

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of the Liberal Arts

**FROM “LUMBEE” TO “TUSCARORA”: VARIETIES OF CITIZENSHIP CLAIMS
IN ROBESON COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA**

A Thesis in

Communication Arts and Sciences

by

Dominic Manthey

© 2015 Dominic Manthey

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

August 2015

The thesis of Dominic Manthey was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Stephen H. Browne
Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences
Thesis Advisor

Thomas W. Benson
Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of Rhetoric

Kirt H. Wilson
Associate Professor of Rhetoric in the Communication Arts and Sciences
Department

John Gastil
Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences
Head of Department

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

Abstract

Civil rights activism following the Voting Rights Act of 1965, labeled by scholars as the “Long Civil Rights Movement,” came from a wide variety of actors fighting for their rights and integrity as citizens of the United States. In this thesis, I examine indigenous civil rights activism from 1967 to 1973 in Robeson County, North Carolina. The struggle for indigenous equality in Robeson County was split between two competing movements, each of which I analyze in terms of their recurring appeals and visions of citizenship. First, I analyze the rhetoric of three non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that constructed a Lumbee social movement network in Robeson County. Federal “self-determination” policy, in particular, greatly informed the dominant appeals of the Lumbee activists. The three key themes of “self-determination”—economic partnership, civic engagement, and cultural appreciation—shaped the way the movement framed its activities and interpreted local political issues. Second, I examine the Tuscarora countermovement and its construction of a more militant vision of indigenous citizenship. The Tuscarora movement used a vernacular interpretation of Red Power rhetoric to challenge the Lumbee movement and its moderate citizenship framework. The Tuscarora’s appeals to tribal authenticity, political autonomy, and militarism effectively caught the attention of outside actors, such as Russell Means and Dennis Banks of the American Indian Movement (AIM). Finally, I analyze the temporary collaboration between the competing movements during the “Save Old Main” campaign. Activists rallied together through appeals to the public memory of the Old Main building that stressed a shared indigenous history of oppression. Gubernatorial candidate James E. Holshouser reinforced Lumbee-Tuscarora collaboration by offering a common enemy in the Democratic Party. This case study of American Indian civil rights protest contributes to rhetorical scholarship at the intersections of resistance, class, and indigeneity. An

analysis of Robeson County's competing networks of activism also invites critical rethinking of social movement rhetoric as it relates to public policy, rural-urban dynamics, and public memory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 Mobilizing Urban "Lumbee": The Rhetoric of "Self-Determination in Robeson County, North Carolina.....	18
Chapter 3 Rhetoric of Blood: Framing Protest in the "Tuscarora" Countermovement.....	48
Chapter 4 Remembering Indigenous Education: The "Save Old Main" Movement.....	79
Chapter 5 Conclusion.....	110
Bibliography.....	120

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A Master's thesis is the product of innumerable conversations, debates, and impressions. My advisor, Stephen H. Browne, is owed special gratitude for his tireless feedback, criticism, and encouragement throughout my time at Penn State. I am indebted to Dr. Thomas Benson for teaching me the stakes, challenges, and possibilities of rhetorical criticism my first semester of graduate school, as well as for first embracing my study of indigenous rhetoric and activism. I am grateful to Dr. Kirt Wilson for challenging me to view social movements as complex and rhetorically rich events. I would also like to thank Dr. Alan Derickson, Dr. Rosa Eberly, Dr. Jeremy Engels, Dr. J. Michael Hogan, and Dr. Michele Kennerly for productive conversations about rhetoric, social movements, and political theory. The graduate students of CAS have greatly influenced my style of thinking in ways I cannot express, and I would like to thank them for making me a better scholar. Last, I want to acknowledge the enthusiastic support from employees at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill's Wilson Archives, Southern Oral History Program (SOH), and Samuel Proctor Oral History Program (SPOH).

Chapter 1

Introduction

Together the Lumbee and Tuscarora make up the approximately 55,000-person American Indian community in southeastern North Carolina. Today, the Lumbee tribe is the largest in the eastern United States and the ninth-largest nationally. Their home, the swampy land of Robeson County, is one of the most racially diverse and densely populated counties in the state. These numbers alone partly explain the county's complicated political history. For centuries local and state politicians have targeted the American Indians as resources for gaining leverage in the county. The name "Lumbee" is a derivative of the city and river of Lumber, NC, although most Lumbee have since moved to the city of Pembroke and its surrounding rural region. The indigenous of Robeson County, according to tradition, were the first tribe to make contact with the Lost Colony of Roanoke. Many citizens identify with this narrative although little evidence exists from that period to substantiate it.¹ The name "Lumbee" has since been both state- and federally-recognized, however with an added clause that prohibits any material benefits. This has been the central site of political and legal contestation for the last 30 years.²

All appeals for federal recognition have been thus far unsuccessful. There is, however, a rich history of grassroots activism in Robeson County that has often

¹Gerald Sider, *Lumbee Indian Histories: Race, Ethnicity, and Indian Identity in the Southern United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 82.

² *Ibid.*, 276-305. After years of petitioning to the BIA Arlinda Locklear successfully argued in 1988 the Lumbee's case should be heard in joint Congressional hearings since Congress had already recognized the Lumbee and was thus responsible for the final addendum under question.

confronted basic material needs and inequalities more directly than federal appeals.³

These basic material needs, which operate in the background of the legal pursuit for cultural identity, persist today. Robeson County has a rate of poverty over twice as high as its state's average and a per capita income of just \$15,000.⁴ Most disquieting of all is that these statistics mark an improvement over mid-20th-century conditions. In response to these conditions, local actors attempted the first broad-based grassroots mobilization the county had ever seen.

This thesis explores the competing rhetorical strategies of Robeson County activists from 1967 to 1973. I hope to illustrate how actors attempted to create solidarity and make sense of local issues through appeals to both moderate and radical visions of indigenous citizenship. One of the Lumbee movement's most significant activities was a voter registration campaign. This more "moderate" movement has conventionally been understood as effective in establishing solidarity by bridging divisions of race and class.⁵ I argue that such mobilization efforts were significantly influenced by the emerging "self-determination" federal policies of both the Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard Nixon administrations. Self-determination rhetoric privileged certain behaviors and themes that tended to exclude the more rural poor indigenous citizens. The Lumbee movement's collective framework accordingly functioned more as a mediating framework that

³ Possible factors for recurring dismissal include: a strong opposition from the Cherokee tribe in regard to the distribution of benefits and the questions such a case raises about the legitimacy of BIA standards. There is likely also governmental anxiety over a projected \$700 million payout and general hesitancy from Congress to make a decision on an issue which it has virtually no precedent to reference and likely fears establishing one.

⁴ US Bureau of the Census. *Robeson County, North Carolina, 2013*. Online. Census Bureau. Available: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/37/37155.html> (15 September 2014).

⁵ Sociologist Robert Merton describes "moderate" or "innovative" as a type of collective reaction that seeks social or political change within a given structure. See Tepperman, L, and Curtis J. *Principles of Sociology: Canadian Perspectives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2006), 117.

inscribed new issues onto old frameworks of race and tribal citizenship. These long-standing divisions crystallized in 1971 with the emergence of the more radical “Tuscarora” group. The Tuscarora crafted a vernacular form of Red Power rhetoric to deploy “countersymbols” directed at the Lumbee movement.⁶

This historical case study ends with an analysis of a momentary unification of these two competing movements during James E. Holshouser’s 1972 gubernatorial campaign. Holshouser rallied both Lumbee and Tuscarora activists together through appeals to a shared indigenous memory in response to the destruction of the Old Main building in Pembroke, NC. This thesis seeks to demonstrate how public policy, political campaigns, and even geographic location influence the rhetorical dynamics of protest at the intersection of indigeneity and identity. Specifically, I hope to show how the Lumbee movement’s self-determination rhetoric and the Tuscarora’s Red Power rhetoric battled over local interpretations of civic issues that ultimately left them exposed to third-party interests. The end result was not a greater sense of tribal solidarity, but its fragmentation.

In this introduction I will first describe the major historical factors leading up to 1967. The legal context, in particular, proves useful to trace the organization and composition of Robeson County’s indigenous population. Federal tribal law imposed fragmented notions of citizenship and cultural identity that correlate with the material and geographic divisions of 1967. Then I review relevant scholarship, including key work on history, rhetorical studies, and social movements. Before concluding with a brief summary of each chapter, I operationalize key terms, such as “rhetoric,” “framework,”

⁶ Jonathan J. Edwards, “Countersymbols and the Constitution of Resistance in American Fundamentalism, 1919-1922,” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 17.3 (2014): 421-454.

and “citizenship.” This study is relevant to rhetorical studies because it brings to light myriad ways that marginalized people can take command of symbolic resources, both from within and without of their collective, and use it to challenge dominant frameworks. The contemporary demand for American Indians to represent themselves as legal tribes often ignores the underlying complexity of indigenous communities and a rich history of activism, innovation, and resistance to exploitation.

Context

Outside activists in 1967-1973 likely underestimated the entrenched legal divisions that partly shaped the organization and geographic layout of Robeson County indigenous citizens. For American Indians, a legal designator implies both cultural status as well as the amount of material aid owed by the government. For over a century state politicians and federal agents imposed five different names on different segments of the population. The names were often the result of short-term policy agendas rather than the careful consideration of local needs. Each name given to American Indians of Robeson County correlates with a different historical phase of federal policy: “Free Persons of Color” during the time of *removal and reservations* (1829-1886), “Croatan” during *assimilation* (1887-1932), “Cherokee” and, for 22 citizens, “Tuscarora” during *reorganization* (1932-1945), and finally “Lumbee” during *termination* (1946-1960).⁷ Each name wove indigenous citizens into a new relationship with government officials. The indigenous expected the full benefits of tribal sovereignty under whichever name. In

⁷ Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Treaties: The History of a Political Anomaly* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

return, the federal government and state politicians expected the citizens to act according to the norms of “Indian” as they were thus imagined to be.⁸

Legal designators also wedded the indigenous to federal Tribal Law and were subject to its myriad, often contradictory, interpretations. Throughout the coming decades different tribes would invoke and contest the various rulings. The legal code underlying the names “Croatan,” “Cherokee,” and “Lumbee” is so complex and inconsistent that few tribes could ever meet the criteria that it presumed. Legal philosopher James Tully describes how the basis for American Indian Tribal Law rests on an assumption that indigenous tribes do not have “prior sovereignty.”⁹ Therefore any tribe that appeals for legal recognition must show proof of a coherent and homogeneous tribal history beginning at the time of colonization. That is, tribes must demonstrate *unity* starting from the moment that colonizers *fragmented* their communities. When tribes look back at their own history it becomes evident that whatever solidarity and cohesion they maintained was often done in spite of, rather than through, such legal rulings.

These legal designators led to serious cultural and material divisions, particularly in terms of the pronounced rural and urban divide in 1967. When the urban citizens of Robeson County accepted the name “Cherokee,” for instance, they were simultaneously accepting the middle-rung of North Carolina's racial hierarchy. State politicians rewarded

⁸ Malinda Maynor Lowery, *Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation: Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010). Lowery charts these shifts in Robeson County throughout her monograph. For a broader discussion of the stages of American Indian policy, see Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Treaties: The History of a Political Anomaly* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

⁹ James Tully covers the propositional impasses through two of his works: *Public Philosophy in a New Key: Democracy and Civic Freedom* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009). See especially 257-258, and Tully's *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 99-129.

the Cherokees' "racially progressive" role by assisting them with the construction of new schools and churches. The Cherokees' new political allegiance alienated their rural counterparts. The rural indigenous still identified with the name "Croatan" at the behest of federal agents who gave them farming subsidies. These divergent political alliances put stress on the indigenous peoples' network of kinship and settlement ties. Through this system many Cherokee and Croatan struggled to recognize each other as family in spite of the growing material and political divisions. The Croatan became disillusioned with federal assistance by 1956 as many of them lost ownership of land and were faced with the dismal prospects of sharecropping. Meanwhile their more prosperous urban counterparts accepted the federal government's newest legal designator "Lumbee."¹⁰

During the period of concern for this thesis, 1967-1973, these legal designators contributed to a horizon of understanding, or an abstract point of reference, that informed actions and beliefs. The shift in federal policy from "termination" to "self-determination," covered in Chapter 2, brought with it a bureaucratic order that demanded a specific, unified legal name. The legal context thus helps to explain why the urban middle-class chose the "Lumbee" identity while the rural poor branched off as "Tuscarora." Today, the Tuscarora are comprised of roughly 2-3,000 indigenous people—most of whom once considered themselves "Lumbee" or "Croatan." The name "Tuscarora" in North Carolina stems from a 1937 ruling by the Office of Indian Affairs (OIA) that concluded 22 individuals were "full-blooded Tuscarora."¹¹ The rural poor who took part in the Lumbee voter registration movement interpreted their abject material

¹⁰ Lowery, *Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation*, 99-118.

¹¹ As cited in *Ibid.*, 88.

condition in reference to their own unique legal name. The legal designator “Tuscarora” thus found rhetorical power in part through the legal history that granted it a degree of legitimacy. The name adumbrated a cultural and political identity that was also in opposition to their enemies, the “Lumbee,” and their early connection with European and Caucasian blood.¹²

My thesis enters the conversation a time when many outsiders, such as anthropologists Gerald Sider and Karen Blu, began working with the Lumbee. Drawing on archival material, presidential policy speeches, newspapers, and interview transcripts of activists, I hope to give a fine-grained analysis of the dominant collective frames for the two movements. My argument is that the rhetoric surrounding the Lumbee movement did not unite the disparate groups of people under a shared vision of indigenous citizenship. Instead, the Lumbee movement disseminated a moderate rhetoric influenced by “self-determination” policy that favored economic partnership and civic engagement. This vision of indigenous citizenship inscribed the name “Lumbee” into new urban spaces and created a non-governmental organization (NGO) network that excluded some of the poorer indigenous voices. In response the rural poor constructed a countermovement to challenge the Lumbee’s rhetoric and appealed to a more radical indigeneity. This tension set up a new rhetorical exigence, which the “Save Old Main” movement and James Holshouser responded to with a rhetoric of indigenous unity and shared oppression.

¹² Blu, Lowery and Sider note the growing divisions between “Lumbee” and “Tuscarora” by the mid-20th century. See Lowery, *Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation*, 78, 177, 226; Sider, *Lumbee Histories*, xx, 81. Karen Blu, *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian People*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980): 231.

Relevant Scholarship

The majority of scholarship I have relied on thus far is historical.¹³ In particular, Malinda Maynor Lowery's *Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation: Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South* offers a sweeping history of the Lumbee from the earliest recorded history to the 1950s. Her intricate portrait of Robeson County is my chief means of understanding the local historical context leading up to the 1960s. I also make use of broader scholarship about American Indian history and law.¹⁴ Political and legal theorist James Tully offers a useful explanation for the legal anomaly that is American Indian law, which is crucial to understanding the tensions and legal ambiguities leading up to 1967. Historical scholarship on the American Indian Movement (AIM) also helped me draw out the larger political climate of indigenous activism as well as the "Red Power" ideology that the Tuscarora later came to identify with.¹⁵

¹³ The most relevant work on the Lumbee include Christopher Arris Oakley, *Keeping the Circle: American Indian Identity in Eastern North Carolina, 1885-2004* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2005); Sider, *Lumbee Indian*; Blu, *Lumbee Problem*; Lowery, *Lumbee Indians*.

¹⁴ Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, *Critical Race Theory* (New York: New York University Press, 2012); Tully, *Public Philosophy*; Haldun Gulalp, *Citizenship and Ethnic Conflict: Challenging the Nation-State* (London: Routledge, 2006); Robert A. Ferguson, *The Trial in American Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008); Jan Broekman and Larry Cata Backer, *Lawyers Making Meaning: The Semiotics of Law in Legal Education II*, (London: Springer Science + Business Media, 2012); David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2002); David E. Wilkins, *American Indian Sovereignty and the U.S. Supreme Court: The Masking of Justice* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1997); John T. Noonan, *Persons and Masks of Law* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1976).

¹⁵ Dennis Banks and Richard Erdoes, *Ojibwa Warrior: Dennis Banks and the Rise of the American Indian Movement* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004); Tim Baylor, "Media Framing of Movement Protest: The Case of American Indian Protest," *Social Science Review* 33.3 (1996): 241-255; Antoinette Nora Claypoole, *Ghost Rider Roads: American Indian Movement 1971-2011* (New Mexico: Wild Embers Press, 2012); *Beyond Red Power*, Eds. Daniel M. Cobb and Loretta Fowler (New Mexico: School for Advanced Research Press, 2007); Bruce D'Arcus, "The Urban Geography of Red Power: The American Indian Movement in Minneapolis-Saint Paul, 1968-1970," *Urban Studies* 47.6 (2010): 1241-1255; Robert C. Day, "The Emergence of Activism as a Social Movement," in *Native Americans Today: Sociological Perspectives*. Eds. Howard M. Bahr, Bruce Chadwick, and Robert C. Day (New York: Harper and Row, 1972): 506-532; Vine Deloria Jr., "The New Activism," *Dialogue* 6.2 (1973): 3-12; James S. Frideres, "Native Rights and the 21st Century: The Making of Red Power," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 22.3

Rhetorical studies deal with many of my thesis' topics, such as the construction of "counterpublics" and how collective actors work to craft shared identities and visions of citizenship through discourse.¹⁶ There are also seminal works on indigeneity and indigenous politics.¹⁷ I do not debate larger theoretical points related to these topics, but

(1990): 1-7; Frederick E. Hoxie, *This Indian Country: American Indian Political Activists and the Place they Made* (New York: Penguin Press, 2012); Troy R. Johnson, *Red Power: The Native American Civil Rights Movement* (New York: Chelsea House, 2007); Alvin M. Josephy, *Red Power: The American Indian's Fight for Freedom* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1999); Stew Magnuson, *Wounded Knee 1973: Still Bleeding: The American Indian Movement, the FBI, and their Fight to Bury the Sins of the Past* (Chicago, IL: Courtbridge Publishing, 2013); Paul McKenzie-Jones, "Evolving Voices of Dissent: The Workshops on American Indian Affairs 1956-1972," *American Indian Quarterly* 38.2 (Spring 2014): 207-236; Joane Nagel, *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Joane Nagel "The Political Mobilization of Native Americans," *Social Science Journal* 19.3 (1982): 37-45.; Bradley G. Shreve, "'From Time Immemorial': The Fish-In Movement and the Rise of Intertribal Activism," *Pacific Historical Review* 78.3 (2009): 403-434; Bradley G. Shreve, *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism*. (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011); Paul Chaat Smith and Robert Allen Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee* (New York: The New Press, 1996); Sherry L. Smith, *Hippies, Indians, and the Fight for Red Power* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Kenneth S. Stern, *Loud Hawk: The United State versus the American Indian Movement* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994); James Treat, *Around the Sacred Fire: Native Religious Activism in the Red Power Era* (New York: Palgrave, 2003); David E. Wilkins, *American Indian Politics and the American Political System* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2002); H.W. Wilson, "Beyond Red Power," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 32.3 (2008): 51-72.

¹⁶ Gerard A. Hauser *Prisoners of Conscience: Moral Vernaculars of Political Agency* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2012); *Public Modalities: Rhetoric, Culture, Media, and the Shape of Public Life*, Eds. Daniel C. Brouwer and Robert Asen (Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 2010); Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (Brooklyn, NY: Zone Books, 2002); Christian Lundberg, *Lacan in Public: Psychoanalysis and the Science of Rhetoric* (Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 2012); Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989); Dana L. Cloud, *We are the Union: Democratic Unionism and Dissent at Boeing* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2011); *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999); John Dewey, *The Public and its Problems* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1927).

¹⁷ Jeffrey Nealon, *Alterity Politics: Ethics and Performative Subjectivity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998); Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2014); Cheryl Walker, *Indian Nation: Native American Literature and Nineteenth-Century Nationalisms* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997); Darrel Allan Wanzer, "Delinking Rhetoric, or Revisiting McGee's Fragmentation Thesis through Decoloniality," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 15.4 (2012): 647-658; John Sanchez, Mary Stuckey, and Richard Morris, "Rhetorical Exclusion: The Government's Case Against American Indian Activists, AIM and Leonard Peltier," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 23.2 (1999): 27-45; Richard Morris and Philip Wander, "Native American Rhetoric: Dancing in the Shadows of the Ghost Dance," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76 (1990): 164-191; Randall Lake, "Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69 (1983): 127-142; Maurice Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Quebecois," In *The Routledge Reader in Rhetorical*

instead I make pragmatic use of diverse theoretical literature insofar as it helps explain my case study. Randall Lake, for example, offers a reading of the Red Power Movement that I put into conversation with my own rhetorical analysis of indigenous activism, especially in terms of strategies and goals.¹⁸ There is also important literature on social movements in the fields of Communication and Sociology. In particular, I am inspired David Snow's "frame theory" and Alberto Melucci's hermeneutic approach to social movements.¹⁹

Methodology

The key primary sources for this project are oral interview transcripts from the Samuel Proctor Oral History Program and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill's Southern Oral History Project. These interviews, totaling well over 150, come from

Criticism. Eds. Brian L. Ott and Greg Dickinson (New York: Routledge, 2013): 432-447; Jeremy Engels, "Equipped for Murder: The Paxton Boys and 'the Spirit of Killing all Indians' in Pennsylvania, 1763-1764," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 8.3 (2005): 355-381; Lisa M. Gring-Pemble, "'Are We Going to Govern by Anecdote?' Rhetorical Constructions of Welfare Recipients in Congressional Hearings, Debates, and Legislation, 1992-1996," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87.4 (2001): 341-365.

¹⁸ Jason Edward Black, "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95.1 (2009): 66-88; Jason Edward Black, "Native Authenticity, Rhetorical Circulation, and Neocolonial Decay: The Case of Chief Seattle's Controversial Speech," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 15.4 (2012): 635-645; Danielle Endrese, "American Indian Activism and Audience: Rhetorical Analysis of Leonard Peltier's Response to Denial of Clemency," *Communication Reports* 24.1 (2011): 1-11; Casey Kelly, "Blood-speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 8.3 (2011): 240-265; Randall A. Lake, "Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69.2 (1983): 127-142.

¹⁹ Sidney Tarrow, *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011); *Frames of Social Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective*, Eds. Hank Johnston and John A. Noakes (Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005); Erving Goffman, *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*, (New York: The Free Press, 1964); Alberto Melucci, *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

both Lumbee and Tuscarora activists reflecting on the political, social, cultural, and material contexts of the two respective movements, as well as the brief “Save Old Main” movement. The Wilson archives at University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill also help substantiate the political economy and culture of Robeson County. Of particular value for this project are notes and memos from the Lumbee Regional Development Association (LRDA) located in the Helen Scheirbeck Papers. In addition, I had access to the digital archives of the local newspaper, *The Robesonian*, as well as several other regional and statewide newspapers that covered the elections and the emergence of the Tuscarora.²⁰ Given these methodological conditions, I believe I have legitimate grounds to speculate about the dominant rhetorical frameworks used to mobilize citizens and interpret their effects based on the reported outcomes.

Key Terms

“Rhetoric,” “framework,” and “citizenship” all play central roles in my thesis. I understand my “rhetorical criticism” to be an investigation of the consequences of speech, language, and representation. I search for broad themes that emerge from a large series of diverse texts, although I do incorporate more traditional texts, such as presidential speeches. I consider these recurring themes of representation to be “frames” or “frameworks” that *thematize*, or order, phenomena in a way that coordinates

²⁰ Digital newspaper archives include the *Robesonian* (previously known as the *Lumberton*), *Asheville Citizen-Times*, *Charlotte Observer*, *Fayetteville Observer*, *Daily Reflector*, *News and Observer*, *Winston-Salem Journal*.

behavior.²¹ For instance, the “frame” of “tribal citizenship,” when evoked and directed at particular events, works to the extent that it makes meaning of events at hand. Through such meaning-making, “tribal citizenship” frameworks position adherents in such a way that their membership to a tribe becomes the dominant reference point for understanding their political reality. Put simply, frameworks strategically simplify reality with political consequences. My understanding of “citizenship” is simply whatever relates to, or designates, an understanding of one’s rights. The understanding of one’s rights, or lack thereof, is always contextually bound. For example, “citizenship” comes prepackaged for the indigenous of Robeson County with a collection of different legal and political signifiers, which I argue affects their sense of their rights and partly structures their behavior. The different outside discourses, such as “self-determination” or “Red Power,” combine with vernacular frameworks and create new, contingent visions of citizenship.

Chapter 2: Mobilizing Urban Lumbee: Self-Determination Rhetoric

The rhetoric of federal "self-determination" public policy in the late 1960s and early 1970s greatly impacted the Lumbee movement's dominant rhetorical frames and appeals. I argue that self-determination rhetoric, an externally generated discourse, reimagined Robeson County American Indian citizenship as an economic integration and partnership with mainstream American society. By adopting this framework, the Lumbee

²¹ The notion of frame weaves throughout the work of rhetorical scholars and sociologists. See especially Kenneth Burke, "Terministic Screens" in *Language as Symbolic Action* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966); Erving Goffman, *Frame Analysis* (London: Harper and Row, 1974); David A. Snow, "Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields," in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Eds. David A. Snow, S.A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004): 380–412.

movement sutured an indigenous identity of "Lumbee" to a rhetoric that created a uniquely urban social movement discourse that, at times, excluded rural indigenous voices. In fact, the tribal name "Lumbee" would become the main rhetorical wedge between urban and rural indigenous activists in the years to follow. This chapter substantiates its argument through the close textual examination of two key presidential speeches, archival documents, and oral interview transcripts from activists and the three NGOs that helped start the movement. The study of the Lumbee movement's rhetoric can inform scholars about the various ways federal policy can impact and inform the rhetorical dimensions of indigenous activism. The Lumbee movement also offers a robust historical case-study to rethink the dynamics of urban protest at the intersection of indigeneity and class. Social movement theorist Manuel Castells claims "urban social movements" combine struggles over consumption with "those for community culture" and "political self-determination."²² The Lumbee movement's rhetoric notably reflects a vernacular interpretation of these priorities and an instance when they closely aligned with state governance. "Lumbee," as a result, became the vehicle through which an indigenous community culture was celebrated and integrated into urban spaces.

²² Manuel Castells, *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983): 300-305. See Margit Mayer's analysis of Castells, "Manuel Castells' The City and the Grassroots," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30.1 (2006): 202.

