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Introduction

For roughly the past sixty years, everyone from academics to sports enthusiasts have debated the issue of Native American references in sports names, logos, and mascots. During this period, many team names and mascots have been changed, driven by the proven social harms and issues of racism inherent to them. However, many of these racist mascots still exist today on the high school, collegiate, and professional sports level. None are more egregious than the Washington football team’s name and mascot, which Native American groups have fought against for decades. Recently, the United States Patent and Trademark Office cancelled the federal trademark registrations for the second time finding that the term disparages native people. The team and league have appealed this decision by the federal government again. A bi-partisan group of members of Congress have introduced a bill to remove the team name and the public debate over that name and native team name and mascots in the sport world has hit a fevered pitch. In response to this movement, some have argued that there is nothing negative about native and tribal names in sports, that they are simply team names and they honor native people.

To learn more about this issue, in an effort to better educate the public of the harmful effect of racist mascots, students of the Glushko-Samuelson Intellectual Property Clinic at the American University Washington College of Law prepared four case studies on universities who made the
decision early on to remove Native American imagery from their sports programs. The students researched the experience at Dartmouth College, Stanford University, Oklahoma University, and Syracuse University. The common themes in each story not only provide valuable historical reference, but also highlight many of the issues and tensions that are surfaced in the debate going on today. The case studies also demonstrate that none of the arguments used to counteract movements to remove Native American imagery in the debates are new, and none have succeeded in salvaging the use of the mascots. These case studies also helped to prepare panelists who took part in the “Racist Stereotypes and Cultural Appropriation in American Sports” symposium hosted by the National Museum of the American Indian on February 7, 2013.
Origins of “Little Red”

The Native American collective presence at the University of Oklahoma (OU) began around 1908 with the formation of the first “Indian club” on campus. From this formation stemmed the first of the Native American traditions during OU football games, beginning in the 1930s, which involved the crowning an “Indian Princess” and the dancing of a “Young Indian” during the OU Homecoming Halftime. During the same era, Native American members of the football team became known as “Big Red,” a name that later became the team’s official moniker.

Around the same time, an American Indian member of the band began to dress in full regalia and became known as “Little Red.” One source states that Jack Redbird, a member of the Pride of Oklahoma, was the first to don the regalia as Little Red and began the tradition of appearing on the field as a semi-mascot. Sometime in the late 1950s, “Little Red” was deemed an “official mascot.” Most sources discussing the “Little Red” recruitment process state that it was required that “Little Red” be of Native American descent by a percentage of 1/4 or more.

Amidst the turmoil of the late-1960s Civil Rights Movement and Vietnam era, the

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Timmons, Boyce. “A Matter of Individual Choice.” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 3, 22-23. Print. Author of this article, Boyce Timmons, was University Registrar and also proud father to a son who played Little Red at some point.
National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) was formed to address the issues plaguing modern-day Native Americans. Up until this time, in comparison to the other civil rights movements (i.e. African American Civil Rights and Women’s Liberation Movements), the Native American civil rights movement was much less acknowledged—particularly on OU’s campus. However, in 1969, the climate on campus began to change. In October of 1969, the NIYC met in Albuquerque to discuss the abolishment of Native American imagery in collegiate athletics—particularly focusing on OU’s Little Red. “The Council's primary aim was to bring attention to the social needs of Native Americans and to encourage schools and colleges to do more to stimulate support for providing good educational opportunities to American Indians. Little Red was an easy target.” Contemporaneous with NIYC’s interest in OU’s Native American student affairs, there were other sources on campus trying to educate students on Native American life in Oklahoma. Often, the efforts of these sources were met with a lesser degree of fervor and attention. By focusing on Little Red, the Native American students and the NIYC had a solid platform from which to bring attention to the plethora of issues facing both Native American students on OU’s campus as well as the plight of the Native American community nationally.

