THE CHALLENGE OF THE PAST: A NATIVE AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE

James Treat

The first recorded instance of interreligious dialogue between Europeans and Americans took place, as the Christians reckoned it, on October 12th, 1492. Just after dawn on that Friday morning at the Caribbean island of Guanahani (as the Tainos called it) a group of children, women and men gathered on the beach to welcome a foolhardy, misguided adventurer and his near-mutinous, all-male crew. Christopher Columbus elected to forego the customary formalities of human social encounter (expressions of good will, courtesy, respect and generosity), a decision which seems particularly odd in light of the momentous novelty and importance of the situation. Instead, he initiated a religious conversation by first offering to his god "a prayer of thanksgiving" and then honoring that same deity by "taking possession of this island for the King and Queen" and renaming it "San Salvador, in honor of our Blessed Lord."[1]

Columbus "went ashore in the ship's boat, armed," though he soon learned that the Taino people waiting to greet him were, in his own words, "friendly and well-dispositioned, people who bear no arms except for small spears." The Tainos welcomed Columbus and his crew by offering them those same spears, along with "parrots, balls of cotton thread . . . and many other things." Afterward he wrote in his log: "I want the natives to develop a friendly attitude toward us because I know that they are a people who can be made free and converted to our Holy Faith more by love than by force." Yet later in the same entry he remarked, "They ought to make good and skilled servants, for they repeat very quickly whatever we say to them. I think they can easily be made Christians, for they seem to have no religion. If it pleases Our Lord, I will take six of them to Your

Highnesses when I depart, in order that they may learn our language."[2]

What can we learn from the events of that fateful day five hundred years ago, a day which marked the beginning of the end of so much human freedom and life? The religious crisis facing us today has its roots in that initial Columbian encounter; we may discover how to set things right in the future if we can recognize what went wrong in the past.

We may begin by observing that Columbus committed two rather serious blunders insofar as interreligious dialogue is concerned. First of all, he made the common mistake of judging someone else's faith and practice on the basis of this own religious standards. Effective interreligious dialogue hinges on our ability to listen, to appreciate other ways of being in the world. Secondly, there's the problem of kidnapping and slavery, which is virtually always an impediment to authentic religious interaction. Columbus listened to the Taino men he had "taken" from their homes, but only when they told him what he wanted to hear; the next day he wrote in his log, "I have been very attentive and have tried very hard to find out if there is any gold here."[3]

October 14th was the first Sunday in American history, and Columbus began the day by exploring the southern coast of Guanahani. In light of his actions two days earlier, which demonstrated his concern that the entire venture be undertaken with the blessing and for the honor of his god, we might expect to read that he marked the day with some kind of Christian service. Instead, he described in his log what appears to be a religious experience of another kind. As the ships moved up the coast, Columbus spotted other villages,

> *and the people came to the beach, shouting and praising God. Some brought us water; others, things to eat. Others, seeing that I did not care to go ashore, jumped into the sea and swam out to us. By the signs they made I think they were asking if we came from Heaven. One old man even climbed into the boat we were towing, and others shouted in loud*

> *voices to everyone on the beach, saying, 'Come see the men from Heaven; bring them food and drink.' Many men and women came, each one with something. They threw themselves on the sand and raised their hands to the sky, shouting for us to come ashore, while giving thanks to God.*[4]

We shall recall that Columbus had already concluded that the Tainos had "no religion," and three days later he repeated this interpretation when he wrote, "I do not recognize any religion in the people."[5] We should also remember that on day three of the American/European encounter no living person could translate between any of the American languages and any of the European languages. Columbus missed the opportunity for interreligious dialogue, because he made himself the object of ambiguous religious gestures and unintelligible religious utterances. So deluded was Columbus by his own self-serving intentions that he mistook exuberant hospitality to be idolatrous worship.