Chapter 3: Blood Memory: Tuscarora and the Countersymbols of Red Power Rhetoric

In 1971 a predominantly rural indigenous movement began in Robeson County, North Carolina. Through the examination of extensive archive material and oral interview transcripts from activists, I analyze how the emergence and construction of the Tuscarora movement was partly defined by the competing Lumbee movement's dominant rhetorical frames. The rhetoric of Red Power as reimagined by the Tuscarora movement amplified Tuscarora appeals to tribal authenticity and blood quanta, which in the end became an exclusionary appeal that led to several purges within the movement in pursuit of "perfect" Tuscarora blood. Nevertheless, the rhetoric of the Tuscarora countermovement was still largely effective as an oppositional vision of indigenous citizenship expressed through appeals to political sovereignty, tribal authenticity, and civil disobedience/militarism. The countermovement's rhetoric was strategically combined with the controversial tribal history and name "Tuscarora," thereby rejecting the purportedly neutral "umbrella" name "Lumbee." First, I detail the broader context of the Red Power movement and isolate several rhetorical themes that both the American Indian Movement, in particular, and the Tuscarora movement shared. The Tuscarora, a non-reservation rural indigenous group, followed a number of other non-reservation American Indians by initially appealing to a type of pan-Indianness that invoked the question of tribal authenticity. Focus on tribal authenticity affected the way that the Tuscarora framed local issues as well as affected the way outside actors perceived them. Urban Lumbee, at times, framed rural activists as ignorant and backwards citizens who were, at best, a mechanism for publicizing Robeson

County politics. This paper can help add to the historical understanding of American Indian activism at the intersection of rural citizenship and indigeneity.

Chapter 4: Remembering Indigenous Education: The “Save Old Main” Movement

The “Save Old Main” movement temporarily united competing indigenous rhetoric in 1972. Through the examination of archival documents, newspapers, and oral interview transcripts from indigenous activists, I describe how the threatened destruction of "Old Main," one of the first United States tribal colleges, served as a symbolic resource for two competing indigenous organizations. The “Save Old Main” movement temporarily fused dominant Tuscarora and Lumbee frameworks by appealing to a shared history of oppression instigated by a common enemy. Specifically, Tuscarora and Lumbee activists used the Old Main building to reconcile their conflicting views on indigenous education and integration. I argue that the movement was able to reconcile the moderate urban Lumbee appeals to cultural appreciation, economic development, and civic engagement with the more militant rural Tuscarora appeals to tribal authenticity, political sovereignty, and civil disobedience. As a result, the movement was able to combine the Tuscarora’s penchant for staged media spectacles with the Lumbee’s connections in Raleigh, NC, and Washington, D.C. Gubernatorial candidate James E. Holshouser added the missing link to the "Save Old Main" movement: a common, tangible enemy. Holshouser, in the process, helped popularize the movement while using it to create an indigenous voting bloc. A close textual analysis of Holshouser’s speeches demonstrates how he framed the destruction of Old Main as just the most recent episode

in a long history of Democratic oppression. An analysis of the “Save Old Main” movement contributes to discussions on strategic framing, protest at the intersections of race, ethnicity, and public memory, and the potential risks of third-party interests in grassroots movements.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In the conclusion I explicitly connect the different chapters and the project’s overall theoretical and historical significance. I discuss how rhetorical studies can benefit from understanding the rhetoric of political mobilization at the intersections of indigeneity, class, and public memory. Additionally, I offer conclusions about how these issues relate to the rhetorical limitations of dissent and social movement studies and suggest future research questions related to political contestation from unrecognized indigenous citizens. I finish with a suggestion for how rhetorical criticism can uniquely contribute to the study of mobilizing frameworks.

Conclusion

Cultural and political unity seemed palpable for many indigenous citizens in 1967. Visiting anthropologists Gerald Sider and Karen Blu describe the burgeoning optimism and sense of personal agency spreading throughout Robeson County, dubbing this time the “Spring of Hope.” Yet shortly afterwards, there was only increased fragmentation in the tribal population. The Lumbee movement’s rhetoric of “self-

determination,” while resonant with many urban indigenous, was inadequate for bridging entrenched legal and material divisions. Instead the Lumbee movement operated as a “mediating framework” that inscribed new issues, such as integration and education reform, onto old frames of tribal culture, reinvigorating these old frames with new themes and rhetorical styles. Today the legalistic route is the favored path for material aid and civic justice. I agree with political philosopher James Tully that the very nature of federal appeals presupposes the illegitimacy of indigenous Americans. Thus, such attempts must navigate impossibly vague rhetorical terrain that often only reaffirms the court’s legitimacy and places agency under an interpretive horizon that is built to exclude it.

The Lumbee and Tuscarora activism illustrates the critical roles that language and representation play in framing and coordinating social and political dissent. Further, it sheds light on how indigenous actors, outside of federal courts, innovated and crafted mobilizing frames related to local conditions. Rhetorical criticism must follow the grassroots activists’ lead and vigilantly look at the material conditions underlying the dominant frames and representations. In the end, symbols do not constitute basic survival and equality. Symbols guide, shape, provoke, and conceal perspectives of reality, but it is for the sake of reality—or of what reality *ought to be*—that these symbols are born, and therefore also the standard against which symbols must continually be judged. The indigenous of Robeson County, North Carolina, have much to teach scholars about the relationship between speech and the realities of oppression often lingering below.

Chapter 2

Mobilizing Urban “Lumbee”: The Rhetoric of “Self-Determination” in Robeson County, North Carolina

Political change was slow to come to Robeson County, the swampy southeastern region of North Carolina, despite severe economic and social inequality throughout the 1950s and 1960s.²³ By the late-1960s, the county posed a myriad of challenges to social activists, especially those more familiar with African American civil rights movements. Politically, Robeson County was staunchly Democratic. The Democratic Party had long represented the status quo throughout North Carolina to virtually no opposition. Economically, wealth was concentrated into the pockets of the few through an archaic system of sharecropping that financially crippled rural laborers. Culturally, Robeson County was ethnically divided into four recognized groups, making it difficult to broker minority coalitions.²⁴ Official and unofficial segregation was a part of everyday life for Robeson County citizens: separate restaurants, separate jobs, separate schools, and, geographically, separate worlds. The Lumbee Indians of Robeson County, although noteworthy for being one of the largest indigenous tribes in the United States, were perhaps better known for the cheap labor they provided the state’s booming

²³ One of the few instances of social unrest and activism was the widely publicized Ku Klux Klan “routing” of 1958. See Christopher Arris Oakley, “When Carolina Indians Went on the Warpath”: The Media, the Klan, and the Lumbees of North Carolina,” *Southern Cultures* 14.4 (2008): 55-84. Oakley observes how the event was couched in stereotypical “noble savage” terms. Equally important is how the mass media framed the American Indians as “Lumbee,” ignoring activism of white and black allies, in addition to that of the Tuscarora and Smiling American Indians.

²⁴ Several interviews from the Samuel Proctor Oral History Program describe the presence of four races: White, Black, Lumbee, and Smiling. The Smilings were considered their own tribal race and had their own school district. See especially Reverend Barto Locklear, interview with Lew Barton, December 28, 1973 (LUM 155A), in the SPOH Program Collection.

manufacturing and service industries. A broken education system undergirded these inequalities and divisions.²⁵

American Indians of Robeson County started their own civil rights movement in the spring of 1967. One of the movement's most significant operations was a series of voter registration drives from 1967 to 1970. Three non-governmental organizations (NGOs) played key roles in creating and coordinating this activism and helped to foster new spaces for indigenous actors to congregate, form new identities based off shared histories, and work together under a unified vision. Specifically, the Pembroke Jaycees, the Robeson County Church and Community Center (RCCCC), and the Lumbee Regional Development Association (LRDA) built this activist network while registering thousands of American Indians in Robeson County and generating new socioeconomic opportunities. The NGO network, primarily funded by new federal policies I refer to as "self-determination" policies, forged a predominantly urban network of activism.

This chapter analyzes the rhetorical dynamics of self-determination policy and how it affected the Lumbee movement's dominant rhetorical frames and gave shape to their urban network. Self-determination rhetoric, an externally generated discourse, reimagined Robeson County American Indian citizenship as an economic integration and partnership with urban American society. "The Movement," in the process, injected the indigenous identity "Lumbee" into the rhetoric of self-determination. The Lumbee movement's discourse tended to exclude rural indigenous voices that identified as

²⁵ As noted by Malinda Maynor Lowery, *Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation: Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 5, 32-35. See also Carnell Locklear, interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery, February 24, 2004 (U-0007), SOHPC.

“Tuscarora.” The tribal name “Lumbee,” in fact, would become a central rhetorical wedge between the urban and rural citizens throughout the years to come.

First I analyze the shift in American Indian federal policy in the late 1960s, a result of well-fought victories by Civil Rights groups against “termination” policies. The new series of “self-determination” policies, however, proved ambiguous.²⁶ These policies often highlighted economic development and civic engagement while marginalizing questions of political autonomy and tribal sovereignty. Next, I trace how the rhetoric of self-determination entered into Robeson County and became a constituent part of “The Movement’s” urban NGO system. The NGOs’ choice to endorse the “Lumbee” tribal name and history resulted in new networks of communication that ignored the rural, uneducated poor American Indians of Robeson County and their claims for tribal sovereignty. The Lumbee NGO network ultimately created a “block of capacity-communication-power.”²⁷ This network of communication consolidated the Lumbee identity while also tying it to a “discursive field” that favored federal cooperation and, at times, co-option.²⁸

The study of the Lumbee movement’s rhetoric can inform scholars how federal policy impacts and informs the dominant frames of indigenous activism. In this case, self-determination rhetoric found resonance in a uniquely urban indigenous movement.

²⁶ For an excellent analysis of the “piecemeal” nature of federal self-determination policy and its relationship to and American Indian perspectives, see Samuel R. Cook, “What is Self-Determination?” *Red Ink* 3.1 (1994).

²⁷ Ronald Greene, “Y Movies: Film and the Modernization of Pastoral Power,” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 2.1 (2005): 21. Greene draws off Foucault to describe a “block of capacity-communication-power” as a diagrammatic system that consolidates the language of authority and lays the groundwork for a public culture’s norms.

²⁸ Kirt H. Wilson, “Interpreting the Discursive Field of the Montgomery Bus Boycott: Martin Luther King Jr.’s Hold Street Address,” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 8.2 (2005): 310. Wilson defines a “discursive field” as the “larger context of symbolic exchanges and the rhetorical culture that gives them particular meanings.”

“The Movement” offers a robust historical case-study to rethink the dynamics of urban protest at the intersection of race and indigeneity. Sociologist and social movement theorist Manuel Castells claims “urban social movements” (USMs) tend to combine struggles over “collective consumption with those for community culture and political self-determination.”²⁹ Urban indigenous citizens of Robeson County, in particular, were among the first to be appointed to new federal positions and receive aid through self-determination policies. The Lumbee movement’s rhetoric reflects a vernacular interpretation of USM priorities and also a unique instance where these priorities closely aligned with state governance. The “Lumbee” name aided this process by acting as a symbolic vehicle through which an indigenous community culture was collectively celebrated and integrated into *urban* spaces. The Lumbee movement institutionalized their rhetorical vision by constructing a myriad of cultural and economic centers located in key cities that functionally served as anchors for Lumbee identity. This laid the foundation for a rural indigenous countermovement that challenged the Lumbee interpretation of “self-determination” as a primarily economic process.

Self-Determination: A Rhetoric of Partnership and Economic Development

The rhetoric of self-determination stresses three themes, each implying a trade-off: economic development over political autonomy, tribal culture over tribal sovereignty, and civic engagement over civil disobedience. Self-determination rhetoric sidesteps the

²⁹ Manuel Castells, *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983): 300-305. See Margit Mayer’s analysis of Castells, “Manuel Castells’ The City and the Grassroots,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30.1 (2006): 202.

legal questions that plagued the “termination” era of federal policy through these three appeals.³⁰ Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard Nixon articulated self-determination rhetoric in two key addresses. Both addresses try to integrate the “forgotten” American Indian into US society through primarily *economic* rather than legal or political means.

American Indians as a whole benefited from Johnson’s shift away from “termination” policies. Johnson founded the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in 1964 as part of his expansive “War on Poverty” campaign, which played a central role in communicating self-determination policies.³¹ The OEO acted as a proxy between the federal government and local organizations. In this capacity, the OEO exerted tremendous influence on urban NGOs in Robeson County, North Carolina. Oral interview transcripts and archival documents indicate that there was, in fact, significant federal pressure for activists to conform to a specific image of American Indian citizenship in line with “self-determination” policies.³²

Lyndon B. Johnson’s 1968 “The Forgotten American” speech and Richard Nixon’s 1970 “Special Message to Congress on Indian Affairs” make artful use of self-

³⁰ By focusing on the stasis question of “policy” and, arguably, “quality,” self-determination rhetoric suggested that the questions of “fact” and “definition” were already settled. As archival material from the Helen Maynor Scheirbeck Papers indicates, a pressing matter that was continually ignored both nationally and in Robeson County was the “Indian Definition” question. Helen Maynor Scheirbeck, 14 March 1980, Box 29, Folder 237, Helen Maynor Scheirbeck Papers, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill Libraries.

³¹ See David Zarefsky, *President Johnson’s War on Poverty: Rhetoric and History*. Tuscaloosa (AL: The University of Alabama Press, 1986). Zarefsky describes the “The War on Poverty” as a social movement in itself. For the purposes of this analysis, LBJ’s campaign is considered a constitutive part of a “social movement sector” (SMS) (a concept from John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald, “Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory,”) that exerts tremendous influence over local actors without necessarily being a movement itself. The OEO, in particular, acted as a proxy for different local organizations to combat poverty.

³² This pressure, in turn, shaped the NGO and social movement’s rhetoric. Stephen John Hartnett, “To ‘Dance with Lost Souls,’” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 16.2 (2013). Stephen Hartnett describes how nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) proliferate their own set of norms, which usually reflect their source of funding, while interacting with local activists, 227.

determination rhetoric. Their vision of American Indian citizenship trickled down to the OEO and informed its relations with various American Indian NGOs.³³ On one hand, both presidential addresses illustrate a willingness to rethink the role of American Indians in US society and open a space to reconstitute the public memory of past atrocities. On the other hand, both speeches bring the “alien”³⁴ and “isolated”³⁵ tribal citizen into a very particular fold: an economic integration rather than addressing issues such as the definition of tribal citizenship and legal sovereignty.³⁶ The rhetoric of self-determination aligned especially well with urban, middle-class citizens in Robeson County if not those who were in the grimmest of socioeconomic conditions. The Lumbee NGOs’ “self-determination” appeals to economic development, civic engagement, and cultural appreciation first originated, I argue, in the “self-determination” addresses of Johnson and Nixon.

Economic Development over Political Autonomy

³³ Joshua S. Hanan and Catherine Chaput, “Stating the Exception: Rhetoric and Neoliberal Governance during the Creation and Passage of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008,” *Argumentation and Advocacy* 50 (Summer 2013): 18-33. Hanan and Chaput observe how the economic intervention by the government—whether for the wealthy or poor—can effectively bypass the root “problematic governmental structure... [by] simultaneously manag[ing] the deep-seated exceptionalism inherent in neoliberal governance while occlude[ing] rhetorical intervention into its systemic operations” (23). Part of this process is achieved by attaching groups of people to a system of federal bureaucracy that remains “consistent with the underlying technocratic values of neoliberal governance” (23).

³⁴ Lyndon B. Johnson, “Special Message to the Congress on the Problems of the American Indian: ‘The Forgotten American,’” March 6, 1968. Online transcript by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=28709>.

³⁵ Richard Nixon, “Special Message to the Congress on Indian Affairs,” July 8, 1970. Online transcript by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=2573>.

³⁶ Legal scholar James Tully delineates the legal impasses haunting tribal litigation, highlighting what he terms “hinge propositions” in legal discourse that have kept tribes in a system of dependence, the main one being the presumption that tribes do not have “prior sovereignty.” James Tully covers the propositional impasses of this legal phenomenon throughout two of his works: *Public Philosophy in a New Key: Democracy and Civic Freedom* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009). See especially 257-258, and *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 99-129.

Both Johnson and Nixon portray the American Indian “rhetorical exigence” in terms of a history of past travesties that demand *fiscal* solutions.³⁷ Johnson opens his address by acknowledging the importance of “political equality and compensation for ancestral lands,” but states that these solutions alone are simply “not enough.” The minimization of these key issues creates the expectation for a new approach to resolve the American Indian situation. The new federal vision for American Indian justice, although labeled “self-determination,” is not to grant full indigenous independence. Johnson instead articulates a new vision of indigenous *integration*. He asserts, “the American Indian deserves a chance to develop his talents and *share* fully in the future of *our* Nation” [emphasis added]. The collective ownership suggested in “our Nation” implies a partnership that implicitly negates a notion of mutual sovereignty. The vision of a singular, shared nation also implies that American Indians are subjects, like other minority citizens, to the system of laws that have often been used to oppress indigenous people.³⁸

The “full participation in the life of modern America” is repeatedly framed as a monetary activity, one that hinges on “a full share of economic opportunity.”³⁹ The vision of indigenous integration is couched in a long list of new fiscal programs. The Economic Opportunity Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and the creation of new economic advisory positions, such as the Indian Secretary of Labor and the Indian Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, are each referenced as answers to

³⁷ Lloyd Bitzer, “The Rhetorical Situation,” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1.1 (1968). See also Thomas B. Farrell, “Sizing Things Up: Colloquial Reflection as Practical Wisdom,” *Argumentation* 12 (1998): 1. Farrell describes the way that rhetors simultaneously disclose and conceal different dimensions of reality in order to create new interpretations—both positive and negative—of situations.

³⁸ Johnson, “Forgotten American.”

³⁹ *Ibid.*

American Indian injustices. Near the end of his brief address, Johnson again highlights economic partnership rather than sovereignty. Descriptions of untapped resources, such as oil, that await development of indigenous land drives home the mutual economic benefit for both the US and American Indian citizens. American Indian citizenship and US citizenship overlap most naturally, in Johnson's vision, at the point of economic partnership and development.⁴⁰

Nixon also frames solutions to the American Indian problem in mostly economic terms. The presidential address comes roughly one year after the occupation of Alcatraz Island by American Indian activists and was likely informed by the rise in militant indigeneity. The address reads as a bionic version of Johnson's, amplifying the themes of self-determination in order to reimagine a cooperative and fiscally minded American Indian citizen. The address opens with a vague acknowledgment of the need to grant American Indians justice: "[we need] to strengthen the Indian's sense of autonomy without threatening his sense of community." However, Nixon locates the solution to this crisis in the OEO's fiscal programs, noting the millions of dollars already given to fund American Indian "economic development."⁴¹

Far from depicting economic support as a path toward full autonomy, Nixon describes indigenous economic development as anathema to complete independence. The wise, self-determined American Indian should not "risk economic disadvantage from managing its own programs" but instead ought to acknowledge how the preservation of his or her tribe rests on an economic *partnership* with the US government. In the rest of

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Nixon, "Special Message."

his short address Nixon mentions “money” and “economics” over thirty separate times to the exclusion of many potential topics.⁴² The vision of indigenous citizenship, like Johnson’s, integrates the American Indian into US society by portraying economic development as the primary vehicle for justice. This strong focus on fiscal matters casts a large shadow over discussions of “political autonomy” and functionally negates discussions of sovereignty outside of the colonizing state’s economic structure.⁴³

Cultural Identity over Tribal Sovereignty

Johnson and Nixon are able to further sidestep discussions of tribal sovereignty by depicting indigenous culture as just another culture within the United States. This rhetoric is reinforced through reference to the US’s pluralist society and its call to preserve diversity through acts of cultural appreciation. Both presidents draw off the previous theme by suggesting that cultural preservation comes through economic prosperity rather than a reconfiguration of political order. Johnson frames the trouble within American Indian communities as a multicultural or civilizational angst: “[the] American Indian, once proud and free, is torn now between white and tribal values; between politics and language of the white man and his own historic culture.” Descriptions of how tribal identity and culture can in fact be salvaged through integration into US society supplant discussions on the nature or cause of indigenous loss of freedom. Johnson recommends “economic opportunity,” the training of teachers “familiar with Indian history, culture and language,” and giving citizens “freedom of choice . . . with respect for Indian culture”

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2014). Simpson applies James Tully’s legal theory to the case of the Mohawks, particularly the Mohawk’s fight for reciprocity from Canada—a settler state—that acknowledges mutual sovereignty, not for *recognition*, which implies a dependent relationship.

in order to “bridge” the “white and tribal” cultures.⁴⁴ Nowhere in his address does Johnson mention “sovereignty” or suggest a clarified legal process for determining tribal identity. Instead, all of Johnson’s proposed methods for preserving tribal culture imply foregoing absolute sovereignty. Instead of explicitly rebuking the issue of tribal sovereignty, Johnson implicitly undermines it by suggesting the risk of any further separation between US and American Indian culture.

Nixon similarly speaks of American Indian tribal culture as an integral piece of the American nation. Early in his address Nixon expresses his admiration for tribal contributions to the United States, praising contributions “to its art and culture, to its strength and spirit, to its sense of history and its sense of purpose.” All of these commendations place tribal culture *within* the purview of the United States rather than buttressing an independent political identity. The suggested avenue to preserve tribal culture is cooperation with federal services. Pressing issues, such as legal recognition, reservation funding, and tribal sovereignty, thus fall to the wayside. Nixon insists that he “recognize[s] that cultural pluralism is a source of the nation’s strength.” This statement again implies that tribes are simply another culture or minority group within the United States and the recognition of this minority culture’s identity can help fulfill the inherent strength of the United States. The subsequent praise for economic development immediately after celebrating indigenous culture symbolically conflates fiscal prosperity and partnership with the preservation of tribal identity. The address concludes with a focus on the millions of dollars that federally funded programs bring in to help “empower a tribe or a group of tribes or any Indian community to take over the control or operation

⁴⁴ Johnson, “Forgotten American.”

of Federally-funded and administered programs.”⁴⁵ Although hinting at some degree of autonomy, none of these programs resolve the question of tribal sovereignty.

Civic Engagement over Civil Disobedience

Both Johnson’s and Nixon’s addresses associate economic development and cultural appreciation with the creation of an indigenous civil society that engages the United States from within as opposed to independently from without. Civic engagement is implied throughout all the previous recommendations for cultural appreciation and economic partnership. The emphasis on civic engagement, evidenced by the Lumbee’s NGO network that communicated self-determination’s main rhetorical themes, aligned more with urban forms of activism and organization than the often more decentralized and polycentric rural movements. Furthermore, the focus on civil society, fiscal expansions, and partnerships implies that militant or “rebellious” activities are unnecessary or even irrational.⁴⁶ Johnson and Nixon likely hoped to deter forms of protest and resistance that plagued the 1960s by integrating American Indians into the civic and economic system.

Johnson repeatedly describes “self-determination” as a “partnership” and “cooperation” with both the federal government and local “private industry.” The American Indian, in the logic of “self-determination,” can develop into “a full citizen” only through the new opportunities to collaborate with the government. “Self-determination” rhetoric implies that other strategies toward progress that are common to disadvantaged groups, such as protest and civil disobedience, are inefficient and

⁴⁵ Nixon, “Special Address.”

⁴⁶ Robert Merton describes “rebellious modes of adaption” as pushing against popular norms and conventional methods of redress. See Tepperman, L, and Curtis J., *Principles of Sociology: Canadian Perspectives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006), 117.

unjustifiable.⁴⁷ Nixon also outlines the various ways the government can work with American Indians in order to build “communit[ies]” as inclusive and civic spaces.⁴⁸ Nixon and Johnson give power and authority to the current paradigm of United States citizenship by stressing civic engagement—as if the only thing currently missing is the inclusion of the American Indian. In short, self-determination’s inclusiveness is framed in terms of *economic development as both the acceptable form of civic engagement and the path toward cultural preservation*. This rhetoric of self-determination creates an “ideal type” of American Indian citizenship that ignores questions of political autonomy and tribal sovereignty while implicitly denigrating civil disobedience.⁴⁹

The themes of civic engagement, economic development, and tribal identity triangulate to form the powerful and ambivalent rhetoric of self-determination. These three themes loosely align with Castell’s theory of urban social movements, as the Lumbee case study also substantiates. American Indians certainly needed more connection to their surrounding communities. The communities, in turn, had to respect tribal culture and offer the new citizens substantive economic opportunities. However, what remains unspoken is telling. Some of the most significant American Indian concerns for both reservation and non-reservation rural indigenous citizens centered on questions

⁴⁷ Johnson, “Forgotten American.”

⁴⁸ Gay Seidman, *Beyond the Boycott: Labor Rights, Human Rights, and Transnational Activism* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2007). Seidman observes how the reliance on “civil society,” often reinforced by NGOs, can actually decrease the appeals of workers and activists directed at the state, thus holding the state less accountable for specific concerns.

⁴⁹ Max Weber, in *Principles of Sociology: Canadian Perspectives*. Eds. Tepperman, L, and Curtis J. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006): 17. Weber describes the advantage of fictive types, stating, “An ideal type is formed by the one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasized viewpoints into a unified analytical construct.” For scholars, policy makers, and social activists, “ideal types” are useful simplifications that act as guides in the complex reality of social life.

regarding political autonomy and tribal sovereignty. If buying into the federal “self-determination” narrative meant becoming dependent on bureaucracies and the vagaries of the US free market, then civil disobedience might, in fact, be necessary. The next section shows how the themes of self-determination operated as “rhetorical antecedents” to Robeson County NGOs and played a large role in fostering a “Lumbee” community that functioned at times as an exclusionary urban social movement.⁵⁰

Importing Self-Determination: An Outside Birth of an Indigenous NGO Network

“It seems strange that most of the registration efforts came from someone outside or we were provoked from outside.”—Brenda Brooks, interview with Karen Blu, August 21, 1973 (LUM 127A), SPOH Program Collection.

American Indian NGOs started operating in urban Robeson County areas in the 1960s. Through this network the NGOs established “The Movement” and articulated a vernacular vision of self-determination rhetoric. Local activists used the rhetoric of self-determination to understand local issues, such as education, and unite various actors within the movement around a particular vision of indigenous citizenship. It is noteworthy how, in relation to Manuel Castells’ theory on grassroots urban social movements, the Lumbee urban movement was heavily collaborative with state policies and agents. In this section I examine archival documents and oral interview transcripts from the three NGOs that created “The Movement”: the Pembroke Jaycees, the Robeson

⁵⁰ Gerald Hauser and Carole Blair, “Rhetorical Antecedents to the Public,” *Pre/Text: A Journal of Rhetorical Theory* 3.2 (1982): 139-163. Hauser and Blair formulate rhetorical antecedents as norms of speaking that act as constraints and limitations on rhetors in order for them to appear in the “public sphere.” I argue that the self-determination policy operated as a rhetorical antecedent—a preference for what kind of American Indian citizen should be celebrated—for the Lumbee movement’s counter-public.

