Center, 1978), pp. 6.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 5.

8. Stan Albrecht, "Energy Development: prospects and implications for Native Americans," paper presented at the annual meetings of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, 1977.

9. Levitan and Johnston, *op. cit.*, pp. 25.

10. Jorgenson *et al.*, *op. cit.*; Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz, *Economic Development in American Indian Reservations* (Sante Fe, NM: Native American Studies, University of Mexico, 1979); Lorraine Turner Ruffing, "Navajo Economic Development: a dual perspective," in Sam Stanley, ed., *American Indian Economic Development* (The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1978), pp. 15–86.

11. H. Craig Miner, *The Corporation and the Indian: tribal sovereignty and industrial civi-*

lization in Indian territory, 1865–1907 (Columbia: MO: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1976), pp. 147–62.

12. J. Milton Yinger, and George Eaton Simpson, "The Integration of Americans of Indian Descent," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 436, pp. 137–51, (1978).

13. W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1960); Bert F. Hoselitz, and Wilbert E. Moore, eds., *Industrialization and Society* (Mouton: UNESCO, 1966); Neil J. Smelser and Seymour M. Lipset, "Social Structure, Mobility and Development," in Neil J. Smelser and Seymour M. Lipset, eds., *Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development* (Chicago: Aldine, 1966).

14. Paul Baran, *The Political Economy of Growth* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1957); Andre Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: historical studies of Chile and Brazil* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967).

15. Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: the role of race, religion, and natural origins* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1964).

16. Yinger and Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 142–3.

17. Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., *The White Man's Indian: images of the American Indian from Columbus to the present* (New York: Random House, 1979), pp. 28–9.

18. Ralph Linton, *Acculturation in Seven American Indian Tribes* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1940), Chapter 10, pp. 501–20.

19. Prodipto Roy, "The Measurement of Assimilation: the Spokane Indians," *American Journal of Sociology* 67, pp. 541–51 (1962); Joan Ablon, "Relocated American Indians in the San Francisco Bay Area: social interactions and Indian identity," *Human Organization* 23, pp. 296–304 (1964); Lynn C. White, and Bruce A. Chadwick, "Urban Residence, Assimilation, and Identity of the Spokane Indian," in Howard M. Bahr, Bruce A. Chadwick and Robert C. Day, eds., *Native Americans Today: sociological perspectives* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972); Bruce A. Chadwick, and Joseph H. Stauss, "The Assimilation of American Indians: the Seattle case", *Human Organization*, 34, pp. 359–69 (1975).

20. Evon Z. Vogt, "The Acculturation of American Indians," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 311, pp. 137–46 (1957), p. 139.

21. Joseph G. Jorgenson, "A Century of Political Economic Effects on American Indian Society, 1880–1980," *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 6, pp. 1–82 (1968), pp. 1–2.

22. Redfield is credited with the distinction between "folk" and "urban" societies and for his work on analyzing the differences between these two types of cultures. Redfield's work was later disputed by Lewis which resulted in a major controversy in the anthropological literature. See Robert Redfield, "The Folk Society," *American Journal of Sociology*, 52, pp. 293–298 (1947) and Oscar Lewis, "Tepoztlan Revisited," *Rural Sociology*, 18, pp. 121–36 (1953).

23. Baran, *op. cit.*

24. Joseph G. Jorgenson, "Indians and the Metropolis," Chapter 2 in Jack O. Waddell and O. Michael Watson, eds. *The American Indian in Urban Society* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971); Jorgenson, *op. cit.*; Nancy Oestreich Lurie, "Menominee Termination: from reservation to colony," *Human Organization* 31, pp. 257–70 (1972); Ruffing, *op. cit.*

25. Gunder Frank, *op. cit.*

26. Jorgenson, *op. cit.*

27. *Ibid.*, pp. 84.

28. Gunder Frank, *op. cit.*

29. Michael Hechter, *Internal Colonialism* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1975).

30. Robert Blauner, "Internal Colonialism and Ghetto Revolt," *Social Problems* 16, pp. 393–408 (1969); William K. Tabb, *The Political Economy of the Black Ghetto* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1970).

31. Gunder Frank, *op. cit.*, pp. 123–42. Although an early application, Andre Gunder Frank was not the first to use this perspective. An even earlier discussion of colonialism and American Indians is Everett E. Hagen and Louis B. Schaw, *The Sioux on the Reservation: an American colonial problem* (Cambridge, Mass.: Center for International Studies, 1960) and Everett E. Hagen, *On the Theory of Social Change* (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1962).

32. Lurie Oestreich, *op. cit.*; Nancy J. Owens, "Indian Reservations and Bordertowns: the metropolis-satellite model applied to the northwestern Navajos and Umatillas," Ph.D. Dissertation in anthropology, University of Oregon, (1976); Robert Bee, and Ronald Gingerich, "Colonialism, Causes, and Ethnic Identity: Native Americans and the National Political Economy," *Studies in Comparative International Development* 12, pp. 70–93 (1977); Mel Watkins, ed., *Dene Nation: the colony within* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1977); Jorgenson, *op. cit.*; Turner Ruffing, *op. cit.*; Gary Anders, "The Internal Colonization of Cherokee Native Americans," *Development and Change* 10, pp. 41–55 (1979); Gary Anders, "Theories of Underdevelopment and the American Indian," *Journal of Economic Issues* 40, pp. 681–701 (1980); Gary Anders, "The Reduction of a Self-Sufficient People to Poverty and Welfare Dependence: an analysis of the causes of Cherokee Indian underdevelopment," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 40, pp. 225–37 (1981); Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz, *Economic Development in American Indian Reservations* (Santa Fe, NM: Native American Studies, University of New Mexico, 1979); Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz, *American Indian Energy Resources and Development* (Santa Fe, NM: Native American Studies, University of New Mexico, 1980); Richard Nafziger, "Transnational Corporations and American Indian Development," pp. 9–38 in Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz, ed. *American Indian Energy Resources and Development* (Santa Fe, NM: Native American Studies, University of New Mexico, 1980); Cardell K. Jacobson, "Internal Colonialism and Native Americans: Indian labor in the United States from 1871 to World War II," *Social Science Quarterly* 65, pp. 158–71 (1984).

33. Anders, "Internal" *op. cit.*; Anders, "Theories," *op. cit.*; Anders, "Reduction," *op. cit.*; Nafziger, "Transnational Corporations," *op. cit.*, pp. 9–38.

34. Nafziger, *ibid.*

35. These numbers are illustrative but they should be regarded with caution. Even in recent censuses, federal data are notoriously inaccurate for American Indians.

36. Gunder Frank, *op. cit.*

37. *Ibid.*

38. Jacobson, *op. cit.*, pp. 169.

39. It is true that petty exploitation was widely practiced by licensed traders and other agents of the Federal Government. Thomas Jefferson is generally credited with founding the trading outpost system which used a variety of deceptions to keep Indians dependent on traders (De Rosier, 1970).

40. H. Craig Miner, *The Corporation and the Indian: tribal sovereignty and industrial civilization in Indian territory, 1865–1907* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1976).

41. Jim Richardson, and John A. Farrell, "The New Indian Wars," *Denver Post*, Special Reprint, November 20–27, 1983.

42. Another dimension of this issue concerns the wisdom of the trade-off between traditional lifestyles and economic development. According to Richardson and Farrell (1983, pp. 19–25), many tribal leaders believe that economic development is possible without sacrificing too many elements of traditional culture. Whether this belief is justified remains to be seen.

43. This term is borrowed from McNickle *et al.*, *op. cit.*