If we read just the first week of entries in Columbus' log, we will make some discoveries of our own. We will find that he repeatedly marveled at the natural beauty and diversity of the islands and at the remarkable generosity of their inhabitants. At each stop he and his crew were offered lavish gifts, helpful information, and free passage across lands and through waters. Their hosts, Columbus wrote, "took great delight in pleasing us." "They let us go anywhere we desired and gave us anything we asked." "Rest assured," he told Queen Isabella and King Ferdinand, "that this land is the best and most fertile and temperate and level and good that there is in the world."[6]

And yet those seven daily entries in the log are also a litany of militaristic aggression and narcissistic paranoia, all the evidence you would need to charge Christopher Columbus with crimes against humanity, but charges to which he could justifiably plead "not guilty, by reason of insanity." Columbus himself described his lust for gold and his desire to establish an American slave trade, and he bragged about his abilities of deception, fraud and theft. On Tuesday, October 16th he recorded his perception of the seven tour guides whom he had kidnapped on the Sunday before:

> *They said that there is a lot of gold [on a large island to the west] and that the people wear it on their arms, legs, ears, noses, and necks. I do not know if this is another ruse of theirs or not, for I am beginning to believe that all they want to do is escape and they will tell me anything I want to hear.*[7]

The Americas have always been a place of remarkable natural beauty and tremendous human diversity. Today life in the Americas is also marked by shocking social inequities, disheartening political duplicities, confusing cultural contradictions, and dangerous religious antagonisms—the absolute, infuriating madness which is the legacy of five hundred years of genocidal colonialism. Perhaps we can find some small sense of empowerment in at least identifying the seeds of our dilemma in this original trans-hemispheric encounter. It was not exactly a healthy beginning for five centuries of religious interaction. We all undoubtedly wish that it might have been different.

Native people in the Americas learned very quickly that their traditions of social hospitality and their attempts at interreligious dialogue would not be met with reciprocal expressions of respect and generosity. Indeed, they found that their time-honored religious attitudes of openness and inclusion would be ignored and denigrated, even that their very lives would be at stake whenever they encountered these strange, overdressed visitors. The initial meeting between American and European religious communities established an unfortunate precedent for the next five centuries of religious interaction. Native people have often struggled to understand and to appreciate a religious tradition which articulates a message of charitable love, universal justice, and transcendent spirituality but whose representatives have consistently granted tacit or even explicit approval to wanton murder, racist slavery, and material dispossession. Native people who participated in the 1980 conference of Theology in the Americas expressed it this way: "To us, it became evident at the outset of our contact with European peoples that their Way of Life possessed an apocalyptic separation between its creed and its deed."[8] What ensued was not interreligious dialogue but religious warfare. Steven Charleston, Episcopal Bishop of Alaska, recently wrote:

> *From the native perspective, the story of cultural conflict in North America is not a history of struggle over* things, *but over* ideas. *Even the word, "ideas," is insufficient; we might say over spiritual values or spiritual perceptions. In short, the conflict was not so much a colonial war as a religious war. It was a life and death struggle to see whose story would prevail.*[9]

It would be impossible to review the history of religious interaction between native people and Christianity, which has involved thousands of tribal communities speaking hundreds of distinct languages and many more Christian denominations and mission agencies, other than to characterize that history with the broadest of generalizations. We could recall the church's complicity in widespread land dispossession and Indian slavery through the institution of *encomienda.* We could point to the systematic denial of religious freedom by Puritans and later by other Christians who exerted their influence over the United States government. We might consider the willingness of the denominations to support reservation agents and the Indian boarding schools in their attempts to "civilize and Christianize" native people. In the interest of fairness, we would need to mention those rare Christian groups and individuals who have come to native people not to talk but to listen, not to change but to be changed. Choctaw writer Owanah Anderson sketched the history of interaction between native people and the Episcopal Church in her recent book, *Jamestown Commitment.* In the preface she described some of the difficulties she encountered while conducting research for the project:

> *Certain available source materials, such as the old Episcopal periodical,* Spirit of Missions, *were written in a perspective repugnant to an Indian person in 1987. Frequently, in tedious research through these materials, I found it necessary to close the files and walk away, questioning at times my own commitment to an institution*

> *whose history, as reflected in the language of its old publications, was so brazenly patronizing and racist.*
>
> *While I did not set out to unmask the myths surrounding church heroes such as William Hobart Hare or Henry Benjamin Whipple, my views simply do not parallel the views of non-Native chroniclers of the past. Thus, in sketching our church's missionizing history among my people, I cannot with integrity avoid at times a confrontational posture. Racism and neglect have endured.*[10]

Anderson pointed toward what I consider to be the most striking and memorable feature of the last five centuries of American religious history: the profound and enduring spiritual arrogance of Eurocentric Christianity, a self-centered parochialism which might be a source of amusement were it not still thriving today. ("Eurocentric Christianity" refers to those Christian groups and individuals who consider the European and Euro-American Christian traditions to be normative for and superior to other cultural expressions of Christianity; it does not necessarily include those European and Euro-American Christians who recognize that their own cultural expressions of Christianity are no more divinely ordained than those of other Christians.) This persistent Christian superiority complex is characterized by the historically indefensible claim to comparatively superior moral authority, the unbelievable assertion of textual (and in one instance, personal) infallibility, the transparently self-serving claim to exclusive and final religious insight. Vine Deloria Sr., father of the well-known activist/scholar Vine Deloria Jr., served for many years as an Episcopal archdeacon in South Dakota. Two decades ago he discussed the religious situation among his people in a conversation in which he made these remarks:

> *Christianity was not new to the Sioux; the Sioux had their own kind of Christianity. We just did not call it that. We believed in one God, the Great Spirit. We believed in our own kind of Ten Commandments. And we behaved as though we believed in them. That's why it was easy to*

change to the white man's religion. It was there to start with.

The Sioux was a Christian whether he ever heard of Christ or not. But the white man did not practice *his religion. He did not* behave *as a Christian. He lied to himself, and to us. He tried to destroy our religion and leave us with promises of heaven.*

Missionaries always told the Indians that they had the only path to the Great Spirit. That there was only one path. The Sioux did not believe that the Great Spirit was as small as that. If there was only one path, then the Great Spirit would have to be as small as a church. The Sioux believed that the Great Spirit was as large as the world.

That disillusioned the Indians. Churches, the denominations, are like fraternities; yes, they are. Except that the fraternities don't steal each other's members.

The white man cannot stand a peer. He believes no one is his equal. Yes, oh yes, he loves to help the downtrodden, to pity the Indian, to convert the heathen, to save the sinner. But he would not permit the Indian to look him in the face and say, "I am your peer."

The ways of my forefathers have not passed away. My father is in my heart often these days. Religion is strong in the hearts of my people. It is in my heart, too.

Once the white man thought he was chosen of the Lord. He knows now that three-quarters of the people of this world are not white. He knows that the Lord created most people with dark skins, like Indians. He knows this. But still I do not trust him.

Sometimes I despair of the white man ever becoming a Christian. Sometimes the Holy Bible does not seem to teach people anything.[11]

The spiritual arrogance which arrived with Christopher Columbus, who attempted to justify his own sins through superficially pious rationalizations, has been present and active in nearly every encounter between native people and Eurocentric Christians since 1492. It has a pronounced tendency to take the paradigm of self-sacrifice demonstrated by Jesus of Nazareth, a religious nonconformist who attempted to reinvigorate creation, and to transmute this prophetic worldview into a doctrinal dogmatism which demands the sacrifice of religious creativity at the altar of institutional conformity.

To put it another way, most Christians seem to have trouble believing in the Holy Spirit. This spiritual arrogance can be found throughout the Americas today; it has its advocates here at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific and at every other member seminary in the Graduate Theological Union, and it is probably represented to some degree among my readers. Perhaps someone is already working through the theological computations necessary to challenge my heretical comments. Perhaps I will be reminded that it can't be helped. Yahweh, God of the Israelites, chose to address humanity once and for all through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, who was called the Christ, and after fifteen hundred years of building the church around the Mediterranean and throughout Europe, that same trinitarian God worked through European colonialism and Euro-American imperialism to spread the news of universal salvation. "The bible says . . ." they may begin, or, "the church teaches . . ." they may argue, or, "The Holy Spirit testifies . . ."; they may proclaim that Jesus is the way, the truth, and the life; no one goes to heaven except by him. "It's not our fault that native people were living in spiritual darkness until 1492. Don't blame us . . . blame God."

Surely, it is time to begin a new era in the history of Christianity. It is time to move beyond the simplistic cosmologies which place the Christian church at the center of the religious universe. Today we are called to remind ourselves that all theological language has a human context; social and political and cultural realities influence our religious discourse, and our religious discourse has social and political and cultural consequences. We must remember that no matter how certain we are that the creator of the world has spoken a definitive word to us, many of our sisters and brothers around the world understand other theological languages. Our model for interreligious dialogue in the 1990s and beyond should be not Christopher Columbus and the paranoid, feudal, repressed, imperialistic religious institution he represented, but the Taino people who welcomed Columbus to their homes and then thanked their own god for the opportunity to learn and to grow through that unexpected encounter. Native people have had enough evangelization during the past five centuries to last us right through to the Second Coming. It is time for the Christian churches to listen for a change.