County Church and Community Center (RCCCC), and the Lumbee Regional Development Association (LRDA). These three NGOs appealed to a Lumbee-based cultural identity centered on economic development and civic engagement.⁵¹ This vision of citizenship mobilized social movement activities and garnered an enormous amount of financial support. The Lumbee movement, in the process, established indigenous identity in new urban spaces. The vision of a “self-determined urban Lumbee,” in a matter of three years, would become the point of critique for the rural Tuscarora countermovement and the symbolic foil to their militant rhetoric of “Red Power.”

From Jaycees to Lumbee: Early Articulations of “Self-Determination”

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, commonly known as the “Jaycees,” was the first major American Indian NGO funded by the Johnson administration and helped foster an indigenous civil society in urban Robeson County areas. Two central headquarters in Prospect and Pembroke, North Carolina, united the ten different Robeson County Jaycee chapters. These Jaycee chapters brought together mostly middle-class, urban indigenous citizens and fostered specific skills, such as

⁵¹ Non-governmental organizations have long played a large role in fostering social movements. From the ACLU to NAACP, NGOs have frequently provided the material basis for civic and social protest that the federal government, for a myriad of reasons, does not provide. Since the mid-1960s, the United States government has increased funding for a large number of NGOs, in part through the OEO, to help curb more radical forms of social and political protest. Typically, NGOs try to foster a “civil society,” or a voluntary collection of people who work for justice outside of the state apparatus. Sociologist Gay Seidman, in her study of transnational social movements, *Beyond the Boycott*, identifies a rhetorical trend: NGOs focus on political and cultural identity more than specific material and class-based issues. Seidman suggests that this focus on culture gives the movements a more humane and sympathetic image, thus increasing the movement’s popularity. Thus, NGOs have a strong incentive to not only help, but to partly *define* and regulate a social movement’s image. The public image of a movement is coordinated through the control of the activists’ symbolic resources and rhetorical repertoire—a preeminently *rhetorical* process. Some organizations, such as the ACLU, are explicitly Christian, thereby suturing its activists to a particular worldview of which they must not transgress without repercussion. In the case of American Indians, many NGOs, such as the National Commission of American Indians (NCAI), supported the Red Power Movement until its activists increased in militancy and forged an image incompatible with the language, beliefs, and symbolism of the more moderate organizations.

“leadership training” and “civic organization.”⁵² Interviews indicate the Jaycees encouraged its members to embrace formal channels in order to advance the American Indian’s position in Robeson County. The Jaycees, at the same time, disseminated a vision of American Indian citizenship that was described as avoidant of “politics” and “protests,” opting instead for civic engagement.⁵³ The Jaycees framed their activities with the name “Lumbee,” celebrating this tribal culture through major economic development projects.

The rhetorical construction of American Indian citizenship tied to economic development and cultural appreciation are present in interviews from Jaycee leaders. W.J. Strickland, a respected leader of the Lumbee, describes his activist experience in the Jaycees as inextricable from his business operations at the B.F. Goodrich sneaker factory. Strickland describes his ascendant leadership within the Jaycees as a process of combining his business aspirations with civic engagement. When these two areas fused he found himself moved “to be an advocate for the Lumbee Indians of Robeson County.” The principles that the organization stressed to Strickland also mirror the rhetoric of the two presidential addresses. Strickland notes the goals of “economic development” and “civic organization.”⁵⁴

⁵² Lindburg Locklear, interview with Marilyn Taylor, March 13, 1973 (LUM 50A), SPOH Program Collection.

⁵³ Tryon Delton Lowry, interview with Marilyn Taylor, March 16, 1973 (LUM 56A), SPOH Program Collection. Lowry credits the Jaycees with making sure he will “always remain active ... I like causes, and movements that are just getting started,” although when asked about forms of civil disobedience, Lowry admits that the Lumbee are the group you need to “go through normal channels and get legislators and governors.”

⁵⁴ WJ Strickland, interview with Lew Barton, December 30, 1972, (LUM 44A), SPOH Program Collection.

Central to Strickland's recollection of the Jaycees are efforts to promote tribal culture through celebrations that mix civic engagement with economic development. One of Strickland's most significant contributions was the creation of a number of Lumbee-themed cultural events, such as the multi-day Lumbee Homecoming celebration, in cities such as Pembroke and Prospect. These events united large numbers of urban indigenous citizens for the first time around the name "Lumbee" while also celebrating economic achievements through various business awards given to influential Lumbee citizens. Strickland would later expand out from the Jaycees to have a leadership position for the LRDA—a collaboration he credits with the creation of the First Lumbee Bank. Reflecting on his participation, he explicitly describes the Jaycees as "for Lumbee self-determination" and credits them for "bring[ing] about unity on the political front, [and] on the *economic* front" [emphasis added]. Absent from these memories are discussions of tribal sovereignty or political autonomy. Instead, a free-market civic engagement that combines with urban cultural appreciation is central.⁵⁵

Other Jaycee members frame their participation as *civic engagement* rather than *political activism* and highlight efforts on "community projects" to help cement a Lumbee identity in urban spaces.⁵⁶ When asked about "The Movement's" voter registration drive, Herbert Moore, a leader in the urban indigenous community who would later be involved with RCCCC and LRDA, admits that the Jaycees had "not been too political but, you know, really they don't discuss political things in their Jaycee meetings." Moore describes how instead the Jaycees trained men to be aware of

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Herbert Moore, interview with Lew Barton, September 21, 1972 (LUM 27), SPOH Program Collection.

“community issues.” Other Jaycee members reflect a similar hesitancy toward “politics” per se, in favor of community engagement tied to urban business development. Influential Lumbee leaders such as Jim Chavis, Dewey Locklear, and Reverend Simeon Cummings describe the Jaycees as an influential organization for young men that helped raise awareness of civic issues while fostering economic development.⁵⁷ As these interviews indicate, self-determination’s vision of an economic and civic partnership between US society and the American Indian was first celebrated by the Jaycees who, through their efforts and financial successes, were able to popularize the name “Lumbee” and inscribe it into urban centers.

“The Movement”: Constructing Self-Determination Citizenship through the LRDA and RCCCC

The Robeson County Church and Community Center (RCCCC) and the Lumbee Regional Development Association (LRDA) built off the Jaycees’ self-determination rhetoric and expanded its reach in Robeson County. The RCCCC and LRDA, with the help of large sums of federal money and connections in Washington, DC, created projects for economic development and cultural appreciation under the name “Lumbee.” Oral interview transcripts and archived memos indicate that both Johnson’s and Nixon’s administration aggressively sought out urban Robeson County American Indians to be

⁵⁷ James E. Chavis, interview with Adolph Dial, July 21, 1971 (LUM 254), SPOH Program Collection; Dewey Locklear, interview with Lew Barton, April 18, 1973, (LUM 92A), SPOH Program Collection; Simeon Cummings, interview with Lew Barton, August 30, 1972 (LUM 21A), SPOH Program Collection.

exemplars of “what other American Indians would have to be like in the future.”⁵⁸ An astonishing number of self-identified “Lumbee,” as a result, were appointed to top positions during both the Johnson and Nixon administrations, including Helen Maynor Scheirbeck, Brantley Blue, WJ Strickland, Purnell Swett, and Bruce Jones. These individuals worked closely with the RCCCC and LRDA’s NGO community to foster “self-determination” citizenship and in the process shaped the material and symbolic contours of “The Movement.”⁵⁹ In short, the NGO network privileged and disseminated a vision of American Indian citizenship that appealed less to political activism per se and more to civic engagement and economic development. Local issues, such as school integration and educational rights were thus framed as problems that demanded moderate activism and faith in conventional means of redress.

Economic Development as Civic Engagement

Key activists from the RCCCC and LRDA reflect self-determination’s rhetoric by framing economic development as the primary means of civic engagement and indigenous progress. Leaders Herman Dial, Jeffery Maynor, and Janie Locklear, when describing the role and vision of RCCCC and LRDA, focus on the organization’s enormous economic impact, stressing the Lumbee Bank, the Lumbee’s Small Business Association, and the formation of a Businessman Club through collaboration with the Tourist Oil Company.⁶⁰ RCCCC activist Paula Connelly likewise depicts the

⁵⁸ Brantley Blue, interview with Lew Barton, May 19, 1973 (LUM 86A), SPOH Program Collection.

⁵⁹ Gerald Sider, *Lumbee Indian Histories: Race, Ethnicity, and Indian Identity in the Southern United States*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 104-107.

⁶⁰ Herman Dial, interview with Lew Barton, March 21, 1973 (LUM 58A), SPOH Program Collection; Jeffery Maynor, interview with Lew Barton, June 8, 1973 (LUM 82A), SPOH Program

organization's mission to spread "social action" as inextricable from the church community's economic development. Connelly recalls when "money from outside the county, people from outside the county concerned about the communities here and funding them" funded Herbert Warren to promote "community development" in the Prospect area. This vision of social-action-as-community-development, articulated by Connelly, was made possible due to large amounts of financial aid given by the government through the aid of Robeson County's own Brantley Blue and Helen Maynor Scheirbeck's involvement with federal self-determination policy.⁶¹ Another RCCCC volunteer, Barbara C. Sampson, also notes the "huge impact" of Johnson's administration, particularly the Office of Economic Opportunity in helping advance the Lumbee movement.⁶²

Brantley Blue, during his 1971 "State of Lumbee Address" in Lumberton, North Carolina, frames Lumbee activism in similar terms. In his brief address, Blue celebrates Lumbee identity while repeatedly stressing the role of financial help and cooperation with various federal organizations, such as the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare.⁶³ Blue elaborates at length on this speech in an interview several days later and praises the success of the Lumbee, calling them "the most advanced group of Indians in the country." Blue notes in particular the importance of the Lumbee's "lack of land claims" and describes it as "a virtue," thus extending the logic of self-determination. For Blue,

Collection; Janie Locklear, interview with Lew Barton, June 8, 1973 (LUM 82A), SPOH Program Collection.

⁶¹ Paula Connelly, interview with Lew Barton, September 27, 1972 (no transcript number), SPOH Program Collection.

⁶² Barbara C. Sampson, interview with Bruce Barton, September 18, 1973 (LUM 129A), SPOH Program Collection.

⁶³ Blue, 86A.

privately owning land under the United States' governance—rather than as an independent, sovereign territory—allows for participation within the US economy, which is the key to advancing American Indian society. That is, American Indians must develop and engage US society through economic practices, not through protest, not by seeking reservation land, nor by reclaiming their tribal sovereignty.⁶⁴ Several days later at the National Indian Day Celebration in the city of Clifton, NC, Blue's LRDA co-chair, Adolph Dial, addressed an audience of regional American Indians and also shifted the focus away from reservation money or tribal sovereignty. Dial instead stressed the importance of LRDA's economic development programs, which he tells the audience, have already received over a half-million dollars in the last six months alone.⁶⁵

Other LRDA and RCCCC activists frame the advancement of American Indians as achievable through primarily economic development and civic engagement in urban areas. Tommie Dial, an LRDA leader and federal employee, highlights the importance of OEO grants specifically designed to form a "Lumbee Indian Caucus for the Registration of Lumbee." Dial notes how the OEO money filters into the Lumbee Adult Business and Education programs, totaling almost a quarter of a million dollars and, Dial tells the interviewer, if the Lumbee continue to work with these federal programs "another \$400,000 is coming!"⁶⁶ Dial's colleague, Reverend James Harold Woods, when reflecting on the role the RCCCC and LRDA played in establishing a Lumbee civil society, focuses exclusively on civic engagement and economic development rather than

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Contained within "National Indian Celebration Day, Clinton, NC," recorded in interview with Adolph Dial, September 4-5, 1971 (228A), SPOH Program Collection.

⁶⁶ Contained in "Lumbee Regional Development Association Convention," interviews by Adolph Dial, July 23, 1971 (LUM 254A), SPOH Program Collection.

tribal sovereignty or political autonomy. He describes the LRDA as “a private, non-profit corporation funded with the sole expressed purpose of doing education, social, and health and economic development programs for the Lumbee people. And we are primarily funded by the Federal Government [sic].” His co-worker, Reverend James Harold Woods also echoes self-determination’s vision of a civil society closely engaged in privately owned economic projects. Woods praises the success of such organizations as the Lumbee Outreach Project and the First Lumbee Bank and underlines important donations from the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI).⁶⁷ The NCAI, although partly concerned with reservation issues and tribal sovereignty, was often regarded as a moderate organization that cooperated with the federal government’s self-determination projects. The NCAI and the LRDA worked together to disseminate self-determination policies and create a Lumbee society structured by federally funded projects geared toward economic development and civic engagement. This was their chosen vision of integrating American Indians into society—as an alternative to protest.⁶⁸ In a matter of three years, these appeals would fall flat on the ears of many rural indigenous citizens who could not find adequation between the Lumbee’s ideals and the reality of rural poor North Carolina, resulting in the formation of a countermovement around the identity of “Tuscarora.”

WJ Strickland, an influential member of both the Jaycees and LRDA, describes both programs as specifically “for Lumbee self-determination” and describes different

⁶⁷ James Harold Woods, interview with Lew Barton, September 6, 1972 (LUM 19A), SPOH Program Collection.

⁶⁸ Sherry L. Smith, *Hippies, Indians, and the Fight for Red Power* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 14, notes that the NCAI was made to “appear moderate and relatively easy to work with” when compared to urban Red Power activists, and the two movements mostly fought for different goals.

appointments of Lumbee Indians to key positions of civic authority, such as positions on the county Board of Elections and as voting registrars. The Lumbee's self-determination framework made such civic and economic cooperation with the status quo seem like the best solution to local concerns. According to Strickland, the culmination of the Lumbee project for self-determination was through the establishment of the First Lumbee Bank, noting how it played a "tremendous role, advocate role, in getting our voice into the economy-making decisions."⁶⁹ His colleagues Dewey Locklear and Artie Jacobs articulate a similar vision of Lumbee citizenship: cooperating with the OEO's vision of Lumbee "self-determination" through aiding small businesses and, ultimately, "educat[ing] the Indian ... to build a little low economy within itself." Once again, discussions of political or tribal sovereignty are entirely ignored in favor of self-determination's rhetoric of *civic engagement as economic development*. Alternative forms of expression, such as civil disobedience, were both implicitly and explicitly discouraged by the LRDA.⁷⁰

In short, the leaders of RCCCC and LRDA reflect the influence of self-determination's rhetorical antecedents by favoring moderate means of partnership and development in urban areas. This approach toward activism partly explains why the Lumbee chose to accept school integration and moderate education reform. These concessions were supported by the NGOs' framework of American Indian citizenship and its emphasis on economic development and civic engagement—not civil disobedience or disruptive resistance. This choice stems from a very material source: the

⁶⁹ WJ Strickland, LUM 44A.

⁷⁰ Jeffrey Maynor, LUM 82AB, recalls his bosses berating him for attending a civil disobedience march on the school board.

OEO and other federal agencies that worked closely with Lumbee leaders to expand self-determination policy. The rhetoric of self-determination discloses certain paths for progress while concealing others. Economic development and civic engagement—at times economic development as itself the primary form of civic engagement—were frequently used to portray the ideal American Indian citizen. This articulation of self-determination rhetoric was echoed and disseminated through these NGOs and resonated mostly closely with a certain type of fiscally minded, urban “middle-class” citizen.⁷¹ In the next section, I detail the way in which economic development and civic engagement were explicitly linked to a vision of tribal culture. Tribal identity was first filtered through the previous two themes of self-determination as a way to encourage the celebration of tribal *culture* rather than the enactment of tribal sovereignty.

Choosing “Lumbee” as Cultural Identity

The name “Lumbee” was not a universally accepted name for American Indians in Robeson County.⁷² The RCCCC, LRDA, and the Jaycee’s construction of urban American Indian citizenship, nevertheless, made frequent use of the name “Lumbee” to frame activism and various cultural celebrations. These early uses of “Lumbee” almost uniformly omit discussions of tribal sovereignty. “Lumbee” instead acts as a vehicle to represent self-determination citizenship. Brantley Blue, an executive member of the LRDA and the recently appointed Indian Claims Commissioner for the Nixon

⁷¹ Brantley Blue, in his Lumbee Address, LUM 86A, acknowledges that most Lumbee are, in fact, “middle-class.”

⁷² Robert Mangum, interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery, November 18, 2003 (U-0008), SOH Program Collection. Mangum states that there was “a lack of unanimity in the support of the Lumbee name over the years... some felt Lumbee were accommodating... with a ‘given’ name.” Similarly, Karen Blu, interview with Brenda Brooks, August 21, 1973 (LUM 127A), SPOH Program Collection. Blu also notes the problem of identity: “Well, it seemed to me that one of the striking problems here that Indians found problematic also, was the question of identity.”

administration, explains the financial—and rhetorical—utility of the name “Lumbee” during his 1971 State of Lumbee Address in 1971:

Since 1968 quite a number of thousands of dollars have been used here in different programs along various lines. Many of you are unaware of these activities ... This has been done and a few other things have already been done through the efforts of the Lumbee Regional Association ... Now I am told that the efforts of certain persons and through the use of the name, *Lumbee*, we have qualified with several [more] agencies of our federal government that have been unreachable, but are now reachable.⁷³

The LRDA’s choice to organize individuals around the “Lumbee” identity was far from a purely sentimental one. The decision was tied to self-determination policy and its strong financial incentives to publicize a particular indigenous identity in line with federal organizations. Some of the earliest RCCCC archival documents indicate use of the name “Lumbee” as a cultural rallying point to attract federal programs but *not* to substantiate federal recognition of tribal sovereignty.⁷⁴

The RCCCC’s Reverend Robert Mangum and Tommie Dial specifically target the “Lumbee” American Indians, ignoring the history and controversial nature of this name.⁷⁵ An early meeting in New York concluded with “the consensus ... that the *Lumbee* people would benefit greatly from a movement toward community organization

⁷³ Blue, LUM 86A.

⁷⁴ As previously noted the name “Lumbee” itself originated from legislation that prohibited any material benefits of tribal sovereignty.

⁷⁵ “Minutes from the Committee on Evaluation and Long-Range Planning of the North Carolina Council of Churches,” from the Helen Maynor Scheirbeck Papers. Coll. 05526. Wilson Archives, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. Minutes during the summer of 1966 reveal that a key goal was to “help meet the needs of Lumbee Indian People of North Carolina.”

... [and] leadership for such a program must come from outside the community.” The only step involving interaction with American Indians that would add nuance to the outside activists’ perceptions of Robeson County was to contact urban community leaders in Pembroke County and the *Lumbee* Citizens Council.⁷⁶ In a later interview, RCCCC’s leader, Reverend Mangum, again describes the organization as designed to “help the Lumbee” and try to conduct “tri-racial talks” which would only include White, Black, and *Lumbee*.⁷⁷ Reverend Mangum also describes how his organization repeatedly appealed to Robeson County American Indians through a *Lumbee*-based identity when canvassing door-to-door, conducting church meetings, and preaching sermons centered on “Lumbee,” not American Indian or Tuscarora, issues.⁷⁸

Other activists from RCCCC and LRDA reflect a similar rhetorical preference when naming different projects, indicating the extent to which the activists’ charity and fundraising projects in Robeson County were in part tied to cultivating and amplifying a *Lumbee* culture. Adolph Dial, chairman of the RCCCC’s board of directors, notes how he received a \$19,276 grant from the Ford Foundation early in “The Movement” to conduct research specifically on the “*Lumbee* Indians of North Carolina.”⁷⁹ Dial also brought in \$30,000 to the RCCCC and then later an additional \$20,000 through the United Methodist Church to form the *Lumbee* Caucus, a group expressly designed to run Lumbee Indian candidates. Dial momentarily alludes to regional American Indians who rejected the Lumbee Caucus, yet confirms that the RCCCC’s task was to form a basis for

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Mangum, U-0008.

⁷⁸ Mangum, interview with Lew Barton, October 5, 1972 (LUM 26AB), SPOH Program Collection.

⁷⁹ Adolph Dial, LUM 126A.

expanding *Lumbee* power, such power, he confesses, is “not given, but taken.” Reverend Simeon Cummings of the United Methodist Church in Prospect describes bringing in \$45,000 to renovate churches and the subsequently rapid expansion of “*Lumbee* Indian churches in the United Methodist Conference,” as well as the importance of training Lumbee ministers.⁸⁰ Dewey Locklear, an activist for the LRDA, also describes his work with the RCCCC as part of the “same Indian trail” that supported Lumbee-themed activities in urban centers, such as Lumberton’s Lumbee Homecoming, the Lumbee Talent Search, and other cultural events that cemented a Lumbee-based tribal identity buttressed by self-determination themes.⁸¹

LRDA leaders Jeffery and Janie Maynor, in particular, describe their work helping to celebrate tribal culture and inscribe Lumbee identity into new urban spaces. Both Jeffery and Janie stress the importance of the Miss Lumbee pageant in Lumberton, NC, as well as the Lumbee Homecoming and Lumbee Businessman of the Year Award. They note, in particular, how the naming of certain organizations and projects was central to their construction: the *Lumbee* Recreation Center in Prospect and the *Lumbee* Businessmen Club in Lumberton, of which the two criteria are “to be a Lumbee Indian and own or operate a business.” Jeffrey and Janie Maynor detail the founding of the newspaper *Carolina Indian Voice* after finding the local newspaper, *The Robesonian*, inattentive to Lumbee concerns. The *Carolina Indian Voice* was specifically created to

⁸⁰ Simeon Cummings, LUM 21A.

⁸¹ Dewey Locklear, LUM 92A. Other activists who worked on-the-ground described their work as Lumbee-focused, yet never allude to tribal sovereignty issues. Paula Connelly, LUM 48, in an interview about Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), describes her work as “working with Lumbee” people to better their socioeconomic place in Robeson County. Her co-worker, Barbara C. Sampson, LUM 129A, reveals a common misconception about the name “Lumbee” when she remembers her work in adult education and other OEO-funded programs as designed to help any American Indian in Robeson County, which “doesn’t necessarily mean Lumbee Indians ... [yet] all there had been was just Lumbee.”

“serve the interests of the Lumbee Indians in Robeson County.”⁸² Most interviewed activists, including Jeffery and Janie Maynor, associate such use of the name “Lumbee” with Brantley Blue’s description of its strategic use. Blue describes to an audience: “Listen, I am very serious, we are all Lumbees! ... Lumbee serves as an *umbrella* [term]” for the Robeson County American Indian activists taking part in self-determination policies.⁸³

Ruth Roberts of the LRDA encourages a similar strategy during her public address in Prospect: “[I am] charging each of you to pick up the banner in the name of creating an Indian voice for the *Lumbee* Indians! ... This Indian voice is to be the voice of the *Lumbee* body of people” (emphasis added). Notably, this is for economic reasons: “[federal leaders] are familiar with the Indians on reservations, they have tribes, they have constitutions, they have bylaws. Let LRDA be [the Lumbee’s] mother!” Requests for federal policies “will be received with credibility because they had been filtered through LRDA.”⁸⁴ In short, activists needed a name in order to appeal to self-determination policies. This rhetorical use of tribal culture, however, was as a vehicle for mostly urban economic development and civic engagement rather than as a rally point for tribal sovereignty or legal issues related to land rights.

⁸² Jeffery Maynor with Janie Maynor, 82AB.

⁸³ Brantley Blue, LUM 86A.

⁸⁴ Contained in Adolph Dial, interview LUM 254A.

Conclusion: “Lumbee” Self-Determination and Networks of Communication

The Jaycees, RCCCC and LRDA emerged in Robeson County with certain preferences in language, action, and organization. These preferences reflected the NGOs’ dependence on federal grants that constrained what rhetorical culture activists were able to promote. Equally important to understanding the *type* of rhetoric the Lumbee organizations produced is determining *where* the rhetoric was disseminated. “The Movement’s” rhetoric of self-determination traveled along specific channels, or “networks,” which affected the formation of the movement and, eventually, the formation of a countermovement.⁸⁵ The Lumbee NGOs constructed a network of key cities in Robeson County, including Pembroke, Lumberton, Prospect, Rowland, and Red Springs, which united a discrete demographic of American Indians around self-determination rhetoric.

This NGO network channeled resources, money, and ideas throughout urban centers—which operated as “nodes.”⁸⁶ Self-determination circulated along these lines. As for the surrounding areas, the NGOs, especially the RCCCC, reached out to the Methodist Congregation.⁸⁷ As interviews indicate, these cities were home to relatively

⁸⁵ Manuel Castells describes the production and reproduction of ideas across communicative networks in his essay “Materials for an Exploratory Theory of the Network Society,” *British Journal of Sociology* 51. 1 (2008): 3-24. Through this framework scholars can conceptualize “self-determination” ideology traveling to different urban and rural nodes which share similarities with each other, yet the shared norms inevitably become reinterpreted and “framed by their social structure,” 7.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ In a county with only 89,000 people, Robeson County is home to an astonishing 250 Baptist churches and 42 congregations, versus only 10 Methodist congregations. Connelly, LUM 48, notes how Robeson County “churches cause divisions”; Herman Dial, LUM 58A, describes the divisions and states that, perhaps, the Lumbee are “too religious”; Elisha Locklear and Betty Rogers, interview with Adolph Dial, July 26, 1971 (LUM 216A), SPOH Program Collection. Locklear identifies as a “Tuscarora” American Indian, and describes his fellow Baptist citizens of Maxton in contradistinction to the Methodists. The Lumbee organizations were so closely connected to Methodist congregations that it created a network of communication that tended to exclude the lower-class, rural Baptist citizens who lived south of the

prosperous, “middle-class” citizens who often had pre-existing relationships with the white urban power structure. Historian Melissa Maynor Lowery explains how white citizens in this area had a recent history of recognizing the name “Lumbee.”⁸⁸ Regions with poorer American Indian citizens, particularly the more rural Red Hill and Maxton areas, were systematically shut out from the NGO network of “The Movement.

The legacy of “The Movement” is undeniably impressive. The NGOs garnered money, resources, and protesters through repeated appeals to a “Lumbee” tribal identity, thereby solidifying a controversial name, celebrating it and institutionalizing it in key urban centers, and supporting a culture and demographic that did not, however, encompass the entire oppressed population. From 1967 and 1970, activists from “The Movement,” traveled through this network as official voting registrars to register an astounding 10,680 American Indians, with a 50% turnout rate, compared to only 2,000 registered voters during the previous elections. An enormous amount of economic prosperity began channeling through the Lumbee network while the voter registration was happening. This network, as this chapter has tried to show, is the product and key disseminator of self-determination policy in Robeson County. In the end the NGOs’ rhetorical preferences became enmeshed in the political economy of Robeson County—and in its own rhetorical antecedents—thus resulting in an ambivalently politicized critical mass, rather than a tidy unification of indigenous citizens.