**Removal of “Little Red”**

“Little Red” became a recognized campus issue in November of 1969, when members of the NIYC OU Chapter delivered a petition, signed by thirty-two members, to OU President

---

8 “Little Red was a non-issue until it was raised by the National Indian Youth Council, which held its 1969 conference at OU.” Ruggles, Connie. Interview. 1 Oct. 2012. Email.
11 For example, “Indians for Indians,” a show moderated by Boyce Timmons, director of Indian education at OU, airs on Public Access Television. He states that the purpose of the show “is to involve more Indians in the life of their communities, economically and socially. In our TV programs we contrast both cultures to show that Indians today can live in both without giving up tribal traditions and ceremonies.” “Indian Show Aired Again.” *Oklahoma Daily* 14 Oct. 1969: 1. Print.
Herbert Hollomon requesting the abolishment of “Little Red.”\textsuperscript{13} The petition stated that the “Little Red, mascot, serve[d] as a symbol of the physical oppression and cultural degradation that American Indians have suffered in past years.”\textsuperscript{14} Around the same time, fifteen OU Native American students sent a letter demanding the abolition of Little Red citing that the “continuation of this farce will be yet another instance of the American Indian being given a royal rapping by Whitey.”\textsuperscript{15} Additionally, many Native American students picketed outside of OU President Hollomon’s office.\textsuperscript{16} During that time, the Native American impact at OU began to take form and become entrenched. As a result of the opinions expressed by his fellow Native American students, Ron Benally, the “Little Red” mascot at the time, donned school clothes for the first time in the history of the mascot while performing at that week’s football game.\textsuperscript{17}

Upon receiving the NIYC petition, President Hollomon submitted the request to the OU Human Relations Committee for analysis.\textsuperscript{18} On November 25, 1969, the Committee recommended temporary suspension of “Little Red” while they evaluated the opinions and arguments on both sides of the issue.\textsuperscript{19} On February 6, 1970, the Human Relations Committee delivered a report to President Hollomon recommending that (1) the office of Little Red be discontinued, and (2) that individual Indian cheerleaders not be prevented from dance and dress “that reflect their unique heritage.”\textsuperscript{20} It was not until April 17, after a Native American student

\textsuperscript{14} “Little Red Dances Again at OU Game.” \textit{The Altus Times} 23 Nov. 1969. Print.
\textsuperscript{15} This was one of many letters sent to the OU Administration and student publications requesting administrative removal of the Little Red mascot. “Indian Students Reaction Fired by OU Mascot.” \textit{Daily O’Collegian} 15 Nov. 1969. Print. One article stated, “The ‘feathered image’ of the forsaken American belongs on the tribal ceremonial grounds, not on the gridiron.” “This distorted picture of the pseudo-Indian mascot represents the ludicrous, contemptible attitude that the vast Anglo-Saxon community has toward the contemporary Indian.” “We will attempt to educate the masses as to the true identity of the American Indian of today.” “This long-overdue involvement at the O.U. scene is in no way directed against the past or present ‘Little Red’ personalities.” Monroe, Kay. “Little Red to Get Axed?” \textit{Oklahoma Daily} 14 Nov. 1969: 1. Print.
sit-in,\textsuperscript{21} that Hollomon officially abolished the Office of Little Red by signing the recommendation letter presented by the Human Relations Committee.\textsuperscript{22}

The second element of the Human Relations Committee’s and President Hollomon’s ruling, which stated that a student could still appear on the OU football field in traditional dress as a member of the cheerleading squad, became the source of controversy in the Fall of 1970—which was also the year Randy Palmer entered the University as a Freshmen. Palmer, a Kiowa native, turned down a scholarship at Stanford University so that he could fulfill his lifelong ambition of performing as “Little Red” at the University of Oklahoma.\textsuperscript{23} Within the Committee’s ruling, Randy Palmer announced his intention to appear on the field, dressed in his traditional Kiowa attire with the OU “Ruff Neks” during the season opener against Wisconsin.\textsuperscript{24} On September 18, 1970, to prevent Palmer from appearing on the field as the defunct mascot, the University Student Court issued Palmer with a temporary restraining order in hopes of pursuing