Five hundred years after that initial encounter between Tainos and Christians, many native people are continuing to engage in an interreligious dialogue of their own. Last July, grassroots religious leaders from Canada and the United States came together on the Stoney Reserve in western Alberta for the Indian Ecumenical Conference, an intertribal, interreligious gathering of native people and their friends. The first Indian Ecumenical Conference was held during the summer of 1970; it grew out of widespread concern over the need for religious healing and revival among native people.[12] John Snow, elected Chief of the Stoney tribe and an ordained United Church minister, eventually became the host and organizer of the conference. He described the situation this way:

> *As we look back over the past century, it has been like a long cold winter for my people as far as our religious life is concerned here on this Great Island.*
>
> *The sacred fire of our religion had almost been put out by people from foreign lands, who do not understand our belief in the Great Spirit, the Creator. If our sacred fire had been totally extinguished, indeed, we would have been a forgotten people who had once lived on this Great Island.*
>
> *The Christian Church came to us as one of the first representatives of the whiteman's society. Its missionaries*

> *preached a gospel of peace and brotherhood which we found congenial to our native beliefs. Because they came as men of God, we believed they spoke the truth. We believed they described the role of their religion truly, and we believed they interpreted the ways of the whiteman's government truly, we believed the advice they gave us was true and just.*
>
> *Because we believed these things and then found them to be untrue, many of my people now question the Church and its mission.*
>
> *Because of this and because it is becoming more and more clear that the revival of the Indian people must come from within our own heritage, it seems to me that our religious revival must also go back to our roots.*
>
> *For the last one hundred years, a few dedicated native religious leaders and medicine men and women from many reserves and communities have kept our sacred fire going. They have been in close touch with nature, the animal world, the birds of the air, and the spiritual world. They still retain the ancient truth and religion of our forefathers. We are very grateful to those who kept the religious fire burning over the long cold century of indifference.*[13]

Native leaders responded to this situation in the late 1960s by calling for an Indian Ecumenical Conference, which would bring together grassroots religious leaders and elders for a week-long meeting designed to foster interreligious dialogue, cooperation and advocacy across tribal and denominational boundaries and between traditional and Christian communities.[14] It would be an attempt to break down the walls of suspicion and hostility which have been built by centuries of competitive missionization. Interestingly enough, the initial funding for the Indian Ecumenical Conference came from a major protestant denomination, the Anglican Church of Canada. In 1966 "A Position Paper Concerning the Stance of the Anglican Church to Indian Work" called for radical changes in Anglican missiology: "We must see our task that of seeking to make possible the development of creative Indian leadership in the widest sense of the term and not be concerned with mere institutional membership or 'in Church' leaders."[15] Three years later Charles Hendry authored *Beyond Traplines: Does the Church Really Care?*, a detailed analysis of the problems facing native people and of the involvement of Christian churches and missionaries in these problems. Canadian Anglicans took an unprecedented step forward in the history of Christian missions when they voted in 1969 to provide a series of annual grants to facilitate the Indian Ecumenical Conference as a new venture in native religious self-determination.[16] The rest, we might say, is native history.

The Indian Ecumenical Conference quickly became one of the most important annual events in Indian country, especially during the 1970s when thousands of native people traveled to the Stoney Reserve each summer for week-long encampments focused on affirming and strengthening native religious identity. It became a kind of church camp without the church, though there were many native Christian ministers and lay people who actively participated in the conferences. Andrew Dreadfulwater, a Cherokee ceremonial leader and a Baptist, told the group in 1970, "We should have started something like this a long time ago. We have almost let all this religious squabbling smother our spiritual power and destroy us as a strong people."[17] Delegates at that first meeting agreed on a final report which summarized their views and which has guided the conference into the 1990s:

> *Everyone agreed that modern Indian religious life must be a furthering of the historic continuity of time-honored Indian values and philosophical concerns; that both modern Indian ceremonies and Indian Christianity must be part of that continuity; and that both native ceremonials and Indian Christianity can be mutually supportive or parallel and cooperative or integrated according to the desire of the particular tribe involved. Most felt that the work of future conferences would be to evolve a way of implementing the process.*[18]

The Indian Ecumenical Conference has been an important new experience in American religious history. The conference has promoted the revival of native religious traditions by demonstrating that religious revival is the product of both continuity and innovation and is based on the authenticity of personal religious experience. Conference leaders have encouraged inclusive attitudes toward religious participation; they view religious pluralism in terms of complementarity, not difference, and they emphasize the shared religious heritage of native people. Conference participants have modeled an approach to religious diversity in which religious solidarity is expressed through interreligious dialogue, cooperation and advocacy.