Lumber River and in the swamplands of southwestern Robeson County. Many members of the RCCCC, when asked about the role of religion in Robeson County, acknowledged the division between Baptists and Methodists. The Lumbee identity, fueled by self-determination policies, was channeled primarily through this Methodist Congregation network. As a result, economic prosperity and Lumbee cultural appreciation was circulated and discussed outside of the highly divisive and segregated Baptist community.

⁸⁸ Brantley Blue, LUM 86A.

“The Movement” framed key issues, such as education rights and integration, as problems to be settled within the given system. Their future collaborative projects, to the extent that they were successful, mostly benefitted urban indigenous citizens. The frequent appeals to “Lumbee” citizenship undoubtedly reenergized a collective pride in tribal identity and culture and helped inspire the development of new urban spaces to celebrate “Lumbee.” The “Lumbee” identity, as previously noted, excluded certain minority and indigenous populations who did not adhere to its particular history. In response to the urban Lumbee movement, rural indigenous citizens formed a countermovement in 1971. The Tuscarora movement drew off of their unique everyday experiences of alienation—both geographically as rural citizens and economically as sharecroppers living in conditions that edged on serfdom. The Tuscarora would form a rhetoric opposed to the dominant themes of the Lumbee movement, fighting instead for a more militant enactment of tribal citizenship and the return of previously sovereign land.

Chapter 3

Rhetoric of Blood: Framing Protest in the “Tuscarora” Countermovement

Robeson County, North Carolina, had radically transformed in a brief period of time. From 1967 to 1970, American Indian activists gave rise to new forms of indigenous activism with the help of new federal policies. Three NGOs in particular, the Lumbee Regional Development Association (LRDA), Robeson County Church and Community Center (RCCCC), and the Jaycees, spearheaded the indigenous social movement, twice orchestrating a massive voter registration movement aimed at unifying American Indian citizens. Activists from “The Movement,” as it became dubbed, frequently framed the activism as a moderate, “innovative” movement.⁸⁹ “The Movement” forged new, financially strong networks of communication united by the name “Lumbee” and connected urban, middle-class American Indians with Robeson County’s surrounding Methodist congregations.⁹⁰ This unified network disseminated the movement’s unique vision of indigenous citizenship characterized by what I term the rhetoric of “self-determination.”⁹¹ These NGOs deployed such rhetoric through frequent appeals to

⁸⁹ Sociologist Robert Merton describes “innovation” as the type of collective reaction that seeks social or political change within a given structure. See Tepperman, L, and Curtis J. *Principles of Sociology: Canadian Perspectives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2006,) 117.

⁹⁰ The previous chapter analyzed the urban networks of the Lumbee movement with a strong eye toward what social theorist Manuel Castells’ identifies as “urban social movement” characteristics, especially their tendency to prioritize discussions of cultural activities, collective consumption, and self-determination. See “Materials for an Exploratory Theory of the Network Society,” *British Journal of Sociology* 51. 1 (2008): 3-24. Under his framework, scholars can conceptualize “self-determination” ideology traveling to different key urban and rural nodes which share similarities with each other, yet the shared norms inevitably become reinterpreted and “framed by their social structure,” 7.

⁹¹ I draw from a prior analysis of Lyndon B. Johnson’s “Forgotten Americans” speech and Richard Nixon’s “Special Address” in 1970 to draw out the main rhetorical themes of “self-determination”

economic development, civic engagement, and the appreciation of tribal culture in urban spaces. “The Movement’s” choice of protest strategies and rhetoric, however, often excluded Robeson County’s more oppressed and alienated population. The Tuscarora movement, in response to the Lumbee movement, emerged out of feudal-like conditions and united rural indigenous citizens in the swampy southern region of Robeson County and its surrounding Baptist congregations near Maxton and Red Springs.

Tuscarora activists began challenging the Lumbee movement in 1971 by deploying a more militant and radical rhetoric influenced by the ongoing Red Power movement.⁹² Red Power rhetoric, although embodied and performed in disparate contexts across the United States, had one of its more uniform and influential expressions in the American Indian Movement (AIM), a group that directly interacted with the Tuscarora. Tuscarora activists integrated several of AIM’s key rhetorical themes and tropes into their own movement and filtered it through their own material, social, and cultural contexts.⁹³ The Tuscarora’s reimagining of AIM’s Red Power rhetoric challenged the Lumbee movement’s interpretation of local issues, especially education reform. Several Tuscarora activists, in fact, originally became aware of these issues through brief and often frustrating involvement in the early stages of the Lumbee

policy. Notably, both the Johnson and Nixon administrations appointed elite Lumbee citizens to positions created post-“termination” policies.

⁹² Randall A. Lake, “Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69.2 (1983) theorizes the rhetorical significance of Red Power and what he terms its “consummatory” function.

⁹³ These contexts constitute part of the same “discursive field” as the Lumbee, but grassroots Tuscarora activists appealed to a different type of indigenous citizen, one that was in contradistinction to Lumbee interpretations of local issues and indigeneity. Kirt Wilson, “Interpreting the Discursive Field of the Montgomery Bus Boycott: Martin Luther King Jr.’s Holt Street Address,” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 8.2 (2005): 306, defines “discursive field” as the “larger context of symbolic exchanges and the rhetorical culture that gives them particular meanings.” AIM’s Red Power movement contributed to the Tuscarora’s unique discursive field.

movement. The Tuscarora's vision of indigenous citizenship operated as a counter-frame to Lumbee citizenship and offered a competing understanding of indigeneity and social activism.⁹⁴

This chapter traces how the emergence and construction of the Tuscarora movement was partly defined by the Lumbee movement's competing network of communication. The Tuscarora's rhetoric, in the end, amplified appeals to tribal authenticity and blood quanta, which resulted in an exclusionary ideal and several purges within the movement in pursuit of "perfect" Tuscarora blood.⁹⁵ First, this chapter details the broader context of the Red Power movement and isolates several rhetorical themes that both AIM and the Tuscarora movement shared. The Tuscarora tribe appealed to a type of pan-Indianness that centered on the issue of tribal authenticity. This focus affected the way that the Tuscarora framed local issues and shaped outside actors' perceptions of the activism. Urban Lumbee, in reaction, often framed Tuscarora activists as ignorant, stupid, and backwards citizens who were, at best, a mechanism for publicizing Robeson County politics. Next, I analyze the relationship of Tuscarora leaders to the early stages of the Lumbee movement, noting the unique integration of Lumbee issues into the initial Tuscarora counter-framing. Last, I analyze the trajectory of Tuscarora's rhetoric, detailing how it functioned as an alternative and oppositional image

⁹⁴ I argue that the Lumbee movement, through self-determination rhetoric, ultimately inscribed new issues onto old *tribal* frameworks, rather than forming a united indigenous front. For the notion of "framework" in relation to social theory and rhetoric see Kenneth Burke, "Terministic Screens" in *Language as Symbolic Action* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966); Erving Goffman, *Frame Analysis* (London: Harper and Row, 1974); David A. Snow, "Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields," in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Eds. David A. Snow, S.A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004): 380–412.

⁹⁵ As Kenneth Burke suggests in his definition of humans—"rotten with perfection"—the pursuit of perfection is one riddled with danger. Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), 16.

of American Indian citizenship through appeals to political sovereignty, tribal authenticity, and civil disobedience/militarism. This alternative vision was strategically framed under the competing tribal history and name “Tuscarora,” thereby rejecting the purportedly neutral “umbrella” name “Lumbee.”⁹⁶

From Alcatraz to Robeson County: Rhetorical Antecedents to Tuscarora Rhetoric

Red Power rhetoric frequently mixes appeals to authentic Indianness with calls for rebellious activism. Rhetorical theorist Randall Lake theorizes Red Power rhetoric as having a “consummatory” function. The calls for militarism and tribal culture consummate an inherent indigenous power that rejects mainstream and oppressive frameworks.⁹⁷ These appeals found popularity roughly starting with the 1969 takeover of Alcatraz Island in the San Francisco Bay.⁹⁸ In the course of four years, AIM took charge of the movement and spread Red Power rhetoric across the United States, garnering enormous media attention and a wide range of responses from Indian and non-Indian citizens.⁹⁹ The Tuscarora’s involvement with the Red Power movement became so

⁹⁶ Many leading Lumbee activists appealed to the use of “Lumbee” as a pragmatic, if not historically accurate, name. See Adolph Dial, interview with Danford Dial, November 30, 1972, interview LUM 126A.

⁹⁷ Lake, “Consummatory,” 128.

⁹⁸ For a robust survey of Red Power and its complex translation into indigenous activism see Paul Chaat Smith and Robert Allen Warrior, *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee* (New York: The New Press, 1996); *Red Power: The American Indians’ Fight for Freedom* 2nd ed., Eds. Alvin M. Josephy Jr., Joane Nagel, and Troy Johnson (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1999); Joane Nagel, *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Sherry L. Smith, *Hippies, Indians, and the Fight for Red Power* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012). Smith, in particular, details the complex relationships among urban, rural, and non-native activists, a dynamic she describes as a sort of bricolage.

⁹⁹ Tim Baylor, “Media Framing of Movement Protest: The Case of American Indian Protest,” *The Social Science Journal* 33.3 (1996), notes the frequent combination of two variables during the protests: heightened media exposure and negative, stereotypical portrayals of indigenous activists.

significant that at one point AIM's Vernon Bellecourt speculated that Robeson County would become the movement's "eastern headquarters."¹⁰⁰ Three broad Red Power themes, in particular, served as rhetorical antecedents to the Tuscarora movement: tribal authenticity, political and tribal sovereignty, and radical activism.

Pan-Indian Authenticity

AIM's vision of Red Power activism often stressed the need for a return, "regeneration," or "renewal" of tribal culture, spirituality, and tradition.¹⁰¹ The call for "Indianness" and tribal authenticity, although exceptions do exist, was typically not constrained to one specific place, tribe, or belief-system but instead signaled a broader pan-Indian authenticity.¹⁰² The record number of American Indians who had left reservations and congregated in large cities, both voluntarily and by force, encouraged this more multicultural approach. The Alcatraz activists, for example, were non-reservation San Francisco Bay area college students, and the leaders of AIM (Dennis Banks, Russell Means, and Clyde and Vernon Bellecourt) all grew up in urban areas and had separate tribal lineage. Historian Sherry L. Smith notes in her innovative historical analysis of Red Power the creative, multicultural relationship between American Indian activists and numerous white, middle-class urban activists. This commingling helped to

¹⁰⁰ Carnell Locklear, interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery, March 3, 2003 (U-0007), SPOH Program Collection.

¹⁰¹ Nagel, *Ethnic Renewal*, 7-12.

¹⁰² Smith, *Hippies, Indians, and the Fight for Red Power*, 127, notes that although many protests were centered on a very specific land or treaty violation, activists frequently spoke of indigeneity in a "pan-Indian" way.

foster initial protest ties that supported a pan-Indian spirituality tied to activism while reinforcing a more abstract indigenous vision of authenticity.¹⁰³

A pan-Indian rhetoric manifested in eclectic protest activities that embraced multiple tribal cultures, such as pow-wows.¹⁰⁴ Randall Lake describes such practices as “ritual self-address,” which achieve a key rhetorical goal of Red Power to “regenerate traditional Indian religious beliefs and to restore the ancient ways of life.”¹⁰⁵ Modes of address such as this incorporate an eclectic mix of practices that helped unite disparate American Indian activists and reinforced a more inclusive albeit at times politically hardline appeal to “Indianness.” Tribal authenticity as pan-Indianness also manifested beyond internal practices and affected perceptions of outside actors, at times inciting acrimony from American Indians accused of being inauthentic. As I will argue, the flexible appeal to authentic “Indianness” would become reimagined in the Tuscarora movement as an appeal to authentic, *legally-certifiable* indigeneity reinforced by an appeal to blood quanta.

Political Autonomy

AIM’s Red Power rhetoric appealed to an oppositional and “rebellious” attitude toward the government, including critiques of federal attempts at granting American Indians “self-determination.”¹⁰⁶ The Red Power movement decried the federal

¹⁰³ Ibid., 16-39. Smith offers an analysis of the Washington “fish-in” as an early example of this unique, multi-identity partnership.

¹⁰⁴ Nagel, *Ethnic Renewal*; Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane*; and Smith, *Hippies*, note pow-wows, teepees, and native dresses at protests across the United States and Canada, even in places where these customs did not originate. Sam Gill also examines how American Indian groups would make strategic use of dominant impressions of indigeneity that may not have been traditional to their tribe.

¹⁰⁵ Lake, “Consummatory,” 135.

¹⁰⁶ Merton describes “rebellious” as another response to social and civic problems, one that rejects norms and traditional means of governance.

government's policies, bureaucracy, and apathy toward American Indians from its inception at Alcatraz and throughout numerous occupations and marches. Russell Means, in a representative statement, said, "We [American Indians] were supposed to be sovereign, independent peoples. Now we have over 4,000 laws that govern *us* that do not govern *you*. And then you get into over 20,000 more rules and regulations from the different agencies of government, government agencies that control us."¹⁰⁷ Red Power rhetoric, as the quote illustrates, framed the federal government as an uncompromising and paternalistic organization that reproduced indigenous dependency despite federal officials' seemingly compassionate rhetoric.

Underlying such critiques of the government was a broader appeal to tribal sovereignty and the recognition of old treaty rights. AIM leaders, such as Russell Means, were no strangers to decrying the federal government's haphazard policies and demanding that the US re-enter treaty relations with American Indians.¹⁰⁸ Against this backdrop, AIM's occupations should not be read as merely symbolic gestures but as acts of repossession intended to reclaim stolen land and remind indigenous citizens about their birthright. This antagonistic attitude toward the US government combined well with the appeal to tribal authenticity, seeming at times as if the two were coeval and mutually constitutive protest goals. Lake, for instance, describes how the need for land was both an

¹⁰⁷ Cited in Lake, "Consummatory," 132.

¹⁰⁸ Russell Means, "For America to Live, Europe Must Die," July 1980, speech transcript available at: <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article19048.htm>; See legal theorist James Tully for a fuller vision of this legalistic impasse. Tully covers the propositional impasses of legal sovereignty—perpetuated by governmental bureaucracy—through two of his works: *Public Philosophy in a New Key: Democracy and Civic Freedom* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), see especially 257-258, and *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 99-129.

enactment of tribal sovereignty and a fundamental part of fostering tribal “spirituality.”¹⁰⁹

The Red Power movement’s appeal for tribal sovereignty manifested itself in the Tuscarora movement’s discrete protest tactics, as well as in the rhetorical contours of the Tuscarora identity—an identity fostered in direct opposition to the Lumbee’s relationship with the federal government.

Militarism and Civil Disobedience

Red Power rhetoric frequently appealed for civil disobedience and militarism. As some scholars note, the Red Power movement was often criticized for its militaristic and violent rhetoric.¹¹⁰ Lake is correct in noting the “consummatory” function of this radical ethos and how it symbolically functioned within the larger vision of Red Power citizenship—an ideal of the dynamic, active and authentic indigenous citizen that realized his or her sovereignty through the radical enactment of it.¹¹¹ Means and Banks, along with other key Red Power leaders, repeatedly stressed the militaristic nature of the movement, often referring to their actions as part of the “longest war in American history”: the war between the United States and the American Indians.¹¹² Demonstrations were usually framed as “marches;” sit-ins were “occupations;” the federal government and opposing parties were “enemies.”¹¹³ Red Power triangulated these three themes in order to construct a radical and often spectacular vision of American Indian citizenship and indigenous protest.

¹⁰⁹ Lake, “Consummatory,” 131.

¹¹⁰ Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane*, 181; Smith, *Hippies*, 161 and 234.

¹¹¹ Lake, “Consummatory,” 151.

¹¹² See Carnell Locklear, interview with Lew Barton, October 12, 1972 (no transcript number), SPOH Program Collection.

¹¹³ Nagel, *Ethnic Renewal*, 165, 169 and 173; Smith, *Hippies*, 23, 148, 155-159, 172-173, 216, and 250; Smith and Warrior, 142, 251, 252.

The deployment of militaristic rhetoric and calls to use illegal methods eventually alienated a number of demographics including some fellow American Indians, especially by AIM's occupation of Pine Ridge in 1973. Sherry L. Smith documents Vine Deloria Jr.'s often vitriolic criticism of the Red Power movement, citing the movement's theft of BIA documents as a sign of its ignorance of "reservation needs."¹¹⁴ Charles Wilkinson, a legal historian, argues for the historical recognition of an entirely distinct *reservation-based* movement that rejected radical rhetoric.¹¹⁵ Red Power's militaristic rhetoric was particularly polarizing in Robeson County, North Carolina. The Tuscarora's appeal to a violent and rebellious image sometimes functioned as a "self-fulfilling prophecy," as was the case for AIM, as typically non-violent officials would violently suppress typically non-violent activists, often only helping to further publicize indigenous concerns while amplifying the media's focus on violence.¹¹⁶ As the following section illustrates, the Tuscarora movement retooled the rhetoric of Red Power to form a countermovement that challenged the Lumbee and Robeson County's rhetorical exigence, challenging citizens to reconsider what it meant to be indigenous.

Vernacular Construction of "Tuscarora" Identity

The Tuscarora movement in Robeson County engaged in the same "discursive field" as the Lumbee movement through which they contested what it meant to be an

¹¹⁴ Smith, *Hippies*, 154, 244-245.

¹¹⁵ Charles Wilkinson, *Blood Struggle: The Rise of Modern Indian Nations* (New York: Norton Publishing, 2005): xiv. Wilkinson calls this reservation-based activism in the 1950-1970s the "modern tribal sovereignty movement."

¹¹⁶ Merton, "The Self Fulfilling Prophecy," *Antioch Review* 8.2 (1948): 195.

American Indian and to appreciate tribal culture. The Tuscarora's appeal to a militant and sovereign indigenous citizen contested the Lumbee's self-determination rhetoric while also claiming higher, more pure ground as authentic Indians. This claim was legitimized, they argued, by a blood-based tribal history.¹¹⁷ As previously stated, activists who were well aware of the Lumbee movement and its federally influenced "self-determination" vision of indigeneity forged this antagonistic Tuscarora identity. In fact, several key Tuscarora actors were originally involved with early urban Lumbee activities and even claimed to be politicized by the early Lumbee appeals to tribal culture.¹¹⁸

The Lumbee movement created major urban institutions that disseminated self-determination rhetoric and its vision of a fiscally minded tribal culture. The movement had the inadvertent effect of politicizing Tuscarora activists and amplified their own interest in tribal identity. The Tuscarora's countersymbols, as a result, were directed at the same rhetorical exigence of the Lumbee movement and sought to reinterpret this exigence in terms of the Tuscarora's unique experiences. Tuscarora activists Cecil Hunt and Elisha Locklear recount in the early 1970s "trying to find out where we were coming from." When asked directly how the countermovement began Locklear states, "I think Indian awareness" and then singles out the Lumbee Regional Development Association (LRDA), a key NGO during the Lumbee movement. He states: "Anytime you got a

¹¹⁷ James M. Jasper, *The Art of Moral Protest* (Oxford: University of Oxford Press, 1997), 307, notes how "movements and countermovements contest each other's interpretations and frames."

¹¹⁸ The formation of the Tuscarora countermovement can be conceived in terms of "publics theory." See Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (Brooklyn, NY: Zone Books, 2002), 66. Warner describes the formation of "publics" and "counterpublics" as a process of "texts and their circulation." Jonathan J. Edwards connects Warner's work to social movement studies in "Countersymbols and the Constitution of Resistance in American Fundamentalism, 1919-1922," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 17.3 (2014): 421-454. Edwards theorizes the rhetorical dynamics of countermovements through the concept of "countersymbols." Edwards defines the function of a countersymbol as to "denaturalize and disrupt dominant discourses [in order] to create a space for the resistant community to inhabit" while also framing the dominant movement's behavior as a "betrayal of a common, prior unity."

bunch of Indians that are proud to be Indian, and they see something that looks like it's going somewhere, and it's for the people—Lumbee LRDA has turned a lot of people off because they have a select group of leadership that runs the place.”¹¹⁹ Other activists credit the Lumbee movement with igniting the question of identity and amplifying “Indian awareness.”¹²⁰

The Lumbee's rhetoric resonated in divergent ways for the rural poor, yet brought to their attention important civic issues. Locklear and Hunt explicitly note the Tuscarora's focus on political issues first popularized by the Lumbee. They mention the county school board's unequal “double-voting” system, job discrimination, school integration, and the role of tribal culture. Locklear and Hunt indicate a serious disconnect between the Lumbee's appeal to culture and the Tuscarora's sentiments despite such overlap. The Tuscarora reinterpreted these issues, emphasizing this disconnect and drawing off their everyday experience. Hunt describes the way “real” tribalism was suppressed in rural Robeson County: “when you talk about tribalism and tribal ways and recognition, that kind of thing, all of that was killed. Anywhere the whites saw any symbolism of tribalism, anything that looked like tribalism or clannishness, they moved on it and killed it.”¹²¹ For American Indians of Robeson County *outside* the Lumbee urban network the threat of white oppression was far more imminent, as Hunt details the abusive sharecropping experiences that many Tuscarora citizens faced. According to

¹¹⁹ Cecil Hunt and Elisha Locklear, interview with Melissa Maynor Lowery, February 23, 2004 (U-0004), SOH Program Collection.

¹²⁰ See also Danford Dial, interview with Samuel Proctor, August 1, 1972 (no transcript number), SPOH Program Collection; Brenda Brooks, (no transcript number); Carnell Locklear, (no transcript number); Howard Brooks, interview with Dexter Brooks, June 9, 1973 (LUM 83A), SPOH Program Collection.

¹²¹ Hunt and Locklear, U-0004.

Hunt and Locklear, the poorest indigenous citizens, who were most oppressed and whose identity was most threatened, began to wonder what the Lumbee's appeal to tribal culture meant to them.

The lack of harmony between the Lumbee's self-determination framework and the poor socioeconomic conditions of those outside the Lumbee network continued to give inspiration to the Tuscarora's Red Power rhetoric. Attorney Barry Nakell, who worked for both the Lumbee and the Tuscarora, recalls the growing disparity between the Lumbee's rhetoric and the Tuscarora's day-to-day lives: "The Lumbees were talking about people who were all exploited but the Lumbees were a little better off than the Tuscarora generally, and politically I'd say that the Tuscarora were more radical, more action-oriented than the Lumbees."¹²² Nakell calls it "sad" that the two groups could not collaborate because behind the various protest styles and appeals both groups seemed to focus on many of the same issues. Lew Barton, a local Lumbee historian and journalist, recalls a similar divide between the two movements. Barton explains how many Tuscarora activists first started in his Lumbee-based group that focused on school integration, the "Concerned Parents Organization." The Tuscarora participants left the organization after school district lines were redrawn in such a way that negatively affected the poorer citizens, creating what Barton calls a "fight between middle-class Indians and those who are largely unlettered."¹²³ Barton's comments substantiate that although the Lumbee and Tuscarora initially appeared to share many of the same concerns and participate in the same rhetorical exigence, the Tuscarora experienced a

¹²² Barry Nakell, interview with Melissa Maynor Lowery, October 1, 2003 (U-0012), SOH Program Collection.

¹²³ Lew Barton "Monologue," March 1, 1974 (LUM 169A), SPOH Program Collection.

material disconnect with the Lumbee that expressed itself through a radically different style, strategy, and vision of indigenous citizenship.

Carnell Locklear, the first leader of the Tuscarora movement and later of the East Carolina Indian Organization (ECIO) splinter group, also credits the Lumbee movement's early appeals to tribal identity with first inspiring his own activism. Echoing Hunt and Locklear, Carnell Locklear notes how the Lumbee's self-determination framework resonated differently with the rural indigenous. Carnell recalls in 1968, near the start of the Lumbee movement's first voter registration drive, how he began to "wonder what kind of people we are." After researching the origin of the Lumbee Bill, Carnell claims it "kind of threw me off ... we're Indian in one sense, and non-Indian in the other one."¹²⁴ While the Lumbee movement was promoting economic development and urban civic engagement, Carnell did not experience the same benefits from self-determination policy that encouraged so many urban Lumbee activists toward these priorities. If so, perhaps Carnell would not have looked further into the meaning of tribal culture and simply ignored the fact that the name "Lumbee" occludes the culture's very legitimacy. Carnell instead felt the exigence differently and began meeting with "his people [to study] history books at night" and learn about being Tuscarora. Carnell also notes at this time a large increase of "Indianness."¹²⁵ These early reactions to Lumbee rhetoric mark the first push towards a Tuscarora countermovement catalyzed by conflicting rhetoric directed at local issues.

Howard Brooks, who later became the designated "Chief" of the Tuscarora tribe,

¹²⁴ Carnell Locklear, (no transcript number). Carnell is alluding to the unique nature of the 1956 legislation surrounding the Lumbee Act that officially recognized the Lumbee tribe while simultaneously prohibiting any material benefits recognition would typically entail.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

was also initially politicized and eventually disenchanted through his early involvement in the Lumbee movement, citing in particular his response to their appeals to tribal culture. Brooks describes an increase in “pride in our identity” at the time of the Lumbee movement.¹²⁶ Brooks spent 12 months serving as a “roving registrar” during the late 1960s, helping to register American Indians during the Lumbee’s voter registration drive. Reflecting on early interactions within the Lumbee movement, including participation in the “Lumbee Citizenship Council,” Brooks frames his growing dissatisfaction as a lack of care for the “actual” Indians. Brooks, through a Red Power framework, elaborates on these experiences with urban Lumbee activists, stressing the co-option of Indians by whites and a lack of Indian authenticity:

We had, uh, a political organization in the [urban] Pembroke precinct which was composed of, uh, basically, of Indian people. But Indian people of a kind that, uh, for whatever reason, basically from an economic reason, was tied to what we— was tied to the so-called political structure of Robeson County. Whereby, uh, creating a vacuum, uh, between grassroots Indian people and the actual Indian people that had attained positions on these political organizations beginning with ... the local precincts committee. So we can say ... there was, uh, Indian participation and Indian representation as far as, uh, the precinct committee itself. But it was composed of Indians that did not relate to grassroots Indians ... if they did they were automatically relieved of whatever political position they had.¹²⁷

¹²⁶ Howard Brooks, LUM 83A.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

Brooks, along with other members, experienced a profound disconnect between the urban indigenous' rhetoric and the reality of the rural indigenous poor. The Lumbee's appeal to tribal culture, in particular, motivated activists to find a different culturally based, or "biographical," answer to their problems.¹²⁸ This initial politicization by the Lumbee movement gave birth to the Tuscarora countermovement, which formed itself in opposition to the Lumbee's self-determination rhetoric. The next section details the unique "countersymbols" Tuscarora activists deployed to directly challenge the definition and identity of Robeson County American Indians.