\textsuperscript{21} After not receiving an answer to whether he was going to sign the recommendation of the Human Relations Committee, Native American students sat-in at the President’s Office until President Hollomon promised them that he would announce the “fate of Little Red within 10 days.” Among the issues they presented when finally taken to the President’s home: a culture house where Indian students could visit and Indian studies provided in the university curriculum. Vinyard, Karen. “Indian Students Sit-in at President’s Office.” \textit{Oklahoma Daily} 8 Apr. 1970: 1, 9. Print.
\textsuperscript{22} Hollomon states, “It is degrading to Indians;” “To me, this issue is one of human dignity;” “No institution should countenance hurt or injury to an individual or group of individuals in the official name of the university.” “I realize that many friends and alumni of the university valued the Little Red mascot . . . . There was surely no intent when the administration of the 1950’s created the symbol to do harm to anyone.” “Times have changed since then . . . . If the country is to overcome much of the alienation within it, people from all groups must be sensitive enough to imagine what it feels like to be a member of another group.” “OU Mascot ‘Little Red’ is Abolished.” \textit{Daily O’Collegian} 22 Apr. 1970. Print; “OU Abolished Red Mascot.” \textit{Lawrence Journal} 17 Apr. 1970. Print; “Defending a Cause.” \textit{St. Joseph News} 21 May 1970. Print; Mitchell, Fred. “Big Red’s Little Red Exists No More.” \textit{Oklahoma Daily} 19 Apr. 1970: 1. Print.
more permanent action against *any* student attempting to appear on the OU football field as Little Red.\(^{25}\) In response, Randy Palmer issued a statement that he would not appear at the OU-Wisconsin game because of the restraining order, reversing course on a suggestion he made that he would indeed dance at the game. “If I didn’t [obey the restraining order], I would probably be arrested and thrown in the clink and it’s not worth it.”\(^{26}\) However, despite stating otherwise the day before, Randy appeared on the OU football field that Saturday dressed in his Native American garments.\(^{27}\) In response, the NIYC national chapter, which was at OU that weekend to hold a conference on the organization’s position on Little Red and other student affairs, held a parade demonstration against Randy’s performance.\(^{28}\)

As a result, Randy Palmer faced two charges of contempt of Student Court and was presented with a summons to appear before the Student Court for defying the restraining order.\(^{29}\) The next few weeks saw the floodgates of public opinion thrown open across the pages of the Oklahoma Daily, and factions of supporters and dissenters began to emerge. Overall, there were three primary positions taken in the “Little Red” argument: (1) that of the NIYC and its supporters; (2) that adopted by the dissenting Oklahoma Native American community; and (3) that espoused by the non-Indian dissenting community.

The NIYC used the removal of Little Red from the football arena as a means to speak on Native American issues on campus. The NIYC felt that the issue of “Little Red” was important because people failed to recognize the negative effects felt by the Native American community when Native Americans were associated with a mascot or stereotype.\(^{30}\) For example, an African American student wrote, “We have to remember in America, the importance of the symbol.’ And that, people, is what it’s all about – the SYMBOL [sic] . . . propaganda given out over and over at fixed intervals unconsciously causes one to gradually accept and BELIEVE [sic] this material .


The wild whooping Indian . . . reinforce[s] stereotypes that people have . . . All ethnic groups must get rid of old, trite, white man-imposed images (symbols) before they can assert their humaneness.” Additionally, some charged that Little Red was insulting because he was “performing to the beat of the white man's drums.” Further still, many felt the symbol did not accurately portray Oklahoma's multiple tribes and instead left an impression that all Indian people were the same. David Poolow wrote, “If you want something authentic, why don't you have an Indian ceremony on the field. An Indian ceremony consists of more than just one Indian. But then the question arises-is the football field a proper place for an Indian ceremony? That would be like having a Baptist convention in a bar.” In addition to the abolishment of Little Red, the NIYC’s goals, which had previously gone unacknowledged by the OU Administration, included: instituting a “vigorous Indian recruiting program, initiating special courses for Indians who lack adequate university preparation, providing additional scholarship for low-income Indian students, expanding the curriculum in Indian cultural studies, expanding opportunities for Indian cultural expression on campus, and expanding opportunities for Indians to participate in campus life generally.” Despite these broader goals, attempts to remove “Little Red” became the focus, and for a time, eclipsed the larger agenda of the NIYC and Native American students on campus.

However, there were many Oklahoman Native Americans, as well as many OU Native American students, who objected to the efforts and position of the NIYC. The NIYC primarily argued that (1) one small group of Native Americans could not possibly speak for all Native Americans across all tribes, (2) “Little Red” was a respectful symbol of historical significance.

32 Ruggles, Connie. Interview. 1 Oct. 2012. Email; Karen Vineyard, editor of the Oklahoma Daily, wrote, “We want to keep Little Red as a symbol of Oklahoman and Indian heritage. We do not want him to be a cultural misrepresentation and therefore we ask the Indian students to help Little Red become the authentic symbol they desire. We ask them to design the proper Indian dress and to instruct Little Red in the proper dances. And we ask all Indian students to realize we are not laughing at them but rather we respect them and their contributions to OU, Oklahoma, and this nation.” Vinyard, Karen. “Little Red: A Symbol of Pride.” *Oklahoma Daily* 11 Feb. 1970: 8. Print.
35 “The NIYC call for getting rid of Little Red was met with disbelief, essentially ‘why are these
at the University, and (3) there were much larger issues than “Little Red” within the Native American community that deserve the focus of the Native American Civil Rights movement.