A few non-native observers also attended the conferences; one person who truly understood the broader significance of the Indian Ecumenical Conference was Jay Kothare, an Anglican priest who attended four times. Kothare was raised in Bombay, India, as an orthodox Hindu and member of the Brahmin caste; he later moved to Canada and became a Christian. He recalled his experience with the conference as "a blessing and an enrichment of my spiritual life," and "probably the most enriching time of my life as a Christian minister."[19]

> *It was an experience of Christian fellowship in the truest sense of the word, although most native people would balk at that way of referring to it. I have never before been with such large numbers of people, yet felt so little tension, stress, panic. People looked each other in the eyes. There were long silences and lively banterings. No formalities, no unctuous courtesies. The whole congress was one huge experience in sharing the Peace of Christ . . . .*
>
> *The bottom-line of the spirituality of the Conference was experiencing the truth first-hand, and sharing it, reconciling and integrating varied insights, seeking the voice of the Great Spirit in everything that went on around. Nobody preached. Nobody judged. Nobody was in exclusive possession of some exotic spiritual truth. Everything spiritual had to be earthed, made incarnate, and shared through a*

> *sacramental relationship with everybody around. The feeling of sacredness that permeated the entire proceedings of the Conference was infectious. There was no set agenda. The sacred festivities did not start nor end at any particular hour. There was this ongoing celebration of the Holy in and through every act, word, and gesture. Eating a buffalo steak was as much sacramental as smoking the peace pipe or taking part in the Sun Dance. There was a good deal of humor, integrity, respect, joy, and sadness.*
>
> *The Conferences I have attended have opened my whole being—body, mind, and soul—to the Numinous and the Holy as no experience in the church setting has ever done for me either before or since.*[20]

Kothare was particularly impressed by what he called the "democratic mysticism" of the conferences.

> *These were ordinary native folk with extraordinary insights into the dilemma of modern civilization and the possible ways of healing Mother Earth and her children. In each native person, man or woman, I discovered a prophet, a philosopher, a poet, a mystic, and last but not least, a martyr . . . .*
>
> *There was a sensual, earthy, incarnational quality to their experiences, so unlike the earth-negating pseudo-spirituality prevalent among the bohemian white people disenchanted with materialism. Every native person I met at Morley seemed to know intuitively that mystical insight was not the prerogative of a chosen few but the birthright of every individual who was willing to live in harmony with creation . . . .*
>
> *When I listened to the elders holding forth in the sacred arbor, this theme of democratic mysticism was repeated again and again. Spirituality and justice issues were mentioned in the same breath with no contradiction as you would find in the traditional teaching of the church.*[21]

Kothare's perceptive interpretation of the Indian Ecumenical Conference is remarkable in several ways. At one level, the admission by a non-native Christian minister that his involvement in an interreligious native gathering has been his truest experience of Christian fellowship and the most spiritually enriching time of his life represents an implicit—and devastating—critique of mainstream Christian life. Kothare also highlighted the theological distinctiveness of the conference when he identified its experiential, incarnational, egalitarian approach to truth and contrasted this view with the common Christian understanding of truth as rational, abstract and privileged.

Kothare's view of the conference assumes even greater significance when it is correlated with his personal and professional experiences. Kothare recalled childhood memories of seeing Victorian Gothic church buildings in Bombay where, "surrounded by the war memorials and monuments of imperial Britain, brown Anglicans worshiped with strict adherence to the 1662 version of the Book of Common Prayer, in blissful ignorance of the rich indigenous spirituality of India." Years later Kothare had little trouble understanding the "cultural and spiritual alienation" experienced by native Christians whom he encountered in Saskatchewan and Ontario. He also struggled with church authorities himself, over the same issues that caused problems for some of the leaders of the Indian Ecumenical Conference; Kothare was stripped of his ordination by two mainline Canadian churches because of his desire "to incorporate my Hindu spiritual tradition into my Christian faith."