Tuscarora Countermovement: Vernacular Red Power

Appeal to Tribal Authenticity and Blood Memory

"Some of our blood is better than theirs as far as Indian genetics go." –Elisha Locklear, interview with Melissa Maynor Lowery, February 23, 2004 (U-0004), SOH Program Collection.

The Tuscarora's appeal to tribal authenticity was framed around discussions of ethnic pride and blood quanta. This appeal constituted a countersymbol that challenged the Lumbee movement's appeal to a more moderate and distinctly urban tribal culture. The "authenticity" countersymbol also implied that the Lumbee identity was a "betrayal" of indigenous values and customs. In order to legitimize this controversial claim, the Tuscarora movement cited a 1938 federal report that claimed 22 individuals from the

¹²⁸ James M. Jasper, *Art of Moral Protest*, emphasizes the role that a person's personal experience, culture, and language—which he calls "biography"— plays in persuading activists to join social movements, 210.

Maxton area were “half- to full-blooded Tuscarora Indians.”¹²⁹ The need to counter the Lumbee movement resulted in a rhetoric of Tuscarora pride sutured to the more exclusionary claim of “blood purity” compared to the more abstract pan-Indian rhetoric of Red Power.

The first publicly recorded discussion of North Carolina’s Tuscarora movement is a series of editorials by two of its members in the regional newspaper *The Robesonian*. Peggy Barton and Carnell Locklear of Maxton, NC, both depict in their writing a newborn joy in discovering their *true* tribal identity. Barton’s story describes a highly personal and emotional journey, a likely common Tuscarora conversion experience: “As I grew older, the fact that I had no tribal identity began to bother me, and often I would think, Who am I? ... I cannot express to you, in words, the sheer joy felt by my people, upon learning our true identity ... [this is a] new kind of joy, pride, and hope.”¹³⁰ Barton ends by noting the “Lumbee [name is] a mistake,” gesturing toward the de-legitimizing claim intrinsic to the Tuscarora’s “authenticity” countersymbol. One week later, the *Robesonian*’s editorialist Lew Barton attempted to correct Peggy Barton’s beliefs, describing how the name “Lumbee [is an] umbrella ... [for all the] segments” of American Indians in Robeson County. Peggy Barton responded with a very personal rebuttal, stressing her desire to prevent the “loss of [her] precious identity” as Tuscarora by accepting the name “Lumbee.” For Barton the claim to Tuscarora authenticity brings

¹²⁹ As cited in Malinda Maynor Lowery, *Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation: Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 204-206.

¹³⁰ Peggy Barton, “Believes Indians of Robeson are Linked with Tuscarora,” *Robesonian*, August 21, 1971, 6.

forth a joy in discovering a personal indigenous identity that simultaneously challenges the legitimacy of the Lumbee name.¹³¹

One month later Carnell Locklear deployed a similar rhetoric of tribal authenticity. This time, however, Locklear uses it to reframe the hot-button issue of indigenous education as an attack on the tribal authenticity of Robeson County's indigenous poor. In his statement, Locklear also directly counters the Lumbee's presumed authority on indigenous issues:

The Tuscarora Indian organization has its own plan of maneuvering, not someone else's. We want our own ideas used, not men who have never been in our position. This organization is poor. How could a rich man understand our way of thinking ... [we are] deprived of rights, pride, and now schools ... [but] *most of all our Indian pride*" [emphasis added].¹³²

Locklear does not ignore or trivialize the Lumbee's concerns but instead indicts the Lumbee's methods through critiquing their disconnect with "real" Indians. Locklear adds an emotional resonance quite uncharacteristic of most Lumbee's rhetoric of tribal culture when he describes the loss of ethnic identity and the personal joy occasioned by its rediscovery.

The Tuscarora movement continued to deploy the rhetoric of tribal authenticity in order to reframe key indigenous issues in Robeson County. A Tuscarora flyer that circulated Robeson County in 1972 and 1973 mentions many of the same concerns shared by the Lumbee movement, such as double-voting, racial discrimination, and a

¹³¹ Ibid., "Would Ask President to Aid Indian Cause," *Robesonian*, September 9, 1971, 6.

¹³² Carnell Locklear, "Tuscarora Indians," *Robesonian*, September 14, 1971, 6.

demand for increased representation and educational reform but frames them as challenges to authentic Indianness. The top of the flyer reads “THE INDIAN STRUGGLE IN ROBESON COUNTY,” followed by the introduction “As people of the American Continent and as Native Americans ...”¹³³ From the beginning, the reader is encouraged to identify with an ongoing struggle over an identity, not merely as a US citizen who ought to appreciate a distinct culture within the purview of the US governance, but as an indigenous citizen whose sovereign identity has long been suppressed and threatened. The flyer lists the main battles the Tuscarora are fighting, which include the “STRUGGLE FOR DIGNITY” and “the basic right to be ourselves, our INDIAN selves, in matters of dress styles, culture, and appearance.” The flyer ends with a call for “INDIAN POWER [because] REMEMBER, WE WERE HERE FIRST.”¹³⁴ Central to the Tuscarora cause is a fight for integrity and the cultivation of an indigenous awareness.

The connection of civic issues, such as education reform, with challenges to ethnic pride and authenticity operates as a countersymbol that challenges the earlier Lumbee appeals to tribal culture. The Lumbee recognized tribal culture through a call for economic development and civic engagement within newly created urban spaces. In this flyer the rural Tuscarora’s rhetoric questions the Lumbee’s assumption about tribal identity. For the Tuscarora, it is not a matter of first creating an economic and material base and then simply “being Indian,” as Lumbee’s self-determination rhetoric suggests. Instead it is a matter of first becoming aware of injustice done to one’s identity as

¹³³ “North Carolina Indians Need Your Help Now!” North Carolina Collection Cb971.78 .R65i. Contained in Robeson County (N.C.) Indian Movement in University of North Carolina Chapel Hill Archives, Wilson Library.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

Tuscarora and only then can justice begin to be approached. Reverend Mangum, a leader of the RCCCC and affiliate of the LRDA, describes this deep-seated difference in rhetorical leanings in his 2003 interview: “why were [Lumbee and Tuscarora] people in opposition to each other? Well, as you know, the identity issue, the Lumbee identity is long standing ... controversial ... some felt the ‘Lumbee’ name was given, while ‘Tuscarora’ was a historical name ... [and could] give me more ‘authenticity’ as an Indian.”¹³⁵ Chief Howard Brooks would go so far as to describe the movement’s central goal as to advance “pride in our identity,” a desire, he reminds interviewer Lew Barton, that he considers so fundamental to the Tuscarora tribe as to be genetic: “The Brooks Family [the alleged source of Tuscarora blood in Robeson County] innately cares about Indian plight.”¹³⁶ Brooks comment illustrates the rhetorical flow of the Tuscarora’s appeal to authenticity, as it quickly dovetails into statements of genetic pride in blood quanta.

Carnell Locklear’s early experience with AIM amplified the rhetoric of tribal authenticity. Locklear recounts his early experiences with AIM and his pride in discovering his true indigenous identity at retreats in Minnesota. During his tenure as the leader of the Tuscarora tribe, Locklear repeatedly encouraged members to embrace such Indian pride through an often pathos-filled counter-history. In a 1972 interview he credits the meeting as creating a “warmth and fervor about Indianness” that had “a lot of emphasis on history and different members.”¹³⁷ From these retreats, Locklear was inspired to attach his movement to the Six Nations and the larger North American

¹³⁵ Reverend Robert Lee Mangum, interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery, November 18, 2003, U-0008.

¹³⁶ Brooks, LUM 83A.

¹³⁷ Locklear, U-0007.

Tuscarora tribe. Locklear strategically connected this counter-history to the Robeson County indigenous folk hero Henry Berry Lowry. By associating the “new breed of Indians” and “new spirit ... in Robeson County” with the Lowry Gang, Locklear symbolically tied the newfound Tuscarora pride with Robeson County’s oldest and most esteemed indigenous activist.¹³⁸ The association of the Tuscarora tribe with the Lowry legend was a stark—and to some outsiders, upsetting—counter-narrative to the Lumbee movement. The Tuscarora narrative fundamentally challenged the Lumbee’s authenticity while reinforcing the Tuscarora’s image of a dynamic and ethnically proud citizen who fights against oppressive white culture.

A common appeal of legitimization for Tuscarora authenticity was a reference to blood quanta. Numerous activists appealed to the purity of the Tuscarora blood, which was legally authenticated in a 1938 federal report claiming that 22 individuals in Robeson County were full- or half-blooded Tuscarora.¹³⁹ Activist Cecil Hunt describes his distaste for Lumbee who claim that “being Indian is a state of mind [because by doing so] you’re discounting any kind of blood ties.” Hunt elaborates that “local people need to know, and they needed to know, where their bloodline is, and their [Tuscarora] bloodline is North Carolina, and they don’t know that.” Elisha Locklear stresses how the “Original 22” stayed in the Maxton-area Brooks Settlement to maintain the bloodline, even confessing that there had been numerous “mental defects, that kind of thing, but they kept their blood strong.”¹⁴⁰ In support of this narrative, the Tuscarora movement maintained a longhouse that stood as a symbol of their bloodline’s preservation. The rural longhouse

¹³⁸ Arvis Locklear Boughman, *Legends of the Lumbee* (Chapel Hill, NC: Boughman Press, 2013).

¹³⁹ See Lowery, *Lumbee*, 88.

¹⁴⁰ Hunt and Locklear, U-0004.

also countered the LRDA and RCCCC urban establishments and challenged their legitimacy as centers of genuine tribal culture. Hunt and Locklear state “the whole purpose of the longhouse, [was] to keep people in tact with their culture and what their ancestors had paved the way for.” Hunt elaborates on its preservative functions—both in terms of culture and blood—singling out the Lumbee Bill as a source of inauthenticity: “the fathering of the Lumbee Bill ... the whole idea of the whites was for their land was to get their [Indians’] mindset away from being Indian [because it] gets sights away from who they really are.”¹⁴¹

The Tuscarora appeal to authenticity served as a countersymbol to the Lumbee movement and attempted to co-opt the Lumbee movement’s political concerns into a new indigenous framework. This framework was constituted by appeals to tribal pride and authenticity, which demanded a legal, blood-based legitimization. As Casey Kelly notes in his essay on “blood-speak,” discussions of authenticity and blood are intrinsically exclusionary.¹⁴² While at first the claim to blood purity helped to unite a rural movement against the Lumbee and challenge their self-determination vision of citizenship, it eventually consumed itself. By June of 1973, the Tuscarora movement kicked out Carnell

¹⁴¹ Locklear, U-00007. Both Hunt and Locklear stress how important the blood quanta was in substantiating their appeals to authenticity and, perhaps more pertinently, in obtaining legal assistance. Robeson County’s white community had a strong legal presence, as did the burgeoning Lumbee movement. Through pursuing the old “Original 22” appeal, the Tuscarora’s were able to attract a number of attorneys, including the Lumbee’s own Barry Nakell. Nakell recalls the Tuscarora’s animosity toward the Lumbee name, particularly because of its contradiction of the Tuscarora’s bloodline. Carnell Locklear recounts receiving legal assistance and financial aid from various organizations through the use of the 1937 ruling. Ultimately, the appeal to Indian authenticity served as a countersymbol to the Lumbee movement by co-opting the same political concerns through a new lens, the lens of Indian pride and authenticity that demanded a legal—blood-based—legitimization.

¹⁴² Casey Kelly, “Blood-Speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity,” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 8.3 (2011): 240-265.

Locklear and split into two different groups, each claiming heritage to the “Original 22” bloodline.¹⁴³

Appeal to Political Sovereignty

The Tuscarora movement countered Lumbee interpretations of civic issues through the countersymbol of “political sovereignty.” Contrary to Lumbee calls for “civic engagement” and “economic partnership” as the acceptable means toward social change, the Tuscarora tribe framed injustices as effects of their long-neglected and abused sovereignty. For instance, the Lumbee movement, while originally opposed to school integration, eventually backed away from the fight for independent schools when the white power structure gradually receded its control and appointed several high-profile Lumbee to county and state school board positions. The Tuscarora, in contrast, rallied around the fight for school segregation, arguing that it was an issue of political sovereignty.¹⁴⁴ In addition to challenging the Lumbee’s self-determination rhetoric, this appeal also gained the Tuscarora new allies in the more radical spheres of early 1970s protest, particularly from the Red Power Movement.

The Tuscarora repeatedly used their daily experiences of white landlords exploiting indigenous labor to craft a historical narrative of White invasions on Tuscarora sovereignty. By associating this White history with the name “Lumbee,” the Tuscarora tribe appealed to a more radical indigenous citizenship that rejected the Lumbee’s appeals to “civic engagement.” Early activists rejected the name “Lumbee” itself, claiming it was an attack on indigenous sovereignty. Hunt and Locklear target the Lumbee’s association

¹⁴³ Locklear, U-0007.

¹⁴⁴ See Lew Barton, LUM 38B.

with white outsiders and claim that the name “Lumbee” was a “distraction” that allowed whites to keep their sovereign power:

[Whites were able to keep] their civil authority [so] that they could tend their farms. Sharecropping was big business for the whites so, therefore, if they could keep them [i.e., American Indians] appeased and not cause a disturbance they would make money while they kept them down, so give them something that they could be satisfied with [in this instance, the name ‘Lumbee’], and we wouldn’t have this disturbance, and it wouldn’t cost the economy.¹⁴⁵

By placing the name Lumbee within the Tuscarora’s long history of oppression, the Tuscarora narrative more strongly resonated with the rural poor indigenous who were marginalized in the Lumbee movement’s network.

The Tuscarora began this rhetorical strategy in 1971 when the school district lines were redrawn. The Tuscarora framed this as a tangible, material example of Lumbee-based violations of Tuscarora sovereignty. Rather than relying on an abstract appeal to political autonomy, the Tuscarora’s locally-based appeal proved astoundingly effective: over 50 students boycotted the busing system and performed a sit-in protest at Prospect High School for an entire school year. James Arthur Jones recollects how the protests to redistricting were uniquely framed as a countermovement based on a sovereign Tuscarora tribal identity:

I think they [the Tuscarora] kept a low profile until maybe that period of time, and they just spurt up suddenly up here [at Prospect High School] ... saying, ‘I’m

¹⁴⁵ Hunt and Locklear, U-0004; Danford Dial, (no transcript number); Herbert Moore, interview with Brenda Brooks, September 21, 1972 (LUM 27), SPOH Program Collection.

Tuscarora' ... when all that uproar was that opening day, [and] the Tuscaroras were right in the midst of that.¹⁴⁶

When the next school year began at Prospect High School, principal Danford Dial increased pressure on the Tuscarora parents to stay away, an action that resulted in a violent encounter that was widely publicized in the local *Robesonian*. Importantly, the parents self-identified as “Tuscarora” and demonstrated their sovereignty by carrying hatchets and forcibly occupying Prospect High School, an act described even by frightful Lumbee as non-threatening and “symbolic” of authentic Indian culture and sovereignty.¹⁴⁷ Adolph Dial explicitly describes the protesters in terms of an emergent “Tuscarora” cultural identity with a degree of aggravation: “so, once again, after many, many name-changes in the history of our people, now someone comes up with a different idea, ready to change the name again.”¹⁴⁸ This demonstrates how the Tuscarora’s thematic appeals dovetailed into one another—cultural authenticity was inseparable from the practice of their sovereignty. School integration was a concrete example of violated sovereignty that lent power to the Tuscarora’s framework.

Tuscarora activists also countered the Lumbee’s vision of an integrated indigenous citizenship through appeals to *legal* sovereignty. Throughout the early 1970s Tuscarora activists pursued legislation that would grant official legal sovereignty, an act that upset many Lumbee citizens.¹⁴⁹ Howard Brooks, the Chief of the Tuscarora

¹⁴⁶ James Arthur Jones, interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery, January 19, 2003 (U-0005), SOH Program Collection.

¹⁴⁷ Danford Dial, (no transcript number).

¹⁴⁸ Adolph dial, interview with P. Hyden, August 31, 1971 (LUM 221A), SPOH Program Collection.

¹⁴⁹ The legal claim for “Tuscarora” federal recognition would imply that the 1956 “Lumbee” recognition was incorrect and invalid.

movement, frequently called for Tuscarora sovereignty. His flier advertising the Tuscarora's march on the Raleigh Capitol building demands "the return of the land at Pembroke State University to its rightful heirs and owners.... [and that] ALL schools be fairly controlled by all the people of our area."¹⁵⁰ Brooks' flyer ends with another exhortation for sovereignty: "PLEASE HELP US TO LIVE FREE IN OUR OWN HOME." Peggy Barton recounts her time participating in these protests and her pride in being arrested for fighting to preserve "our [Tuscarora] schools."¹⁵¹ Numerous other *Robesonian* articles associate the Tuscarora's fight to reclaim their schools with their pursuit of sovereign land.¹⁵²

Such disputes over sovereignty cut to the core of many Lumbee and Tuscarora disagreements over the meaning of Robeson County's American Indian rhetorical exigence. The Lumbee movement's self-determination rhetoric stressed activism *within* the governmental system. The Tuscarora countered the Lumbee, arguing that development was only possible through political and tribal sovereignty. Thomas Tureen and Barry Nakell, two separate attorneys, recount intense meetings with the Tuscarora about how to substantiate their sovereignty.¹⁵³ Various demonstrations were also framed as "occupations," much like the Red Power movement's own occupations, which framed

¹⁵⁰ "North Carolina Indians!" Wilson Archives.

¹⁵¹ Barton, LUM 169A.

¹⁵² See Peggy Barton, "Would Ask President to Aid Indian Cause," *Robesonian*, September 9, 1971, 12; Toni Goodyear, "Indian Organization in Robeson may Achieve Federal Recognition," *Robesonian*, January 13, 1972, 3; Delores Briggs, "Picketing Continued by 'Tuscarora': 'Save Old Main' Protesters Plans to Deter Demolition Crew," *Robesonian*, January 12, 1972, Front Page; "Tuscarora March on Recreation Center," *Robesonian*, August 20, 1972, 7B; Bill Price, "Robeson Indian Group's Hopes High for Control of own School," *Robesonian*, October 15, 1972, 2A.

¹⁵³ Nakell, U-0012.

the loss of land as a “theft” of ancestral territory.¹⁵⁴ Howard Brooks and Carnell Locklear both called for a renewal of “treaty relations” between the United States and the sovereign Tuscarora Indians of North Carolina.¹⁵⁵ The framing of rural indigenous poor as genuine, authentic Tuscarora who were “sovereign” and “autonomous” forcefully countered the Lumbee’s moderate activism and challenged their dominant interpretation and political leanings regarding indigenous issues in Robeson County.

Appeal to Civil Disobedience and Militarism

The Tuscarora movement’s most pronounced difference was in its use of militaristic rhetoric and its call for a radical indigenous citizen. Counter to the Lumbee movement’s moderate forms of self-determination activism, the Tuscarora frequently called for civil disobedience and at times even violent behavior. In a 1972 *Robesonian* piece on Carnell Locklear, subtitled “A Militant Warrior Gets it Together,” journalist Olin Briggs depicts the Tuscarora leader as a radical, “angry young man.” Locklear embraced this description, describing in the interview how his acts of protest are “occupations” designed to fight “against the system ... and upset some of the highest Lumbees.”¹⁵⁶ Locklear’s militarism is overtly compared to the Lumbee’s moderate rhetorical leanings. Howard Brooks also called for demonstrations and marches, often bringing weapons such as shotguns and hatchets.¹⁵⁷

Joint Tuscarora and AIM demonstrations countered the civil and conventional Lumbee citizenship with a subversive countersymbol of a militaristic and ethnically

¹⁵⁴ See Carnell Locklear, (no transcript number); Hunt U-0004; Locklear U-0004; Howard Brooks, LUM 83A.

¹⁵⁵ See Olin Briggs, “‘Mad’ Indian on the Warpath: American Indian Movement, A Militant Warrior Gets it Together,” *Robesonian*, August 4, 1972, 3.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ Brooks, LUM 83A.

proud indigeneity that operated as a vehicle for sovereignty. Carnell Locklear led an “invasion” into the Robeson County Social Services building, pronouncing himself to the workers inside as the “Chief of the Tuscarora.”¹⁵⁸ Shortly thereafter, Locklear led a march on the Lumbee Recreation Center and directed a 28-hour vigil in front of the Robeson County School Board. Both of these events, which were regional media spectacles, were described by actors from both within and without the movement as acts of militant resistance. Dennis Banks, a key figure in AIM, describes helping the Tuscarora “take over” the Lumbee Recreational Park and rename it the “Tuscarora Indian Reservation,” an act that he described to the media as a “symbolic gesture” to signify the rights of the oppressed Tuscarora people.¹⁵⁹ These protests countered the ideal of Lumbee citizenship with an image of the militant Tuscarora who enacted its own sovereignty through authentic acts of tribal customs. This strategic coordination of countersymbols—authenticity, sovereignty, and militarism—frustrated Lumbee activists and gained an enormous amount of media attention.¹⁶⁰

Tuscarora activists continued their counter-appeals for a militaristic American Indian by following Banks and Russell Means’ “Trail of Broken Treaties” march to the Bureau of Indian Affairs’ headquarters in Washington, DC. While there, Tuscarora activists—reportedly “the rowdiest”—occupied the offices for days, destroying property and stealing hundreds of thousands of tribal documents, an act they described as

¹⁵⁸ Olin and Delores Briggs, “Food Stamp Application Delays Irk Protesting Indian Group,” *Robesonian*, April 4, 1972, 20.

¹⁵⁹ Bill Price and Delores Briggs, “In School Board Protest: Indian Vigil Ends for Negotiations,” *Robesonian*, October 31, 1972, Front Page.

¹⁶⁰ In a year and a half, the *Robesonian* ran over 40 articles explicitly focusing on the Tuscarora tribe.

emancipatory.¹⁶¹ Upon returning to Robeson County, the Tuscarora amplified their militaristic image by staging protests virtually every other day for two weeks and gained unprecedented media attention—albeit mostly negative—by reportedly committing over 30 acts of arson.¹⁶² Throughout these protests, the Tuscarora repeatedly depicted their movement and actions as a show of solidarity with AIM during its own fight for sovereignty at Wounded Knee, again aggravating Lumbee citizens and challenging their rhetoric of self-determination.

Chief Howard Brooks, in the midst of the media frenzy, framed the Tuscarora tribe as militantly hostile to the Lumbee and their methods within the system. Brooks told Lew Barton in a published and televised interview, “Politics has no place here, not for my people. We will go after our goals through other ways” and concluded the interview by enthusiastically embracing the title “The Great Agitator.”¹⁶³ Cecil Hunt and Elisha Locklear echo Brooks’ appeal to a more militant, action-oriented activism: “Change doesn’t come until people see the crisis of it. If it’s a crisis they’ll see the change.” They once again connect the tendency toward radicalism with their day-to-day experience of white oppression:

One of the things about sharecropping days was when we grew up on farming, if the landowner found out about that Indian people were organizing for a cause

¹⁶¹ Warrior and Smith, *Hurricane*, 172.

¹⁶² See “Fire Razes Prospect Center,” *Robesonian*, October 4, 1972, 2A; Bill Price and CE McLaurin, “In Support of Wounded Knee’: 28 Downtown Store Windows Smashed as ‘Tuscaroras’ Stage Demonstrations Here,” *Robesonian*, March 7, 1973, Front Page; Bill Price, “Second Night of Hostile Action: Caravan through Rowland Results in More Arrests,” *Robesonian*, March 11, 1973, Front Page; CE McLaurin, “Old Main, Grocery Destroyed as Robeson Fires Continue,” *Robesonian*, March 19, 1973, Front Page; Lew Barton, LUM 132A; Howard Brooks, LUM 83A; Carnell Locklear, U-0007.

¹⁶³ “Will Stay Until Demands are Met: Brooks Vows to Keep his Indian Group in Raleigh,” *Robesonian*, April 10, 1973, Front Page-2.

guess what they would do? EL: Put you off their land. CH: If you talked about tribalism and tribal ways and recognition, that kind of thing, all that was killed. Anywhere the whites saw any symbolism of tribalism, anything that looked like tribalism or clannishness, they moved on it and killed it.¹⁶⁴

This daily, tangible experience of suppression served as a warrant for accepting a more disruptive image of protest and to eventually ally with AIM. Hunt describes AIM's help "with [federal] recognition [as] helping push the awareness, [and then] the homes started being burned, and the double-voting broke, and all the demonstrations and sit-ins, and then it became too radical for leadership... white Indians wouldn't have nothing to do with it ... trash."¹⁶⁵

Conclusion: Tribal Split and Resentment

The Tuscarora's deployment of Red Power rhetoric resulted in a troubled relationship with the Lumbee, many of whom responded to the countermovement with their own counter-frames. Lumbee activists depicted the Tuscarora as uneducated, rural deviants who not only represented the worst tendencies of social activism, but also represented the worst qualities of American Indians.¹⁶⁶ In particular, the Lumbee trivialized the Tuscarora's appeal to American Indian authenticity and lambasted the Tuscarora's fervent claims to blood purity. James Dial describes the period with regret,

¹⁶⁴ Hunt, U-0004.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Adolph Dial, LUM 126A. Dial describes the Tuscarora as "ignorant and stupid; Lindburg Locklear, LUM 50A, says they are "embarrassing" and "needy people."

claiming that they were their “own worst enemy for a while there.”¹⁶⁷ Brantley Blue, one of the most prominent Lumbee who worked for both the Johnson and Nixon administrations, reflects on the period with equal parts puzzlement and frustration, revealing key differences between the Lumbee and many poor Tuscarora:

I don't understand the blood test reliance ... [it's] a sham. [I can also rule out force as an acceptable form of resistance] on a logical basis. To the extent that we have advanced from the cave man days it has been the extent to which we've tended as a civilization to rule out force in determining the ... manner of living, and the ... way of living in communities. [The Tuscarora] are backwards, backwards, backwards ... why then make a distinction between men and animals? The ballot box [is the appropriate] system of persuasion through selectivity.¹⁶⁸

Blue's comments reflect not only differences in class, but also fundamental differences in the limits of acceptable protest and rhetoric of resistance.

