

With respect to "quotas" and "reverse discrimination," the story is somewhat different. Running the risk of engaging in a semantic discussion, the authors muster the support of several key personalities in their contention that the *modus operandi* of affirmative action plans does not imply the formulation of quotas, but of goals. The arguments are not convincing, however, and the epitome of that dilemma is evident in their citing of Attorney General Griffin Bell's attempt at a subtle distinction that "a goal is something you do to alleviate past discrimination and looks to the day when the merit system operates. A quota is a fixed position" (87). While the authors advisedly point out that quotas are illegal, they hasten to suggest that quotas are an integral part of goals and may be of extreme importance in the "motivation of an institution" towards fulfillment of their affirmative action goals. The argument either breaks down or undergoes a process of compromise when the authors acknowledge that "a quota system would undoubtedly produce an outcry from the academic institutions. Nonetheless, such a procedure may be required in order to erase the legacy of racism within a reasonable period of time, in view of the projected slack demand, and thus, new temporary guidelines might be required" (262). This, however, may be the harsh reality of affirmative action: "The success of any affirmative action program depends upon individual minority group members and the extent to which they are able to take advantage of opportunities" (12).

This study is extremely important and the subject deserves thorough analysis and serious attention at this time when the ugly head of opposition to affirmative action plans has again arisen. It is comprehensive in terms of the legal battles that have transpired over the years and has sought to wrestle realistically with the gut-level issues which are still the focus of heated debates.

— P. Rudy Mattai
Lane College

Jack D. Forbes. *Native Americans and Nixon: Presidential Politics and Minority Self-Determination 1969-1972*. (Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center, University of California, 1981) 148 pp., \$12.00.

In *Native Americans and Nixon*, Jack D. Forbes, author of several monographs on the Indian in America's past, has undertaken an

important subject, one also difficult because essential sources are lacking. Forbes therefore employs a number of hedges such as “we can only guess” (116) in his conjecture about the motives and actions of the Nixon administration relative to Indian Americans. In a foreword taking twenty-three of the 124 pages of “text,” Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz of California State University, Hayward, sets the theme of “neocolonialism.” Explaining the background of post-World War II techniques of colonial control, she states that “Hundreds of thousands of democratic groups were executed or imprisoned by United States forces directly or through military training and aid to puppet regimes” (7). Readers receptive to this statement will have little difficulty in speculating with these writers that “Nixon’s words were hollow” when he stated in 1970 that “We must assure the Indian that he can assume control of his own life without being separated involuntarily from the tribal group” (5).

Students have wondered why Nixon made proclamations for Indian self-determination—statements that do not square with other policies favoring special interests that would exploit natural resources on Indian lands. Ortiz and Forbes explain that Nixon’s rhetoric was intended to “stabilize and pacify Indian protests; that is, destroy militancy in order to pave the way for the exploitation of Indian resources” (9). Meanwhile, Nixon’s staff and the Department of the Interior would build a representative but “acceptable” group of Indians with which to work—the National Tribal Chairman’s Association.

Forbes does not prove that Nixon himself was insincere when he spoke of self-determination for the Indian, but makes the valuable point that regardless of what the President intended, the President is not the government. The policies would be translated into action (or inaction) by the bureaucracy of the Department of Interior and Bureau of Indian Affairs. At that level, even the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Louis R. Bruce, had little influence when he deviated from the policies of the entrenched bureaucrats such as John O. Crow and Harrison Loesch who were closer to Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton.

It is understandable why Forbes, after years of studying the machinations of government policies and agents, sees little good when the government gave more than forty “super-grade federal jobs” and “tens of millions of dollars” in grants or contracts to Chicano leaders (115). He claims that “Grants were also made in 1972 to Chicano groups specifically to keep them busy during the election campaign or to, in some cases, set them up for later audits and retaliation” (116). These are serious charges made without adequate evidence in the book.

Forbes is dissatisfied even when progress is made toward Indian “self-administration” because this usually develops a cultural-class interest and political interest aligned with that of the ruling group (123). But Forbes concludes that the Nixon years of 1969-1972 were “probably the

most exciting, innovative period in the BIA's entire history . . ." This conclusion rescues Forbes from any charge that he simply could not be objective about the Nixon administration.

— George W. Sieber
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh

Phillip Foss, ed. *The Clouds Threw This Light: Contemporary Native American Poetry*. (Santa Fe: Institute of American Indian Arts Press, 1983) 351 pp., \$10.00.

This is a collection of contemporary American Indian poetry in which the total effort is a result of the *poets* making the decisions about content rather than the editor. Foss provided the writers with the opportunity to select their own "best" or "favorite" for inclusion, avoiding perhaps the negative response that artists sometimes have to editors who choose the "wrong" poems! It is interesting to see the choices some made; at times I wished for a discerning editor, but the variety of material provided a cross-section of poetry being written today by American Indians.

Seventy-seven poets are included, resulting in a broad representation of format, style, and subject matter. Well-established poets such as Joseph Bruchac, N. Scott Momaday, Paula Gunn Allen, and Gerald Vizenor as well as younger poets such as Mary Goose, Geraldine Keams, and Roberta Hill Whiteman have poems in the volume. The anthology is massive in size and length, and a bargain for the reader who wishes a diverse sampling of these contemporary poets. My only complaint is that the poets are identified only by tribal affiliation. Brief biographical sketches would have been useful, particularly for those poets who are new to many readers.

It is impossible to do justice to the content of this volume, so these comments will be general and, of necessity, superficial. The range of emotions contained within the collection extends from wistfulness to hope to anger as the poets respond to their individual and tribal past, present, and future. A few specific examples will have to suffice. Some of the poems are decidedly personal and the reader enters into the private world of the writer. In "The Place" Ramson Lomatewama writes:

There is a place
hidden from most eyes.
I think of it often
for it is a part of me