> *Far from honoring my Indian Hindu black spirituality, the church made me feel guilty for being myself. I love to chant and meditate and read Hindu and Buddhist literature along with my daily regimen of Christian Scripture; but I was warned that it was not good for the integrity of my faith. "Stop all association with your past, and be a good Christian," I was counselled. Of course, being a good Christian meant losing my identity as a black person, forfeiting my black spirituality, becoming thoroughly brainwashed into the western Caucasian mode of consciousness,*

> *and swallowing hook, line, and sinker the white version of Christianity as the only way to understand the gospel of Christ.*
>
> *At the seminary, from the pulpit, in personal conversations, during interviews, and at social get-togethers, I was constantly confronted with the eleventh commandment: "Thou shalt not be a syncretist." By syncretism the church meant my integration of black, third-world spirituality with the Christian faith. Those in the church, who were so worried about my heresies, hardly paused to see that on a daily basis they themselves were injecting their own white, western, middle-class ideology into their own understanding of Christianity. It was quite acceptable to quote Plato or Hegel while discussing the Christian doctrine; but God help me if I ever mentioned Kabir, Rumi, or the Buddha.*[22]

Kothare's ability to understand and empathize (not just sympathize) with the religious predicament of native people is not an isolated example of interreligious solidarity, and his critique of Eurocentric Christianity and affirmation of the Indian Ecumenical Conference are not the confused ramblings of a denominational malcontent. Rather, Kothare's understanding of religious identity reflects an undeniable dimension of global religious reality. Ecclesiastical hierarchies, political autocrats, and intellectual elites have attempted, each in their own ways, to suppress the multiplicity, dynamism, complexity, immediacy, subjectivity, durability and utter centrality of religious identity in our world of human diversity and survival. It is certainly true that in some cases, missionized populations have capitulated to the manipulable pretensions of imposed religiosity, despite the static, simplistic, derivative, objectifying, transient and peripheral nature of these false unities. Yet for many religious communities and individuals in Africa, the Americas, and Asia and the Pacific, and increasingly in post-Christian Europe and among the peoples of the European diaspora, religious pluralism forms the context for both social praxis and religious identity. Native people who have participated in the Indian Ecumenical Conference have been part of this global movement toward religious realism. They have pioneered an inclusive, egalitarian solution to the problem of religious diversity, a solution which addresses social crises, cultural conflicts, and religious divisions in a holistic manner and which affirms the absolute value and the inviolable dignity of every human being. Our world will be a much better place to live when the Christian churches stop living out the religious legacy of Christopher Columbus and start emulating the Taino people he wrote about in his log. I invite you to join us in building a new world of interreligious generosity and respect. Open your hearts and discover new friends, offer them whatever you have to give, and sing praise to your god for something the Tainos never had: a second chance, another opportunity to learn and to grow.

NOTES

1. Robert H. Fuson (trans.), *The Log of Christopher Columbus* (Camden, Maine: International Marine, 1987), pp. 75-76.
2. *Ibid*, pp. 76-77.
3. *Ibid*, p. 79.
4. *Ibid*, p. 79.
5. *Ibid*, p. 83.
6. *Ibid*, pp. 83, 81, 86.
7. *Ibid*, p. 81.
8. "Position Paper of the Native American Project of Theology in the Americas" (Detroit II, 1980), 16 pp. manuscript, 2.
9. Steven Charleston, "Reflections on a Revival: The Native American Alternative," *Theological Education* 20/1 (August 1983), 68.
10. Owanah Anderson, *Jamestown Commitment: The Episcopal Church and the American Indian* (Cincinnati: Forward Movement, 1988). pp. 6-7, 5-6.
11. Stan Steiner, *The New Indians* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), pp. 107-10.
12. See James A. Treat, *Contemporary Native Religious Identity: The Indian Ecumenical Conference*, Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1992.
13. Chief John Snow, *These Mountains Are Our Sacred Places: The Story of the Stoney Indians* (Toronto: Samuel-Stevens, 1977), pp. 143-44.
14. Institute for Indian Studies, "A Proposal for an Indian Ecumenical Conference," 9 pp. manuscript (Center for the Study of Man Collection, Series 8, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution).
15. Edward W. Scott, "A Position Paper Concerning the Stance of the Anglican Church to Indian Work," May 9, 1966; reprinted as Appendix C in Charles E. Hendry, *Beyond Traplines: Does the Church Really Care? Towards an Assess-*

ment of the Work of the Anglican Church of Canada with Canada's Native Peoples (Ryerson, 1969), 98-100.

16. "Radical changes in native policies," *Canadian Churchman* 98/8 (September 1969).

17. Janet Hodgson and Jay Kothare, *Vision Quest: Native Spirituality and the Church in Canada* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1990), p. 97.

18. *Ibid*, p. 98.

19. *Ibid*, pp. 104,106.

20. *Ibid*, pp. 107-8.

21. *Ibid*, p. 105.

22. *Ibid*, pp. 1, 2-3.