This chapter hopes to have added nuance and depth to the historical study of the Red Power Movement by illustrating the complex ways that urban and rural American Indian relationships and antagonisms were played out in areas with no prior history of reservation American Indians. As polarizing as the countermovement was, the Tuscarora tribe did bring an enormous amount of attention, both from the media and government, to Robeson County. As the next chapter analyzes, the Lumbee and Tuscarora movements were able to intermittently unite and reconcile their competing visions and battling rhetoric in the “Save Old Main” movement. Outside actors, such as gubernatorial

¹⁶⁷ James Dial, interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery, February 4, 2004 (U-0003), SOH Program Collection.

¹⁶⁸ Brantley Blue, LUM 63A.

candidate James E. Holshouser, would play an instrumental role in bridging the gap between the movements and focusing indigenous indignation on a common enemy.

Chapter 4

Remembering Indigenous Education: The “Save Old Main” Movement in Robeson County

Few citizens of Robeson County, North Carolina, could ignore the rapid political and cultural changes achieved by the end of 1971. Indigenous activists, tirelessly working since 1967, created a new infrastructure of American Indian programs and resources while running the largest voter registration drive in the county’s long history. Activists and their non-governmental organization (NGO) network, in the process, popularized the tribal identity “Lumbee” in key urban spaces. Many indigenous citizens were rightfully optimistic by 1970.¹⁶⁹ However, American Indians could not achieve perfect unification. A group of rural indigenous citizens formed a countermovement in 1971 under the name “Tuscarora.” These activists were concerned with many of the same issues but with starkly different interpretations of them. The Tuscarora movement attracted enormous attention from the media and state politicians, which helped gain new allies in the Red Power Movement. Many Lumbee citizens, in response, decried the Tuscarora’s militant hostility toward the name “Lumbee,” although few could deny the Tuscarora’s ability to bring far-spread attention to indigenous concerns in Robeson County. Vernon Bellecourt of the American Indian Movement (AIM), just one of several indigenous groups who reached out to the Tuscarora tribe, eagerly spoke of Robeson County as set to become

¹⁶⁹ Gerald Sider, *Lumbee Indian Histories: Race, Ethnicity, and Indian Identity in the Southern United States*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 100, notes the optimism among Lumbee activists who at this time changed the name of a voter registration organization into “Hope, Inc.”

Red Power's "eastern headquarters" by the beginning of 1972.¹⁷⁰ Such alliances only exacerbated the differences between the Lumbee and Tuscarora movements.

In early 1972 an exigence emerged that temporarily united the two indigenous movements and reconciled their competing symbolic frames.¹⁷¹ The "Save Old Main" movement, an indigenous-led attempt to save the first all-Indian four-year college in the United States, periodically merged the Lumbee and Tuscarora activists at key political junctures from January 1972 to March 1973. The movement appealed to a collective indigenous memory that stressed similarities and downplayed differences among activists. New outside actors, especially Republican gubernatorial candidate James E. Holshouser, reinforced the movement's appeal to indigenous unity while also redirecting the movement's focus away from local politics to the upcoming state elections in North Carolina. Holshouser's ability to symbolically align with Nixon's popular American Indian policies, as well as with the ostensibly more sympathetic North Carolina Republican Party, resulted in his successful and unprecedented gubernatorial campaign.¹⁷²

This chapter analyzes how indigenous activists and outside actors turned the Old Main building into a symbol of collective indigenous memory and, through acts of remembering, generated a variety of appeals. I argue that the threatened destruction of Old Main created an opportunity for activists to appeal to a unified indigenous identity by

¹⁷⁰ See Carnell Locklear, U-0007.

¹⁷¹ The previous two chapters argued that the Lumbee movement favored a rhetoric of "self-determination" that informed the construction of the Tuscarora's more combative and radical "Red Power" rhetoric. Notably, these two symbolic frames were used to formulate competing interpretations of mostly the same issues, such as education reform.

¹⁷² James E. Holshouser's campaign was the first recorded gubernatorial campaign to both begin and end in Robeson County, North Carolina. Holshouser spoke directly to the indigenous population during both these speaking engagements.

portraying the building as a symbol for both *future* indigenous potential and *past* oppression. Both Lumbee and Tuscarora activists appealed to an abstract yet shared American Indian heritage, which helped to conceal key differences between the two movements. The Old Main movement also appealed to both the Lumbee's claim to urban spaces and the Tuscarora's claim to tribal authenticity and land rights. The activists leveraged these appeals to reinforce an indigenous public memory that reframed indigenous education, a previously divisive issue, as a unified fight. While the Lumbee and Tuscarora movement's framework met some success in fusing disparate indigenous appeals, James Holshouser's campaign added a critical missing link: a common, tangible enemy. Holshouser's campaign connected the destruction of Old Main to a long history of indigenous persecution by North Carolina's Democratic Party. Activists, in the end, were able to save Old Main, but neither the shared memory of Old Main nor Holshouser's tenure as governor could sustain Lumbee and Tuscarora collaboration.

I begin by describing the history and significance of Old Main and Pembroke State University (PSU) in Robeson County, North Carolina. I then describe the unique political climate in North Carolina as Republican candidates began to aggressively challenge the state's entrenched Democratic legacy, in part by symbolically aligning with Richard Nixon's administration. I next analyze the emergence of the "Save Old Main" movement through a textual analysis of Lew Barton's influential "De-Indianization" editorial and public discourse immediately surrounding it. Interviews from both Lumbee and Tuscarora activists voice appeals to a shared indigenous history of oppression that bridged differences between Lumbee and Tuscarora stances on education. Finally, I analyze Holshouser's campaign appearance in Robeson County and how he worked to

unite the militant Tuscarora's rhetoric with the more conservative Lumbee framework by situating the indigenous memory of Old Main within a narrative of Democratic victimization. This chapter considers how rethinking American Indian public memory can lead to ambivalent discourses, appeals, and actions. The rhetoric of public memory in this instance reveals potential dangers of third party interests interfacing, albeit in good faith, with complex local situations.

Old Main and Naming Tribal Education

Indigenous education was rarely uncontroversial in Robeson County, North Carolina. The Old Main building, a two-story building made out of unassuming clapboard and brick standing near the heart of Pembroke likely seemed anything but controversial or noteworthy to outsiders.¹⁷³ Old Main was, however, one of the most cherished and enduring symbols of American Indian education since its construction in 1923. The small building was immediately extolled as the first brick building specifically for American Indian use. At the time of its construction the debate over the official tribal name was not as salient as the debate over tribal names was in the 1960s and 1970s. The building itself never technically belonged to either "Lumbee" or "Tuscarora" Indians. Indigenous citizens at the time were informally recognized as "Cherokee Indians of

¹⁷³ "History of UNCP," *UNCP.edu*. Last modified 2015.
<http://www2.uncp.edu/uncp/about/history.htm> (accessed April 12, 2015).

Robeson County,” although some identified with the earlier name “Croatan.” When the building was first constructed it was thus called the “Cherokee Normal School.”¹⁷⁴

Old Main’s unique history and name did, however, help to make the appeal to preserve the building more flexible in 1972. The Cherokee Indian Normal School was originally intended to serve the educational needs of the indigenous community. Uses for the building varied tremendously: grade-school courses, college seminars, cultural gatherings, and even funerals.¹⁷⁵ Formal education for indigenous citizens at Old Main often involved only minimal schooling and focused on technical skills in preparation for the labor force. Urban citizens, who would later embrace the name “Lumbee,” used the building more often than the rural sharecropping citizens, yet even the Lumbee were never able to fully capitalize on the building’s potential.¹⁷⁶ The building underwent several name changes throughout the decades until it was eventually renamed simply as “Old Main.” The obscure nature of Old Main’s ownership made it easier for indigenous activists to rally around its history in order to form collaborative protests. Both the Lumbee and Tuscarora were able to stake a claim in the collective memory of Old Main, whether through the promise it represented of an indigenous-focused education in a key urban area or the failure of society to achieve such a goal and grant justice to American Indians.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ Malinda Maynor Lowery, *Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation: Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010): 298.

¹⁷⁵ Danford Dial, (no transcript number).

¹⁷⁶ By the 1950s the building was used mostly by white citizens in Pembroke, North Carolina enrolled at Pembroke State University.

¹⁷⁷ One could conceive of Old Main in the “Save Old Main” movement functioning as an “empty signifier.” Ernesto Laclau describes how under empty signifiers “a chain of signifiers takes a specific meaning and enable the creation of a ‘stable’ political field.” Old Main was able to ground a unified indigenous movement precisely due to its indeterminate symbolic content, which in this case came most importantly in the form of an ambiguous historical relationship to both the “Lumbee” and “Tuscarora”

Lumbee vs. Tuscarora: Education as a Rhetorical Exigence

The political debate surrounding indigenous education was at one of its tensest moments when the North Carolina University System decided to demolish the Old Main building and move its operations to a soon-to-be constructed building across the street. At the start of the Lumbee movement in 1967, only a handful of indigenous citizens had graduated with a four-year degree and some only knew Old Main by name or by their grandparents' recollections. From 1967 to 1971, both the Lumbee and Tuscarora movements, nevertheless, focused on educational reform largely in response to mandated school integration at the primary and secondary school level.¹⁷⁸ The Lumbee movement favored independent, indigenous-ran educational alternatives. The Lumbee NGO network, with governmental assistance through policies loosely known as "self-determination," successfully created a number of non-profit educational programs, such as the Lumbee Adult Education Outreach.¹⁷⁹ These programs were primarily conducted in urban areas such as Lumberton, Pembroke, and Prospect, and were sometimes described by activists and participants as furthering Lumbee self-determination.¹⁸⁰ As the second chapter argued, these Lumbee establishments were part of a larger movement that inscribed the "Lumbee" identity into urban spaces through appealing to an image of indigenous citizenship that favored civic engagement and economic development. The Lumbee NGOs, through this process, were able to pressure the State Board of Education

names. See Laclau, "The Death and Resurrection of the Theory of Ideology," *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 1.3 (1996): 201-220.

¹⁷⁸ Robeson County schools were not forced to integrate until roughly 20 years after Brown vs. Board. See Lowery, *Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation*, 253.

¹⁷⁹ See in particular WJ Strickland, LUM 44A.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid. See also "Lumbee Regional Development Association Convention," Box 29 Folder 237, Helen Maynor Scheirbeck Papers, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill Libraries, Wilson Library archives; Danford Dial, (no transcript number).

to redraw school district lines, and thus by 1970 the Lumbee largely abandoned the pursuit of independent, segregated schools.¹⁸¹

This controversial redistricting process catapulted the issue of indigenous education back into mainstream public discourse and was largely responsible for giving birth to the Tuscarora countermovement.¹⁸² Tuscarora activists repeatedly challenged the redistricting and framed the issue as yet another instance of “red apple” Indians violating tribal authenticity and autonomy.¹⁸³ By January 1972, education was not simply a vague civic concern, but a symbolic touchstone for the competing movements. The Lumbee, who were considered more educated and middle-class activists, appealed for more assistance with developing collaborative programs *within* the integrated school system. The Tuscarora, mostly rural poor and illiterate activists, demanded that educational buildings—and the land that they were built on—be immediately returned to the indigenous population. Neither group, however, paid considerable attention to Pembroke University or Old Main until late-1971.

Nixon and the Republican Appeal to Indigeneity

The late-1960s and early-1970s were a critical period of Republican reform and reorientation toward American Indians. Nixon built off of Lyndon B. Johnson’s “self-determination” policies partly in response to growing radicalism from grassroots activists

¹⁸¹ Numerous interviews and archival memos from the LRDA indicate that the Lumbee movement was looking to work within the integrationist system rather than directly challenge it. See, for instance, “Minutes from the Committee on Evaluation and Long-Range Planning of the North Carolina Council of Churches,” from the Helen Maynor Scheirbeck Papers. Coll. 05526. Wilson Archives, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

¹⁸² The first recorded protest of self-identified “Tuscaroras” was a collection of 60 students who, on the insistence and even force of their parents, refused to go to a Maxton-area school instead of Prospect High School. As various Lumbee activists describe, the redistricting “closed the lines, the old segregation lines for the school districts, after some of the rural communities had been annexed to the so-called city units.”

¹⁸³ Elisha Locklear, LUM 216A.

in urban areas such as San Francisco and Minneapolis.¹⁸⁴ Nixon's self-determination vision, much like Johnson's, was never perfectly articulated. Beyond signaling a departure from the oppressive "termination" policies, self-determination was largely an ambivalent and "piecemeal" agenda that left many American Indians disappointed.¹⁸⁵ The Nixon Administration, nevertheless, was able to successfully give American Indians important new opportunities and political voice. Historian Dean J. Kotlowksi, largely positive in his assessment of Nixon's administration, describes Nixon's gestures as a strategic and deft political move, claiming he saw American Indians as a "'safe minority' to help":

Since [American Indians] numbered fewer than 1 million, their problems seemed more manageable than those of blacks. Popular sympathy favored Indian rights, at least at first, and, unlike liberal African Americans who favored integration, Native Americans welcomed Nixon's anti-assimilationist message... Here was a way, he reasoned, to appease younger Americans—who leaned Democratic—as well as appeal to the public at large.¹⁸⁶

This strategy was echoed in 1969 by Nixon's chief of staff, H. R. Halderman, who explained that "[Nixon] feels very strongly that we need to show more heart, and that we care about people, and thinks the Indian problem is a good area [to do this]."¹⁸⁷

The Republican push to redefine their attitude toward racial and ethnic minorities extended deeply into North Carolina politics, a state which staunchly voted Democratic

¹⁸⁴ See Richard Nixon, "Special Message to the Congress on Indian Affairs," July 8, 1970. Online transcript by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*.

¹⁸⁵ Samuel R. Cook, "What is Self-Determination?" *Red Ink* 3.1 (1994): 20-38.

¹⁸⁶ Dean J. Kotlowksi, *Nixon's Civil Rights: Politics, Principle, and Policy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 132-134.

¹⁸⁷ As cited in *Ibid.*, 204.

since the start of the 20th century.¹⁸⁸ Republican politicians had newfound interest in Robeson County minority groups and began relationships that modified the political context and the broader “discursive field” of indigenous activists. Republican politicians constructed a new, tangible Democratic enemy for indigenous activists. This appeal to an enemy often carried the resonance of transgression, yet called for only moderate changes within the system. North Carolina gubernatorial candidate James E. Holshouser, in particular, first expressed this narrative to Robeson County indigenous citizens in 1971. Holshouser’s widely publicized appearance and address at the Independence Day weekend “Lumbee Homecoming” created a strong affinity for Holshouser in the Robeson County urban indigenous community. Holshouser, likely in an attempt to mirror Nixon’s policies and appeals to minority voters, began his campaign in Lumberton, North Carolina, at Robeson County’s 1971 “Lumbee Homecoming,” a celebration of indigenous culture that coincided with Independence Day. The *Robesonian* referred to Holshouser as “North Carolina’s Republican Party Chieftain” alongside a front-page photo of Holshouser next to the House Minority Leader and Lumbee Indian A. Bruce Jones who donned a traditional headdress.¹⁸⁹

In his short address, Holshouser redirected local indigenous politics toward a broader, national conversation by creating a common enemy: the Democratic Party. His address created a historical narrative that placed American Indians squarely within the realm of the American nation-state and concealed more complex issues underlying

¹⁸⁸ Abby Rapoport, “Republicans vs. Democracy in North Carolina,” *The American Prospect*. *PROSPECT.org*. Last modified July 25, 2013. <http://prospect.org/article/republicans-vs-democracy-north-carolina> (accessed April 2, 2015).

¹⁸⁹ Bill Price, “Holshouser Calls for ‘New Day’ at Lumbee Homecoming,” *Robesonian*, July 6, 1971, Front Page.

indigenous oppression such as land claims and mutual sovereignty. Holshouser called forth “a new day” for American Indians, connecting the United States’ Independence Day with the Lumbee cause, thus combining Lumbee Homecoming with a rarely celebrated holiday in the American Indian community. The call for freedom and independence was not framed as an emerging sovereignty of a nation but instead as a call for democratic citizenship *within* the United States. Holshouser exclaimed that it was time to:

Declare their [i.e., Lumbee] independence from the Democratic power structure that has dominated North Carolina just as England dominated the American colonies until 1755. The Fourth of July is an appropriate time for a Declaration of Independence from the one-party rule in this state. Vote Republican just once and you’ll find both parties listening to you as never before.¹⁹⁰

The short address concluded by highlighting a shared history of persecution from the Democratic Party and relayed how both African Americans and American Indians “have both been so solidly in the pocket of Democrat politicians that they are taken for granted.”¹⁹¹ Holshouser also noted several federal grants he was awarded by the Nixon administration which helped align his candidacy with the broader Republican shift toward reengaging American Indians.

The narrative of Democratic oppression complemented the local fight for indigenous education and helped foster a unified movement in 1972. The following section analyzes how the threatened destruction of Old Main was framed by Lumbee activists as a negative consequence of “integration,” thereby creating a bridge between

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.

¹⁹¹ Ibid.

Lumbee and Tuscarora perspectives on education reform.¹⁹² Indigenous activists and local politicians, in the process, were able to construct new arguments and perspectives about contemporary public affairs through appealing to the past and asking what the history of Old Main signifies. Maurice Halbwachs describes how public spaces can operate as symbolic realms through which collective memory and present social relations get renegotiated.¹⁹³ John Bodner explains how “efforts to achieve consensus on historical ideals ... involve conflicts between groups with strong interests in the uses public memories have in the contemporary state.”¹⁹⁴ Robeson County politicians and indigenous activists had such contestations over the memory of Old Main throughout 1971 and 1972 in ways that argued for different behaviors and perspectives toward current events.

“De-Indianization” and the Limits of Integration: The Birth of the “Save Old Main” Movement

The first publicly recorded mention of the “Save Old Main” movement was an *Indian Newsbeat* piece by a prominent Lumbee writer, Lew Barton. Barton framed the destruction of Old Main as an attack by a very *specific* agent, the white power structure at Pembroke State University (PSU), on a very *vague* object, “Indianness.” His depiction of

¹⁹² In short, Old Main was able to quickly fit into a flexible interpretive framework due to three key contextual elements. Old Main occupied a uniquely abstract and indeterminate place in Robeson County public memory. Old Main as a building referenced back to a time when American Indians were both more oppressed and less divided—neither “Lumbee” nor “Tuscarora” yet existed. Second, the Republican Party *writ large* was reacting to grassroots activists and Democratic dominance by seeking American Indians, in particular, to win over. Last, North Carolina politics were in their most heated and competitive period of the century and James Holshouser targeted Robeson County American Indians. This political activity framed indigenous oppression as an effect of political partisanship, depicting the Democratic Party as the obvious enemy.

¹⁹³ Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 137.

¹⁹⁴ John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), 38.

a broad “Indianness” laid the foundation for the “Save Old Main” movement’s appeal to a shared indigenous history that traversed the Lumbee and Tuscarora rhetoric. Barton’s influential editorial piece in the *Robesonian* on November 18, 1971, quickly sparked widespread discussion and debate that often linked the PSU administration with the statewide Democratic Party while retaining Barton’s description of a vague anti-Indian attack. Lumbee activists maintained that Old Main represented American Indian *potential* in mainstream urban society, whereas Tuscarora activists tended to frame Old Main’s destruction as simply another act of encroachment on American Indian pride and sovereignty. Both perspectives, however, focused on *remembering* a shared history of Old Main.

Barton appeals to *both* Lumbee and Tuscarora activists by challenging integration policy in his piece “The ‘De-Indianization’ Trend Observed at Pembroke U.” Barton claims to have heard the term “de-Indianization” during his recent visit to the Pembroke campus, which Barton reminds the reader was “formerly known as Pembroke State College for Indians.” Barton himself was an instrumental member of the Lumbee movement and a leader of the Lumbee “Concerned Parents Organization.” Although he had been an activist for urban integration of Lumbee culture through self-determination policies, Barton admits his recent experience has forced him to reconsider the legitimacy of integration. Barton affectingly asks, “Is this integration or disintegration?” Most Tuscarora activists were challenging the integrationist policies of the United States while the Lumbee movement achieved much success in urban Robeson County areas, particularly in Pembroke, by working within the integrationist system. Barton, a Lumbee, questions the university’s role in integration, thereby inviting both Lumbee and Tuscarora

activists to engage in the rhetorical exigence. Barton insists that “legal, feasible integration is one thing [while] the dispossession of minorities in the name of integration is quite another.”¹⁹⁵

Barton frames PSU’s integration policy in terms of a vague, anti-Indian sentiment. Allegedly “one university official strongly disapproved of the use of the very name Lumbee on campus, and especially of the Lumbee Student Organization.” Additionally “a course in local Indian history, scheduled for the past two years, has never materialized and probably never will.”¹⁹⁶ Although Barton mentions the name “Lumbee” a few times, he markedly favors the more vague term “Indian,” continually listing the lack of “Indian” presence on campus, including a lack of “Indian” students, teachers, and related courses within the curriculum. Barton avoids polarizing the competing indigenous movements by refusing to make the issue exclusively about “Lumbee.” Barton concludes:

There is definitely anti-Indian sentiment among members of the faculty ... De-Indianization of Pembroke State University is not just a phrase, nor is it a myth. It is a grim reality, whatever its causes; and seems to be a deliberate process, designed to strip the institution of the last vestige of anything Indian.¹⁹⁷

After describing this vague threat from the university, Barton appeals to a shared indigenous history, claiming that “Old Main, the last building on campus directly connected with PSU’s past, is scheduled to be torn down and that no plea or pleas would

¹⁹⁵ Lew Barton, “The ‘De-Indianization’ Trend Observed at Pembroke U.” *Robesonian*, November 18, 1971, A7.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

suffice to preserve it.”¹⁹⁸ The emphasis on “de-Indianization,” not exclusively Lumbee or Tuscarora, invites both movements to consider the limitations to integration.

A series of editorials following Barton’s piece amplify a pan-Indian perspective on the issues of integration and equal education opportunities, notably echoing Barton’s term “de-Indianization.” This public dialogue fostered space for Lumbee and Tuscarora collaboration because it challenged integrationist policies from a Lumbee-based perspective. The dialogue following Barton’s piece was largely between indigenous citizens and white administrators which reinforced the sense of a common enemy while overlooking differences between Lumbee and Tuscarora. Gene Warren, an official at PSU, was the first to respond to Barton in the *Robesonian*. Warren’s piece deflects blame and projects it back onto American Indians by suggesting that indigenous students simply need to work harder. He argues that officials are not propagating an anti-Indian agenda, but merely acting in accordance with the law. PSU policy itself has not decreased the number of American Indians at the university, he notes, but in fact the 1954 Supreme Court’s ruling in *Brown vs. Board of Education* forced the school to be open to non-Indian students. Clearly, he argues, the chance to attend is there for all students. If there is a decrease in indigenous students they simply are not working hard enough. Warren repeatedly stresses that “they have the same opportunity” and that “with determination the Lumbee Indian young people can help to launch an Indian studies program, win class offices, be good students and star athletes.”¹⁹⁹ The reaction by Lumbee readers indicates

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹⁹ Gene Warren, “No ‘De-Indianization’ at PSU,” *Robesonian*, November 21, 1971, A7.

that Warren's argument disrupted expectations about how integration ought to work, which helped to create a bridge between the Lumbee and Tuscarora views on education.

Several days later, a Lumbee Indian named R. Ackley responded to Warren and stressed the "de-Indianization" of the campus while accusing the PSU administration, in particular, of taking advantage of integrationist policies. Ackley's short editorial helps create a pan-Indian exigence by stressing the negative effects the situation has on all indigenous citizens. Ackley directly challenges the legitimacy of integration and its effect on American Indian culture by asking, "Why disintegrate the Indian heritage? The school was chartered Indian. The black schools remain through their own efforts for their own people. Pembroke becomes white. Sad."²⁰⁰ Several days later, another Pembroke resident named R. Ashurst Jr. zeroed in on the *Brown vs. Board of Education* ruling. Lumbee activists were mostly in favor of integration by 1970, but here Ashurst echoes a Tuscarora argument by claiming that integration *is* the central issue. Ashurst also singles out the administration at PSU, including the Lumbee administrator James Locklear, claiming their integrationist approach to education is out of touch with indigenous concerns.²⁰¹

Creating a Unified Movement

Indigenous activists quickly channeled their anger at PSU's integrationist policies into resistance toward the destruction of the Old Main building starting in January 1972. The Lumbee and Tuscarora movements were able to temporarily unite during the "Save

²⁰⁰ R. Ackley, "Indians at PSU," *Robesonian*, November 23, 1971, 8.

²⁰¹ R. Ashurst Jr., "Integration and Indian Education at PSU," *Robesonian*, December 6, 1971, 7.

Old Main” movement because of three factors that helped to minimize differences between the Lumbee and Tuscarora frameworks. First, Old Main’s history could be appealed to in broad terms without offending either Lumbee or Tuscarora—thus granting activists a uniquely flexible mnemonic by which to reconcile competing visions of indigeneity. Second, activists used this ambiguous history to appeal to a shared indigenous history of oppression and perseverance. Last, a common enemy was established, first as the white power structure/administration at PSU, and then more broadly as the Democratic Party of North Carolina. In the end, the rhetorical appeals of the Old Main Movement established a collective indigenous memory that created new political allies and forced administrative officials to cancel the destruction of the building.

Remembering Indigenous Education: Old Main as Placeholder for a Shared History of Oppression

Beginning in January 1972, activists from both the Lumbee and Tuscarora movements began protesting Old Main’s demolition through both formal avenues and civil disobedience. Interviews from activists indicate that Old Main was remembered as a place for *all* indigenous people of Robeson County and symbolized the promise, still unrealized, of full indigenous participation and independence in education. Lumbee activist Velma Michison remembers Old Main as an inclusive place: “The building was, uh, built there for the Indians ... I respect my race and I don’t care what race that building would’a been built for, I’d still have feelings for ‘em. And that’s the last building we Indians could look to remind of anything.” Michison stresses how “Old Main was a symbol of that progress which center around education ... it’s come to symbolize

Indian advancement, not only here ... in Robeson County, but throughout America.”²⁰²

Michison emphasizes the promise that Old Main represents for all American Indians while notably ignoring the competing stances that the Lumbee and Tuscarora have toward education.

Michison also frames Old Main’s destruction as an ambiguous attack on “Indianness.” When asked why it is set to be destroyed, she claims it is due to the same vague anti-Indian sentiment that Barton first articulated: “Well the main reason why [is because] that was the last building, first college that the Indians ever had. It was the last thing that was on that, on that campus of remembrance of Indians and they wanted it destroyed.” She recalls how well Tuscarora activists collaborated with Lumbee around this symbol of progress once word circulated that the administration was destroying it. She notes how the Tuscarora’s more ostentatious style was able to work with the Lumbee’s more formal style in this instance because both agreed on the symbolic nature of the building: “You know we had Indian dances all the way down, ha, ha, ha, Indian war chants, uh, and everybody stood up and, uh, cheered and, uh, it was very impressive.”²⁰³ Michison reveals the flexible mnemonic that Old Main played in the collaborative movement.

Bruce Jones performs a similar act of remembering that places Old Main within a shared indigenous history of oppression. Jones recounts how “Old Main is the last symbol of the first and only four year college in this country for Indians. The Indian people hold her very dearly. She is a part of our heritage.” Jones, an important Lumbee

²⁰² Velma Michison, interview with Lew Barton, March 20, 1973 (LUM 52A), SPOH Program Collection.

²⁰³ Ibid.

activist, does not emphasize the competing histories of Lumbee and Tuscarora but instead remembers Old Main as a common symbol of indigenous progress and pride. Jones continues, framing the movement as a shared indigenous effort:

The Indian people began to protest the demolition. This terrified many politicians because their dictates were being questioned. Old Main is a vital part of the Indian people and she must be spared. You know, it is a sad, sad day when people must endure the agony that was forced upon the Indian people in our desperate attempt to save Old Main.²⁰⁴

The emotional appeal to a shared indigenous history found persuasive force when appeals such as Jones' emphasized the victimization shared by both Lumbee and Tuscarora activists.

Other leaders among the Lumbee and Tuscarora movement frame Old Main's destruction as an attack on "Indianness" and stress the importance that Old Main has in the Indian culture of Robeson County. Danford Dial, a prominent Lumbee activist associated with both the LRDA and RCCCC, and Carnell Locklear, the leader of the Tuscarora movement, describe the destruction of Old Main as an act of "de-Indianization."²⁰⁵ Neither leader stresses the names Lumbee or Tuscarora in their remembrance of the building but instead recount a shared indigenous history. Locklear states that "the culture behind it, that it was the first *Indian* Normal school in the United States. That right there was a lot for me to fight for."

²⁰⁴ Bruce Jones, Janie Locklear and EB Turner, "Lumbee Hearing by North Carolina Civil Rights Committee," contained in interview with Lew Barton, September 29, 1972 (LUM 28A), SPOH Program Collection.

²⁰⁵ Danford Dial, (no transcript number), SPOH Program Collection; Carnell Locklear, (no transcript number), SPOH Program Collection.

Locklear connects this unified indigenous fight with the legend of Henry Berry Lowry, a key figure that both the Lumbee and Tuscarora stake claim to. While Locklear also connects Old Main to the Tuscarora fight for sovereignty, he notably leaves the name “Tuscarora” and “Lumbee” out of his statement on educational policy, stressing the pan-Indian nature of the fight: “This is our land; this is our home. We didn’t invade anybody ... to my knowledge, America is—was the Indians in the beginning and in the end it will be the Indians.”²⁰⁶ The Lumbee’s Ed Chavis also recalls Old Main and the wide-spread inspiration American Indians of Robeson County received from the movement, describing it as a unified Indian front formed from a shared recollection of its significance in response to “de-Indianization”: “we did come to realize you know, that we were Indians and that we were ... we were what we were. You know we can’t be ... we can’t be somebody else.”²⁰⁷ The collective indigenous memory of Old Main, as indicated by these interviews, was able to temporarily reconcile the competing tribal identities.

Janie Locklear, a Lumbee activist who became the *de facto* leader of the “Save Old Main” movement, frequently situated Old Main within a shared indigenous history and culture through acts of remembering. In an interview with Lew Barton, Locklear tells how Old Main:

Represents the first and the only four year college which conferred degrees upon Indians and was established for Indians only, in this country. So we felt like that, this building was very definitely a part of our heritage, our culture, our very being

²⁰⁶ Locklear, (no transcript number), SPOH Program Collection.

²⁰⁷ Ed Chavis, interview with Lew Barton, October 12, 1972 (LUM 37A), SPOH Program Collection.

and our very beginning, uh, not only for us but for Indians across the country...

She is, uh, part of our culture.

Locklear continues, stressing the shared history of oppression by all American Indians:

“All of the Indian people have always been ignored politically... PSU has lost its Indian identity ... the building is something that the Indian people have always held pride in.”²⁰⁸

Speaking again with Elizabeth O. Maynor, Janie Locklear stresses the shared indigenous memory of Old Main and minimizes the differences while highlighting the common indigenous appeal to education: “Well, I think it is one of the greatest things for it to stand ... [if] Old Main is torn down, then we would not have that memory, long cherished memories that we want to stay there. We want to see it stand.”²⁰⁹ Old Main was able to function as an abstract yet effective rhetorical device that united indigenous activists through a shared history that could activate both Lumbee and Tuscarora pride.

Other activists, both Lumbee and Tuscarora, spoke of a united indigenous history through remembrances of Old Main, helping to offset previous differences regarding education and claims to tribal land. Shirley Smith Lowry stresses the importance of preserving the shared culture in education yet avoids taking a direct stance on integration, instead describing a unique pan-Indian vision:

I feel that the salvation of some of the culture is really one of the things that's most needed right now in a change in curriculum of the education of Indian children... I really hope that saving Old Main will be the salvation and a turning point in the type of heritage, Indian heritage and a cultural study that they have,

²⁰⁸ Janie Locklear, interview with Lew Barton, November 17, 1972 (LUM 40A), SPOH Program Collection.

²⁰⁹ Elizabeth O. Maynor and Janie Locklear, interview with Bruce Barton, November 27, 1972 (no transcript number), SPOH Program Collection.

and they can really be proud of... and make them in a way, into a *new* proud race of people, even amidst the new integrated school system.²¹⁰

Betty Sampson also felt Old Main could help indigenous activists unite around the issue of education, emphasizing how it is a “symbol ... for our education—for *Indian* education.”²¹¹ Numerous other activists stressed the importance of Old Main within the collective memory of Robeson County American Indians.

Tuscarora activists Cecil Hunt and Elisha Locklear highlight the collaboration between Lumbee and Tuscarora in defense of Old Main as a shared cultural symbol. They state how “the Indians, white Indians here in Pembroke wanted the swamp Indians and the radical rabble rousers to come in to start a such a big fuss that they wouldn’t tear Old Main down, that they would keep it.” Hunt and Locklear, although not without some critique of the Lumbee also recall how this brief period of collaboration to preserve a symbol of a shared tribal heritage “brought about a lot of change.”²¹² Dexter Brooks, a leading Lumbee activist, also notes how well the different groups collaborated when it came down to preserving the symbol of a shared indigenous memory. Brooks states, “We’re Indians... and the building has meaning for us... even the rural folks, usually the least involved, were at the front.”²¹³ Betty Jo Hunt similarly noted that, regardless of Lumbee or Tuscarora, Old Main “was the last remaining symbol of Indian Education,”

²¹⁰ Shirley Smith Lowry, interview with Lew Barton, March 16, 1973 (LUM 53A), SPOH Program Collection.

²¹¹ Betty Sampson, interview with Lew Barton, March 18, 1973 (LUM 60A), SPOH Program Collection.

²¹² Cecil Hunt and Elisha Locklear, U-0004.

²¹³ Dexter Brooks, interview with Brenda Brooks, May 1, 1973 (LUM 80A), SPOH Program Collection.

and that the two indigenous groups were able unite for what was repeatedly noted as the “most spectacular success” for Robeson County indigenous citizens.²¹⁴

A Common Enemy

The “Save Old Main” movement frequently appealed to a common enemy, often the Democratic Party, which symbolically functioned as the villain in the Lumbee and Tuscarora’s shared narrative of indigenous oppression. The appeal to a common enemy thus complemented Lumbee and Tuscarora framing of Old Main as a pan-Indian cause and redirected conversations toward their shared indigenous plight and collective memory rather than the differences over protest style and strategy. Gubernatorial candidate James E. Holshouser, in particular, played an instrumental role in reinforcing the narrative that Old Main’s destruction was simply one recent act in a long history of Democratic transgressions. Holshouser was able to deploy the rhetoric of “enemyship” to symbolically align with Nixon’s administration and cultivate an indigenous voting bloc.²¹⁵

Many activists note Holshouser’s quick response to the “Save Old Main” movement and use his reaction to contrast the Democratic Party’s history of neglect. Velma Michison, in a representative statement, recalls how

He [Holshouser] was with us one hundred percent on that building and he would back us on it. And I feel like he is done his part ... And I do wish they [PSU

²¹⁴ Betty Jo Hunt, interview with Lew Barton, July 7, 1973 (LUM 111A), SPOH Program Collection.

²¹⁵ See Jeremy Engels, *Enemyship: Democracy and Counter-Revolution in the Early Republic*, (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2010), 65. Engels, drawing off Thomas Paine, describes enemyship as a “relationship between a group of people, states, or... colonies whose bond [is] cemented not by love but enmity.” For a theoretical discussion of this idea, see Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1996).

officials] would've been hundreds and hundreds of Democrats there [during one of Holshouser's visits to Robeson County] and have found out just what a Republican governor is doing for North Carolina and it's time that the Democrats in this state wake up.²¹⁶

Michison builds off of her Old Main narrative of "Democrats versus Republicans," claiming that the Democrats, and the PSU administration that they support, want the building destroyed precisely because "that was the last building, first college that the Indians ever had. It was the last thing that was on that, on that campus of remembrance of Indians and they wanted it destroyed." Her rumination concludes by insisting that American Indians of Robeson County are fortunate to have "a wonderful governor ... and I do hope the people of North Carolina that their eyes will come open and see and know the governor that they have and will back that man. He needs our support." For Michison, like many other Lumbee and Tuscarora citizens in 1972, Holshouser embodied a new hope against the old enemy of the North Carolina Democratic Party.²¹⁷

Danford Dial, who began many of the early protest activities, frames the administration and Democratic Party as the common enemy to all American Indians. Dial recounts how the current Democratic governor, Bob Scott, gave no acknowledgment of the symbolic importance of Old Main. Only when over 300 Tuscarora activists picketed with several Lumbee activists, Dial claims, did the Republican Party step up and help combat the Democrats.²¹⁸ Bruce Jones, Janie Locklear, and EB Turner, in a joint

²¹⁶ Michison, LUM 52A.

²¹⁷ Luther Oxendine, in his reflections on Old Main and its symbolism, also stresses the antagonism of the Democratic Party and Holshouser. See Oxendine's interview with Lew Barton, Undated (LUM 6A), SPOH Program Collection.

²¹⁸ Dial, (no transcript number), SPOH Program Collection.

testimony at the North Carolina Civil Rights Committee meeting, depict the Democratic Party as the enemy, emphasizing the party's neglect through pathos-filled descriptions such as, "Raleigh's deadening silence is a form of Chinese water torture sapping the vitality of the small Indian community."²¹⁹ Janie Locklear, in another speaking engagement for the "Save Old Main" movement, stresses how Democrats have collectively oppressed American Indian citizens:

All of the Indian people have always been ignored politically. They've been loyal Democrats for years and years and uh, they were ignored and taken for granted that their votes were sewed up. And it was so evident to us... that the Democratic Party just almost turned its back on us when, uh, the Robeson County Democratic Executive Committee refused to call the committee meeting... [and] said [Old Main] wasn't a political issue.²²⁰

Both Lumbee and Tuscarora activists, as the interview transcripts indicate, agreed on the neglect from the Democratic Party, which filled out the role of enemy in the "Save Old Main" narrative.

WJ Strickland, an influential Lumbee involved in both the Robeson County Church and Community Center (RCCCC) and the Lumbee Regional Development Association (LRDA), stresses the neglect of the Democratic Party in his descriptions of the Old Main and the indigenous unity in the movement. He states:

To save Old Main is really what was the straw that broke the camel's back. Uh, is when I became thoroughly disenchanted with the Democratic Party ... it really

²¹⁹ Bruce Jones, Janie Locklear, and EB Turner, "Lumbee Hearing by North Carolina Civil Rights Committee," contained in interview with Lew Barton, September 29, 1972 (LUM 28A), SPOH Program Collection.

²²⁰ Locklear, LUM 82A.

brought to light the real, uh, the real political process that has held our people down, because we didn't get any help at all from the Democrat Party. We got it all from the Nixon Administration and the Republican Party. The first man to come out in favor of saving Old Main was Governor Jim Holshouser.²²¹

Strickland highlights the other side of the enemy narrative where, in this instance, the hero is the Republican Party and its most conspicuous face, Richard Nixon.

The connection between Robeson County politics and the Nixon administration was frequently appealed to during Holshouser's gubernatorial campaign. Holshouser found success in appealing to Old Main as a symbol of oppression and untapped indigenous potential. The portrayal of the Democratic Party as the common enemy, however, proved especially effective as a unifying indigenous frame. Tyron Delton Lowry, Holshouser's campaign manager in Robeson County, notes the importance that Old Main played in uniting indigenous activists:

Old Main was an emotional object in that the majority of the people, or the grassroots people, had decided within their own minds that this building should remain on the campus of PSU, as a reminder, forever, that this once was an all-Indian college. And it was the first Indian college in the US ... [Old Main] became *political* in that, one candidate, uh, believed that the people were right and wanted to support them in it, while the other candidate, uh, wanted to hedge about it.²²²

²²¹ WJ Strickland, LUM 44A.

²²² Tyron Delton Lowry, interview with Marilyn Taylor, March 16, 1973 (LUM 56A), SPOH Program Collection.

Lowery confides that he is uncertain if Holshouser's appeals to the public memory of Old Main and his acknowledgement of oppression by the Democratic Party will be enough for long-term success, conceding, "A lot of people ... probably voted for Governor Holshouser due to this one issue."²²³ Tuscarora leader Carnell Locklear, as well as activists Cecil Hunt and Elisha Locklear, also recounts how Holshouser was the only candidate to reach out, asking them to attend and even speak at his rally. Tuscarora activists considered this emblematic of the current political situation. Carnell Locklear remembers AIM's Dennis Banks and Russell Means also coming in support of Holshouser. Locklear also stresses how much he valued Old Main and how the "Save Old Main" campaign is illustrative of the Democratic Party's historical neglect of indigenous people.²²⁴

Perhaps the most effective and influential event in the Old Main movement was Holshouser's October 30, 1972, appearance in Robeson County, where he underscored his support of indigenous voters through referencing his own fight to preserve Old Main. Holshouser once again framed his support of a united indigenous cause as a battle against the Democratic enemy. First, Holshouser's emcee for the night, MC Davy Jones, began the event with a brief speech lambasting the Democratic Party: "there's not a single soul, in here, can tell me that you are satisfied with what you've got ... and all the taxes going into the fat pockets of Democrats."²²⁵ Gene Oxendine, an influential Lumbee, came out next and lauded Holshouser's "unpopular stance" in support of Old Main, reminding the

²²³ Ibid.

²²⁴ Locklear, U-0007.

²²⁵ Contained in "Interview with Governor James Holshouser," compiled by Lew Barton, October 31, 1972 (LUM 45A), SPOH Program Collection.

large indigenous crowd that he pledged his support for the “best interests of the Indians of this country ... we Indians, down here [who] have no voice in the Democrats’ system.” Oxendine ended his brief speech stressing the importance of indigenous unity against the Democrats, noting Nixon’s \$530 million support of American Indian policies.²²⁶

Holshouser’s own speech stressed indigenous unity in the face of a common enemy. Right before coming out, Holshouser invited Tuscarora activists, along with visiting AIM members, to play drums and perform a traditional dance in front of the stage. The short address following reiterated the rally’s main points, stressing how “Democrats have had you for a hundred years, you just go with me once. If we don’t do it, you can always go back, just give us [Republicans] four years, out of those, out of those hundred that you give the Democrats, and we’ll make a difference.” Holshouser stated that the Democrats “have had you in their pockets for too long.”²²⁷ In an effort to emphasize the difference between Democrats and Republicans—indeed, Holshouser had opened his brief address exclaiming, “There is a difference!”—Holshouser alluded to the “Save Old Main” campaign and insisted that his “intent is to be ‘an education Governor.’ Quality, balanced education will have top priority in a Holshouser Administration.”²²⁸

Holshouser let AIM’s Dennis Banks give a short and fiery address immediately following his own, a gesture that further illustrated his solidarity with a unified indigenous front against a common Democratic enemy. Banks, in a rare endorsement of a mainstream politician, told the audience of roughly 2,000 American Indians that

²²⁶ Ibid.

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ Ibid.

“Holshouser is one of very few men that will take up the struggle for the Indian.”²²⁹

Banks appealed to a pan-Indian fight against the system, which in this context was embodied by the Democratic Party: “There aren’t many people, throughout the country, that are willing to become Indian advocates. Because historically, this country has denied Indian people due process.” Banks also placed the issue of education front and center, the one indigenous issue that the “Save Old Main” movement helped bridge the Lumbee and Tuscarora’s differences. He reminded them “Indian people are being hurt in schools across the country.”²³⁰ Holshouser interrupted Banks address, reiterating to the audience that “next Tuesday, November 7th ... [is] when you declare your freedom.” Holshouser quickly left the stage as Banks began railing against the “crooks and criminals” in DC and warning Jim Holshouser that he will be closely watched.

²²⁹ Bill Price, “Holshouser Visits Robeson County,” *Robesonian* November 1, 1972, A7.

²³⁰ Holshouser, LUM 45A.

Legacy

Old Main was officially saved shortly after Holshouser's election. PSU administration, in response to increasing political pressure, decided to keep the building and renovate it in order to better suit the needs of the university and the indigenous population to which it was supposed to serve. Unfortunately, the optimism and unification among Robeson County indigenous activists would not last. In March of 1973, Old Main mysteriously burned down as a result of two independent fires, which was suspected to be an act of arson by many citizens. The Tuscarora were singled out as the culprits because of a string of arsons they had committed in the weeks leading up to the fires. Governor Holshouser came to the building the following morning just in time for a photo-op where he held the ashes of the building while crying. Holshouser vowed to bring the criminals to justice, setting a \$5,000 reward for any information that would lead to arrests. This was the end of any major Lumbee and Tuscarora collaboration.²³¹

Key Lumbee activists, and the Tuscarora's recently ousted Carnell Locklear, formed a new organization tasked with determining the manner and style of the new Old Main building. Archival material indicates that the discussions and final plans mostly ignored Tuscarora history, instead opting for an exclusively "Lumbee" narrative. Old Main became, in the end, a cultural and historical center for Lumbee Indians.²³² The Tuscarora, in the meantime, became increasingly radical and erratic. In April of 1973, Tuscarora activists marched to Raleigh, camping in front of Holshouser's office and

²³¹ CE McLaurin, "Arson Suspected by Authorities: Old Main, Grocery Destroyed as Robeson Fires Continue," *Robesonian*, March 19, 1973, Front Page.

²³² "Save Old Main Study," 1973, Box 39, Folder 318, Helen Maynor Scheirbeck Papers, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill Libraries, Wilson Archive. The manuscript makes no mention of "Tuscarora" (despite their ex-Chief, Carnell Locklear's presence on the board) and states that the building should "become vital to Lumbee identity," 111.

demanding that he help them in the ways that he had promised during his campaign.²³³

The Tuscarora returned to Robeson County shortly thereafter without any substantive acknowledgment and, in the process, racked up an extensive list of felony citations and arrests. The splinter Tuscarora group, within a matter of weeks, became flooded with negative press and in-group fighting. Chief Howard Brooks' group eventually fractured into two more competing groups. The Tuscarora movement, dissipated and financially crippled, ceased major protests and activities. For the remaining decade, the Lumbee and Tuscarora groups shifted their protests to the federal courts, fighting—unsuccessfully—for federal recognition.²³⁴

The “Save Old Main” Movement reveals both the highs and lows of indigenous protest in Robeson County. On one hand, the two competing movements were able to reconcile differences and achieve their express goal. On the other hand, the movement seemed to result in false promises and an unsustainable coalition. Scholars of social movements and rhetoric have grounds to speculate on the risks of third party politics becoming involved with marginalized groups. Such groups often have little more than symbolic resources to mobilize. Appeals to public memory, at first glance, seem like fantastically malleable appeals to unite conflicting movements. A closer look reveals a

²³³ “No Talks with Brooks Yet Indicated: Holshouser, Tuscarora Group Confer in Raleigh,” *Robesonian*, April 9, 1973, Front Page.

²³⁴ An exacerbating factor to the Tuscarora's dissolution was the almost immediate criticism coming from the Holshouser Administration, only several months following their tribal dancing in front of Holshouser's speech on election night. See Jack Scism, “Says Militants Not Representative: Indian of Piedmont Area Views Events in Robeson,” *Robesonian*, March 29, 1973, 8. In Scism's article, he recalls Holshouser's recent recommendation to the American Indians of Robeson County to “let people know Howard Brooks and his militant Tuscarora band ‘do not represent the leadership of the community.’” Lonnie Revels, an American Indian present at a meeting with Holshouser on Robeson County's indigenous population, claimed, “We concluded it was time to stand up and be counted, to let the people know this ([Tuscarora Chief Howard] Brooks' movement) does not represent the leadership of the community. We recognize we need to work within the system to bring about change although we do agree there is need for change.”

potential risk: while appeals to public memory are more flexible, they also lend themselves to ineffective, or even counter-productive, interpretations. Holshouser, for instance, appealed to the movement's shared memory but without having to commit to specific plans of action. Larger movements, such as the Lumbee and Tuscarora collaboration, often struggle to cater to the various parties involved while also articulating hardline political views. The tragic irony seems to be that the bigger movements—ones that are likely to catch the interest of politicians looking for a solid demographic—are precisely the movements that are tasked with negotiating a larger and more malleable collective framework.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Rhetoric and Social Change

No one, perfect variable can be isolated to explain the period of dramatic shifts, alliances, and contestations in Robeson County from 1967 to 1973. Scholars of social movements are certainly no strangers to some of the most important variables, such as race, ethnicity, gender, and class.²³⁵ No historical account of Robeson County activism, however, can be complete with these variables alone. The frequent appeals, recurring framing strategies, and competing interpretations of indigenous citizenship—that is, the *rhetorical dynamics*—play an integral role. The reason that actors choose certain behaviors, interpretation, and words regarding an issue is inextricable from the symbolic economy and rhetorical antecedents of a community. Just one resonant appeal or one fitting interpretation of a local issue can itself be enough to mobilize new actors or, as was the case in this study, spark acrimony, rebuttals, and new alliances. Certain variables, such as the dominant political condition or the material conditions of labor, are more fixed and easy to ascertain. Social change, while usually taking aim at these more entrenched contexts, usually does not do so without first enacting a discursive change of its own. This more fluid process invites the work of rhetorical criticism.²³⁶

²³⁵ For an expansive list of social movement variables, see Sidney Tarrow, *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

²³⁶ For scholarship in sociology that recognizes the importance of rhetorical dynamics, see Alberto Melucci, *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); James M. Jasper, *The Art of Moral Protest* (Oxford: University of Oxford Press, 1997).

This thesis has tried to argue through a case study for the historical importance of studying social movements from a rhetorical perspective. The vernacular voices and locally based arguments deployed by collective actors can help scholars from various disciplines better understand how social movements create, maintain, and sometimes lose solidarity. Central to Robeson County activists' success and failure was a shared faith in a narrative or vision of what it means to be an indigenous citizen. The belief in one's right to determine one's own identity—"self-determination" in its purest sense—calls forth some of the most personal and "biographic" details of one's life.²³⁷ The ability to externalize these biographic details and unite it to a popular vision is a rhetorical task that is a *sine qua non* of successful grassroots activism. The Lumbee, for instance, were able to rally behind an externally generated discourse of "self-determination" because it resonated with their own vision and hopes for citizenship. The Lumbee then reinterpreted the themes of "self-determination" to understand complex local issues, which is another rhetorical task in itself.

The Lumbee and Tuscarora case study reveals the complexity and rhetorical dimensions of citizenship.²³⁸ Citizenship, particularly for marginalized groups, is not always a self-evident or intrinsically egalitarian property of society. Oppressed groups

²³⁷ Jasper, *Art of Moral Protest*, highlights the importance of a person's pre-conditioned experience, culture, and language—which he calls "biography"—in persuading activists to join social movements, 210.

²³⁸ Since the birth of the nation-state, "citizenship" has taken on a plethora of meanings and associations, some more inclusive than others. Rhetorical scholar Karma Chavez points out current trappings of "citizenship" discourses and their inadvertent "collusions" with neoliberalism. See Karma Chavez, "Border (In)Securities: Normative and Differential Belonging in LGBTQ and Immigrant Rights Discourse," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 7.2 (2010): 144. Other works on citizenship sense a similar danger in the uncritical lauding of "citizenship." See especially Jeffrey Bennett. *Banning Queer Blood: Rhetorics of Citizenship, Contagion, and Resistance* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2009). At times, it appears citizenship is only defined at moments when it is exclusionary: to be a citizen of X is made meaningful through the recognition of a non-citizen of X.

often have to make explicit claim to their citizenship, often through appeals to an unfulfilled promise of their rights. Such claims, scholars have noted, often frame situations as the result of society's failure to offer the basic means of survival and integrity.²³⁹ Such grievances frequently find expression through vernacular voices and local experiences. For American Indians, in particular, the rhetoric of citizenship is especially troubled because it partly implies indigenous people are subjects of the US nation-state. Many activists, such as the Tuscarora and AIM, struggle to reclaim their original sovereignty, a fight that contradicts many citizenship claims.

The Lumbee and Tuscarora's competing visions of citizenship help scholars of rhetoric and social movements see the force of colonial frames and their ability to inform even the best-intentioned policies. Federal policies, such as "self-determination," have hidden risks for indigenous citizens because they often come prepackaged with federal connections and foster a relationship of dependency on the *status quo*, precisely what most activists are struggling against. Worse, the legal recourse unique to American Indians—federal tribal law—offers no safe alternative to American Indians. American Indian author and scholar Vine Deloria Jr. eloquently describes the state of federal tribal law:

Legal scholars, jurists, politicians, and bureaucrats have reduced what is inappropriately known as 'federal Indian law' to such a point that legal theories are tested not by comparison with reality, but by comparison with abstractions

²³⁹ Simon Hall, *American Patriotism, American Protest: Social Movements Since the Sixties*, (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011). Hall details throughout this work the historical motif of social activists to frame even radical protests as a fuller realization of one's citizenship and patriotism.

which idealize human rationality in order to give to events and incidents a sense of meaning they would not otherwise have ... it conveys almost no significant meaning, it rarely is tangent to the world of human affairs, and it covers a multitude of historical sins with the shellac of legality.²⁴⁰

The most well-meaning and moderate citizens, when caught between piecemeal public policies and a broken legal system, have little recourse other than to mobilize and protest. Such social activism is sometimes the only avenue by which to express one's citizenship and publicize injustice.

The Lumbee and Tuscarora case study reveals additional problems associated with public policy. Public policy can too easily be considered a static, top-down discourse that affects material and political conditions in predictable ways. However, public policy interacts in often unpredictable ways with the rhetorical dynamics of social protest. Far from a linear relationship, policy runs up against citizens' rhetorical frameworks and thus takes on new dimensions as grassroots actors deploy it in attempts to conceal and reveal parts of their situation. The Lumbee, for instance, used the "self-determination" themes of economic development, civic engagement, and cultural appreciation to inscribe the name "Lumbee" into urban areas through fiscal partnerships and reinforce a moderate image of indigenous citizenship.²⁴¹ As a result, other controversial issues such as school integration became reinterpreted as acceptable for the

²⁴⁰ As cited in David E. Wilkins, *American Indian Sovereignty and the U. S. Supreme Court: The Masking of Justice*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997), 1.

²⁴¹ As argued earlier, particularly in Chapter 2, the Lumbee movement can help scholars rethink Castells' thesis on urban social movements (USM) and the different ways that their rhetoric is reinterpreted and deployed.

Lumbee.²⁴² This is yet another instance where civic engagement and partnership became appealing for Lumbee activists rather than resorting to more radical tactics of resistance, protest, and civil disobedience.

Such vernacular articulations of policy, in turn, interact with the political and symbolic economy surrounding a given movement. The Lumbee's policy-inflected vision of "self-determination" was communicated through a financially strong non-governmental organization (NGO) network that helped to consolidate the name "Lumbee" in urban spaces. Rural poor activists from mostly Methodist congregations, in response to the Lumbee's rhetoric, sought an alternative narrative to explain their situation. Their more radical rhetoric of "Red Power" resonated with concrete experiences of exploitation and labor. The perceived oppression and exploitation disrupted the moderate interpretation of events coming from the Lumbee and resulted in a more militant vision of indigeneity. The competing framework was thus intimately shaped by this rejection of "self-determination" rhetoric and forced Lumbee citizens to reevaluate their own political stances. Many Lumbee, faced with this competing rhetoric, denigrated the radical Tuscarora, although some conceded that perhaps systemic inequalities do exist deeper than federal attitudes suggest. Such is the complex dialectic nature of social movement rhetoric.

Rhetorical appeals and frameworks themselves play an ambivalent role in social protest. The most effective rhetoric can sometimes itself become restrictive. The Lumbee Regional Development Association (LRDA), for instance, discouraged its employees

²⁴² This is true especially after the Lumbee received increased representation on the county school board. Such representation marked a fittingly *moderate* step toward social reform.

from protesting in the streets on at least one occasion. Civil disobedience was judged as an inappropriate activist strategy when interpreted through the “self-determination” framework. The Tuscarora, internalizing their own “Red Power” framework, eventually purged their own ranks in pursuit of a more perfect realization of blood purity.²⁴³ At other times, the social movement frameworks offered foundations on which to organize collaboration and highly effective protests. The “Save Old Main” movement most clearly captures this dynamic. Protesters successfully combatted perceived injustice while united under a shared memory of indigenous oppression. Such collaboration would not have been likely if both movements had not emphasized the importance of indigenous identity, albeit through competing rhetoric. Besides being one of most successful campaigns in Robeson County, “Save Old Main” was also one of the fondest memories for many indigenous activists.²⁴⁴ Even this success, however, came with tradeoffs and unexpected alliances.

The “Save Old Main” movement illustrates potential pitfalls and risks associated with more expansive movements. Such “multi-identity” movements have at their core an exhausting rhetorical task.²⁴⁵ For the Lumbee and Tuscarora, the more abstract rhetoric of a shared indigenous memory was capable of bridging differences in protest strategy and rhetoric. At the same time, the more flexible and abstract appeal to public memory was

²⁴³ Hunt and Locklear, U-0004.

²⁴⁴ See Hunt and Locklear, U-0004; Carnell Locklear, U-0007; Barton, LUM 48A, SPOH Program Collection.

²⁴⁵ For a more recent analysis of “multi-identity” movements, see Sharon Kurtz, *Workplace Justice: Organizing Multi-Identity Movements*, (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002); Miriam Pawel, *The Union of their Dreams: Power, Hope, and Struggle in Cesar Chavez’s Farm Worker Movement*, (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2009). Pawel, drawing off an enormous amount of interview transcripts, illustrates the diversity in identities that gave Chavez’s movement so much power yet also, at times, fragmentation.

more exposed to various interpretations, particularly by outside, third-party interests. Such actors, who may in good faith believe they act on the best interests of the activists, might easily misunderstand—and not be beholden to fully understand—some of the more nuanced *local* dimensions informing the rhetoric.

James E. Holshouser, in particular, found great success through appealing to a common enemy in the Democratic Party, painting them as the agents responsible for the most recent episode of indigenous neglect, that is, the destruction of Old Main. Holshouser leveraged this appeal to gain minority votes and symbolically align with the popular Nixon Administration. He went on to become the first Republican governor of North Carolina in over 50 years. Although Holshouser kept his promise and saw to the preservation of Old Main, he did not meet the high expectations he partly built for the different American Indian groups. The more abstract appeals—such as those drawing off memories of things long past with very ambiguous relations to the present—paradoxically seem to be more useful for collective action and susceptible to the co-optation from outside parties. The rhetoric, on the one hand, provides the necessary flexibility for a multi-identity movement. On the other hand, this flexibility lends itself to misuse or even a false consensus. Perhaps the “Old Main Movement” and its success make for a more concrete public memory among local indigenous activists today, yet the resentment and anger toward Holshouser still has the potential to be divisive.

Such is the dynamic and risks associated with the symbolic contours of social activism. Marginalized groups often have little else to unify diverse actors than through the more symbolic appeals to identity. The Lumbee and Tuscarora case study illustrates the complex interweaving of protest rhetoric with public policy, geography, public

memory, and indigeneity. In order to better understand the constraints, successes, and failures of social activism, it is crucial to consider and evaluate the dominant rhetorical appeals and frameworks that thematize reality. The rhetorical dynamics of protest are what give voice to previously non-articulable dimensions of people's lives that can be too easily neglected in both civic life and academic scholarship. Together, the static and flexible contexts and variables can help scholars better interpret diverse texts, such as speech transcripts, interviews, memos, and newspaper editorials. Scholarship with a rhetorical sensitivity can give a fuller, more nuanced look at social activism than scholarship that ignores the role communication plays in affecting resistance.

Future Possibilities

Robeson County has yet to experience another period of such sustained and forceful protest that could match the activities from 1967-1973. Party affiliation and social organizations have shifted, although few grassroots activities emerged with comparable scope and impact of either the Lumbee or Tuscarora campaigns. Both parties, for now, concentrate their efforts on formal legal appeals for federal recognition, asking for the enormous material benefits associated with them. This legalistic trend began shortly after the "Save Old Main" when Holshouser's promises mostly fell through and federal support significantly decreased.²⁴⁶

The legal complex underlying the names "Lumbee" and "Tuscarora" became the most proximate means to advocate and frame grievances once social movement activity

²⁴⁶ The Tuscarora had started legal attempts almost immediately, although it was not their initial focus, see Nakell, U-0012. The Lumbee were more dependent on federal money and thus had to resort to new alternatives when funding decreased during the Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan administrations. See Ronald A. Janke, "Population, Reservations, and Federal Indian Policy," in *Handbook of Native American Literature*, Ed. Andrew Wiget (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996): 169.

seemed untenable. Neither party has successfully argued for official federal recognition, although various politicians—including local, state, and national—pledge allegiance to their cause. Social protest, in its various forms, is still a plausible path toward getting basic material needs met and absolving past oppression. When official channels ossify, as is seemingly the case with the legal contestation of federal tribal law, actors can learn from and draw off of past indigenous protests to unite actors and avoid pitfalls that divide or tend toward co-option. As this thesis has argued, such understanding requires a rhetorical sensitivity to framing and its relationship to historical, economic, geographic, and cultural contexts.

Scholars of rhetoric, social movements, and history alike can benefit from reading a diverse set of texts, such as memos, newspapers, speeches, and interviews. An eye toward the rhetorical dynamics of texts along with a concrete sense of where these texts emerge can help scholars contribute to both theoretical and historical epistemologies.²⁴⁷ Most importantly, theoretical claims stand less risk of overshadowing concrete events when they are forced to account for a large body of primary sources. Empirical data is nearly inexhaustible in its interpretation, and when considering social movements and agitation, this is especially vital to understand. As Alberto Melucci contends in his “new social movements” theory, collective protest should be approached hermeneutically with special attention toward the textual dynamics of protest.²⁴⁸ Theories are needed, no doubt, but never at the expense of—or in *retreat* from—the complexity of the empirical object

²⁴⁷ Paul Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics: Writings and Lectures*, (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2013). Ricoeur extensively discusses the methodology of simultaneously contributing to different “epistemologies” through the textual analysis of historical artifacts. See especially 1-45.

²⁴⁸ Melucci, *Challenging Codes*. Melucci follows a similar hermeneutic approach as Ricoeur, and warns against sociology’s tendency to hypostatize objects of study.

and the researcher's uneasy relationship to it. Rhetorical studies are in a unique position to grapple with the interpretive play between text and context.

The study of social movements from a textual perspective is as relevant today as it ever has been. Engaging hermeneutically with a series of texts can help scholars better understand identity in social movements. From an outsider, a "tribe" might seem like one homogenous group, a source of a stable identity. Yet the local history of social, legal, and material conditions may have fragmented such organizations, resulting in a multi-identity group. A diverse series of texts can reveal the play of identities. Robeson County indigenous actors, for instance, were fractured partly from within and articulated new identities through tensions among Lumbee, Tuscarora, and outside actors. The identity-formation of a movement, an absolutely crucial step, happened as much from the active, top-down recruitment from federal leaders in the case of the Lumbee's "self-determination" vision, as it did from within the indigenous population, as was the case with the Tuscarora and their subsequent splits. The fight for indigenous equality continues today in Robeson County. Scholars of communication are in a unique place to share with activists the rhetorical dynamics involved when collective actors choose how to identify themselves and mobilize frameworks imbued with vernacular voices of injustice.

Bibliography

- Ackley, R. "Indians at PSU." *Robesonian*, November 23, 1971, 8.
- Allen, Young H. *SOH Program Collection*. Interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery. U-0001, February 16, 2004.
- Ashurst Jr., R. "Integration and Indian Education at PSU." *Robesonian*, December 6, 1971, 7.
- Banks, Dennis and Richard Erdoes. *Ojibwa Warrior: Dennis Banks and the Rise of the American Indian Movement*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004.
- Barton, Lew. "The 'De-Indianization' Trend Observed at Pembroke U." *Robesonian*, November 18, 1971, A7.
- Barton, Peggy. "Believes Indians of Robeson are Linked with Tuscarora." *Robesonian*, August 21, 1971, 6.
- . "Would Ask President to Aid Indian Cause." *Robesonian*, September 9, 1971, 6.
- . "Would Ask President to Aid Indian Cause." *Robesonian*, September 9, 1971, 12.
- Baylor, Tim. "Media Framing of Movement Protest: The Case of American Indian Protest," *Social Science Review* 33.3 (1996): 241-255.
- Bennett, Jeffrey. *Banning Queer Blood: Rhetorics of Citizenship, Contagion, and Resistance*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2009.
- Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1, no. 1 (1968): 1-14.
- Black, Jason Edward. "Native Authenticity, Rhetorical Circulation, and Neocolonial Decay: The Case of Chief Seattle's Controversial Speech." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 15, no. 4 (2012): 635-645.
- . "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, no. 1 (2009): 66-88.

- Blight, David. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2002.
- Blu, Karen. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Brenda Brooks. LUM 127A, August 21, 1973.
- . *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian People*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Blue, Brantley. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interviewed with Lew Barton. LUM 86A, May 19, 1973.
- Bodnar, John. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Boughman, Arvis Locklear. *Legends of the Lumbee*. Chapel Hill, NC: Boughman Press, 2013.
- Briggs, Delores. "Picketing Continued by 'Tuscarora': 'Save Old Main' Protesters Plans to Deter Demolition Crew." *Robesonian*, January 12, 1972, 1.
- Briggs, Olin and Delores Briggs. "Food Stamp Application Delays Irk Protesting Indian Group." *Robesonian*, April 4, 1972, 20.
- Briggs, Olin. "'Mad' Indian on the Warpath: American Indian Movement, A Militant Warrior Gets it Together." *Robesonian*, August 4, 1972, 3.
- Broekman, Jan and Larry Cata Backer. *Lawyers Making Meaning: The Semiotics of Law in Legal Education II*. London: Springer Science + Business Media, 2012.
- Brooks, Dexter. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Brenda Brooks. LUM 80A, May 1, 1973.
- Brooks, Howard. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Dexter Brooks. LUM 83A, June 9, 1973.

- Burke, Kenneth. "Terministic Screens" in *Language as Symbolic Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Castells, Manuel. "Materials for an Exploratory Theory of the Network Society." *British Journal of Sociology* 51, no. 1 (2008): 3-24.
- . *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983, 300-305.
- Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Quebecois." In *The Routledge Reader in Rhetorical Criticism*. Eds. Brian L. Ott and Greg Dickinson (New York: Routledge, 2013): 432-447.
- Chavez, Karma. "Border (In)Securities: Normative and Differential Belonging in LGBTQ and Immigrant Rights Discourse." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 7.2 (2010): 136-155.
- Chavis, James E. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Adolph Dial. LUM 254, July 21, 1971.
- Claypoole, Antoinette Nora. *Ghost Rider Roads: American Indian Movement 1971-2011*. New Mexico: Wild Embers Press, 2012.
- Cloud, Dana L. *We are the Union: Democratic Unionism and Dissent at Boeing*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2011.
- Connelly, Paula. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. No transcript number, September 27, 1972.
- Cook, Samuel R. "What is Self-Determination?" *Red Ink* 3.1 (1994): 9-20.

- Cummings, Simeon. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 21A, August 30, 1972.
- D'Arcus, Bruce. "The Urban Geography of Red Power: The American Indian Movement in Minneapolis-Saint Paul, 1968-1970," *Urban Studies* 47.6 (2010): 1241-1255.
- Day, Robert C. "The Emergence of Activism as a Social Movement," in *Native Americans Today: Sociological Perspectives*. Eds. Howard M. Bahr, Bruce Chadwick, and Robert C. Day. New York: Harper and Row, 1972, 506-532.
- Delgado, Richard and Jean Stefancic. *Critical Race Theory*. New York: New York University Press, 2012.
- Deloria Jr., Vine. "The New Activism," *Dialogue* 6, no. 2 (1973): 3-12.
- Dewey, John. *The Public and its Problems*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1927.
- Dial, Adolph. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Danford Dial. LUM 126A, November 30, 1972
- Dial, Herman. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 58A, March 21, 1973.
- Dial, James. *SOH Program Collection*. Interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery. U-0003, February 4, 2004.
- Edwards, Jonathan J. "Countersymbols and the Constitution of Resistance in American Fundamentalism, 1919-1922." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 17, no. 3 (2014): 421-454.
- Endrese, Danielle. "American Indian Activism and Audience: Rhetorical Analysis of Leonard Peltier's Response to Denial of Clemency." *Communication Reports* 24, no. 1 (2011): 1-11.

- Engels, Jeremy. "Equipped for Murder: The Paxton Boys and 'the Spirit of Killing all Indians' in Pennsylvania, 1763-1764." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 8, no. 3 (2005): 355-381.
- . *Enemyship: Democracy and Counter-Revolution in the Early Republic*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2010.
- Farrell, Thomas B. "Sizing Things Up: Colloquial Reflection as Practical Wisdom." *Argumentation* 12 (1998), 1-14.
- Ferguson, Robert A. *The Trial in American Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Frideres, James S. "Native Rights and the 21st Century: The Making of Red Power," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 22.3 (1990): 1-7.
- Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis*. London: Harper and Row, 1974.
- . *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- Goodyear, Toni. "Indian Organization in Robeson may Achieve Federal Recognition." *Robesonian*, January 13, 1972, 3.
- Greene, Ronald. "Y Movies: Film and the Modernization of Pastoral Power." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 2.1 (2005): 20-36.
- Gring-Pemble, Lisa M. "'Are We Going to Govern by Anecdote?': Rhetorical Constructions of Welfare Recipients in Congressional Hearings, Debates, and Legislation, 1992-1996." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87, no. 4 (2001): 341-365.
- Gulalp, Haldun. *Citizenship and Ethnic Conflict: Challenging the Nation-State*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Habermas, Jurgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.

- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Hall, Simon. *American Patriotism, American Protest: Social Movements Since the Sixties*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Hanan, Joshua S. and Catherine Chaput. "Stating the Exception: Rhetoric and Neoliberal Governance during the Creation and Passage of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 50 (Summer 2013): 18-33.
- Hartnett, Stephen John. "To 'Dance with Lost Souls.'" *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 16, no. 2 (2013): 223-274.
- Hauser, Gerald and Carole Blair. "Rhetorical Antecedents to the Public." *Pre/Text: A Journal of Rhetorical Theory* 3, no. 2 (1982): 139-163.
- Hauser, Gerard A. *Prisoners of Conscience: Moral Vernaculars of Political Agency*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2012.
- Helen Maynor Scheirbeck Papers. Coll. 05526. Louis Rand Wilson Special Collections Library, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill.
- Hoxie, Frederick E. *This Indian Country: American Indian Political Activists and the Place they Made*. New York: Penguin Press, 2012.
- Hunt, Betty Jo. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 111A, July 7, 1973.
- Hunt, Cecil and Elisha Locklear. *SOH Program Collection*. Interview with Melissa Maynor Lowery. U-0004, February 23, 2004.
- Janke, Ronald A. "Population, Reservations, and Federal Indian Policy," in *Handbook of Native American Literature*. Ed. Andrew Wiget. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996, 151-169.

- Jasper, James M. *The Art of Moral Protest*. Oxford: University of Oxford Press, 1997.
- Johnson, Lyndon B. "Special Message to the Congress on the Problems of the American Indian: 'The Forgotten American.'" March 6, 1968. Online transcript by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley. *The American Presidency Project*. Available at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=28709>.
- Johnson, Troy R. *Red Power: The Native American Civil Rights Movement*. New York: Chelsea House, 2007.
- Jones, James Arthur. *SOH Program Collection*. Interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery. U-0005, January 19, 2003.
- Josephy, Alvin M. *Red Power: The American Indian's Fight for Freedom*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.
- Kelly, Casey. "Blood-speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 8, no. 3 (2011): 240-265.
- Kotlowski, Dean J. *Nixon's Civil Rights: Politics, Principle, and Policy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Kurtz, Sharon. *Workplace Justice: Organizing Multi-Identity Movements*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Laclau, Ernesto. "The Death and Resurrection of the Theory of Ideology." *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 1.3 (1996): 201-220.
- Lake, Randall A. "Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69, no. 2 (1983): 127-142.
- Locklear, Barto. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 155A, December 28, 1973.

- Locklear, Carnell. "Tuscarora Indians." *Robesonian*, September 14, 1971, 6.
- . *SOH Program Collection*. Interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery. U-0007, February 24, 2004.
- . *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. No transcript number, October 12, 1972.
- Locklear, Dewey. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 92A, April 18, 1973.
- Locklear, Janie. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 82A, June 8, 1973.
- Locklear, Lindburg. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Marilyn Taylor. LUM 50A, March 13, 1973.
- Lowery, Malinda Maynor. *Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation: Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Lowery, Tryon Delton. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Marilyn Taylor. LUM 56A, March 16, 1973.
- Lowry, Shirley Smith. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 53A, March 16, 1973.
- Lundberg, Christian. *Lacan in Public: Psychoanalysis and the Science of Rhetoric*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 2012.
- Magnuson, Stew. *Wounded Knee 1973: Still Bleeding: The American Indian Movement, the FBI, and their Fight to Bury the Sins of the Past*. Chicago, IL: Courtbridge Publishing, 2013.
- Mangum, Robert Lee. *SOH Program Collection*. Interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery. U-0008, November 18, 2003.

- . *SOH Program Collection*. Interview with Malinda Maynor Lowery, U-0008, November 18, 2003.
- Mayer, Margit. "Manuel Castells' The City and the Grassroots." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30, no. 1 (2006): 202-206.
- Maynor, Elizabeth O. and Janie Locklear. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Bruce Barton. No transcript number, November 27, 1972.
- Maynor, Jeffery. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 82A, June 8, 1973.
- McKenzie-Jones, Paul. "Evolving Voices of Dissent: The Workshops on American Indian Affairs 1956-1972," *American Indian Quarterly* 38, no. 2 (Spring 2014): 207-236.
- McLaurin, CE. "Arson Suspected by Authorities: Old Main, Grocery Destroyed as Robeson Fires Continue." *Robesonian*, March 19, 1973, 1.
- . "Old Main, Grocery Destroyed as Robeson Fires Continue." *Robesonian*, March 19, 1973, 1.
- Means, Russell. "For America to Live, Europe Must Die." July 1980. Speech transcript available at: <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article19048.html>.
- Melucci, Alberto. *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Merton, Robert. "The Self Fulfilling Prophecy." *Antioch Review* 8.2 (1948): 193-210.
- Michison, Velma. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 52A, March 20, 1973.
- Moore, Herbert. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with by Lew Barton. LUM 27, September 21, 1972.

- Morris, Richard and Philip Wander. "Native American Rhetoric: Dancing in the Shadows of the Ghost Dance." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76 (1990): 164-191.
- Nagel, Joane. "The Political Mobilization of Native Americans." *Social Science Journal* 19.3 (1982): 37-45.
- . *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Nakell, Barry. *SOH Program Collection*. Interview with Melissa Maynor Lowery. U-0012, October 1, 2003
- Nealon, Jeffrey. *Alterity Politics: Ethics and Performative Subjectivity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Nixon, Richard. "Special Message to the Congress on Indian Affairs." July 8, 1970. Online transcript by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley. *The American Presidency Project*. Available at: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=2573>.
- Noonan, John T. *Persons and Masks of Law*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- Oakley, Christopher Arris. "'When Carolina Indians Went on the Warpath': The Media, the Klan, and the Lumbees of North Carolina." *Southern Cultures* (2008): 55-84.
- . *Keeping the Circle: American Indian Identity in Eastern North Carolina, 1885-2004*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.
- Pawel, Miriam. *The Union of their Dreams: Power, Hope, and Struggle in Cesar Chavez's Farm Worker Movement*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2009.
- Price, Bill and CE McLaurin. "In Support of Wounded Knee': 28 Downtown Store Windows Smashed as 'Tuscaroras' Stage Demonstrations Here." *Robesonian*, March 7, 1973, 1.

Price, Bill and Delores Briggs. "In School Board Protest: Indian Vigil Ends for Negotiations."

Robesonian, October 31, 1972, 1.

Price, Bill. "Holshouser Calls for 'New Day' at Lumbee Homecoming." *Robesonian*, July 6,

1971, 1.

---. "Holshouser Visits Robeson County." *Robesonian* November 1, 1972, A7.

---. "Robeson Indian Group's Hopes High for Control of own School." *Robesonian*, October 15,

1972, 2A.

---. "Second Night of Hostile Action: Caravan through Rowland Results in More Arrests."

Robesonian, March 11, 1973, 1.

Prucha, Francis Paul. *American Indian Treaties: The History of a Political Anomaly*. Berkeley:

University of California Press, 1994.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Hermeneutics: Writings and Lectures*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2013.

Robeson County, North Carolina, Indian Movement. Coll. CB971.77.R65I. Louis Rand Wilson

Special Collections Library. University of North Carolina Chapel Hill.

Rogers, Betty. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Adolph Dial. LUM 216A, July 26,

1971.

Sampson, Barbara C. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Bruce Barton. LUM 129A,

September 18, 1973.

Sanchez, John, Mary Stuckey, and Richard Morris. "Rhetorical Exclusion: The Government's

Case Against American Indian Activists, AIM and Leonard Peltier." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 23, no. 2 (1999): 27-45.

Scism, Jack. "Says Militants Not Representative: Indian of Piedmont Area Views Events in

Robeson." *Robesonian*, March 29, 1973, 8

- Seidman, Gay. *Beyond the Boycott: Labor Rights, Human Rights, and Transnational Activism*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2007.
- Shreve, Bradley G. "'From Time Immemorial': The Fish-In Movement and the Rise of Intertribal Activism." *Pacific Historical Review* 78.3 (2009): 403-434.
- . *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011.
- Sider, Gerald. *Lumbee Indian Histories: Race, Ethnicity, and Indian Identity in the Southern United States*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Simpson, Audra. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014.
- Smith, Paul Chaat and Robert Allen Warrior. *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*. New York: The New Press, 1996.
- Smith, Sherry L. *Hippies, Indians, and the Fight for Red Power*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Snow, David A. "Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields," in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Eds. David A. Snow, S.A. Soule, & H. Kriesi. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004, 380–412.
- Stern, Kenneth S. *Loud Hawk: The United State versus the American Indian Movement*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.
- Strickland, WJ. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 44A, December 30, 1972.
- Tarrow, Sidney. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

- Tepperman, Lorne, and James Curtis. *Principles of Sociology: Canadian Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Treat, James. *Around the Sacred Fire: Native Religious Activism in the Red Power Era*. New York: Palgrave, 2003.
- Tully, James. *Public Philosophy in a New Key: Democracy and Civic Freedom*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- . *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- US Bureau of the Census. "Robeson County, North Carolina, 2013." Online. Census Bureau. Available: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/37/37155.html> (15 September 2014).
- Walker, Cheryl. *Indian Nation: Native American Literature and Nineteenth-Century Nationalisms*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Wanzer, Darrel Allan. "Delinking Rhetoric, or Revisiting McGee's Fragmentation Thesis through Decoloniality." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 15, no. 4 (2012): 647-658.
- Warner, Michael. *Publics and Counterpublics*. Brooklyn, NY: Zone Books, 2002.
- Warren, Gene. "No 'De-Indianization' at PSU." *Robesonian*, November 21, 1971, A7.
- Wilkins, David E. *American Indian Politics and the American Political System*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2002.
- . *American Indian Sovereignty and the U. S. Supreme Court: The Masking of Justice*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997.
- Wilson, H.W. "Beyond Red Power." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 32, no. 3 (2008): 51-72.

Wilson, Kirt H. "Interpreting the Discursive Field of the Montgomery Bus Boycott: Martin

Luther King Jr.'s Hold Street Address." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 8.2 (2005): 299-326.

Woods, James Harold. *SPOH Program Collection*. Interview with Lew Barton. LUM 19A,

September 6, 1972.

Zarefsky, David. *President Johnson's War on Poverty: Rhetoric and History*. Tuscaloosa, AL:

The University of Alabama Press, 1986.