They felt that despite the NIYC’s use of the “Little Red” platform to improve the lives of Native American students at the University of Oklahoma, the broader concerns of the larger dissenting Native American communities across Oklahoma and the rest of the country were still being ignored in the fight to remove a school mascot. Furthermore, some Native Americans believed outsiders meddling in our affairs?” “Interestingly not unlike the Indian experience of having white people make decisions for them without their input.” Ruggles, Connie. Interview. 1 Oct. 2012. Email; “The mistake that I think was made last year, and I told the NIYC students that it was a mistake, was they made themselves self-appointed Indian spokesmen for the Indians of Oklahoma without ever asking the Indians of Oklahoma anything about it.” Timmons, Boyce. “A Matter of Individual Choice.” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 3, 22-23. Print; In a letter to the editor, Mary Lou Olsen wrote, “Mr. Poolaw, consciously or not, you are trying to tell Randy Palmer and other ‘apples’ how to be Indian! How should an Indian today live? They’d have a hard time forsaking all of ‘whitey’s’ culture because it’s not just white or black or red. It’s all of our culture that we’re living in now!” Shurr, John. “Court Grants Continuance to ‘Little Red’ Defense.” Oklahoma Daily 26 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.

“To my knowledge there was never any resentment about Little Red among Indians over the state. Many times I’ve been to Indian gatherings where Little Red has been, and they’ve honored him with special recognition. They were proud of the fact that Indians were represented at the University on the football field.” Timmons, Boyce. “A Matter of Individual Choice.” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 3, 22-23. Print; The Ohoyohoma Indian supported “Little Red,” stating that Little Red “symbolized the contribution Indian culture has made to the state of Oklahoma.” Letter to the Editor. “Indians Still For Red.” Oklahoma Daily 10 Jan. 1970: 12. Print. Also, Ron Benally, a former Little Red, stated that he became Little Red because he was interested in “Indian affairs” and figured this was a way to get involved in learning more. Benally took dancing lessons from Conney Gailey, and Native American dancer. “Mascot At Home on Gridiron.” Oklahoma Daily 30 Oct. 1969: 4. Print. Terry Walker, Oklahoma Seminoles Chief, stated “I am 100% for ‘Little Red.’ We Indians ought to share other’s views and let ‘Little Red’ stay in. All of us ought to sit down across from each other and talk. We should try to understand each other.” Walter, Elionne. “Little Red Exits Turf for Court.” Oklahoma Daily 24 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.

“There are many things more important than an Indian dancing at football games. I think we can be concerned about helping stop the large dropout of Indian students at the junior high school level. Most of them don't even finish high school.” Timmons, Boyce. “A Matter of Individual Choice.” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 3, 22-23. Print.

NIYC announces that they have succeeded in attaining an American Indian Student Office to coordinate Indian student activities, American Indian Cultural Lounge, an American Indian library, Indian tutors to help slow the high attrition rate of Indian students, an NIYC office, and Native American studies courses offered by Indians at OU. Poolaw, David N. “Indian Youth Council Lists Many Achievements.” Oklahoma Daily 29 Sept. 1970: 12. Print.

“I think Little Red is the most trivial, disgusting issue that Indians have ever been split up
that the presence of “Little Red” did more to bring attention to their causes than did its removal.\textsuperscript{40} The dissatisfaction with the NIYC movement on OU’s campus was exhibited by an Oklahoma Daily article that reported, “Tribal leaders representing 200,000 Oklahoma Indians made it plain . . . they don’t consider it degrading that the University of Oklahoma’s athletic mascot is a dancing Indian. The approximately 125 chairmen and other leaders of about 20 tribes adopted a resolution—with only three dissenting votes—asking that the banished mascot, Little Red, be reinstated to stir school spirit.”\textsuperscript{41}

The third perspective belonged to non-Indian students, or students with minimal Native American heritage, who generally relied on two main arguments to keep “Little Red” as a mascot: (1) “Little Red” had nothing to do with Native Americans and was instead a symbol of pride that they had in their state and school;\textsuperscript{42} and (2) “Little Red” resembled the history and cultural influence of Native Americans in Oklahoma that led to the Oklahoma of the present—therefore, the mascot represented an homage of respect versus an object of ridicule.\textsuperscript{43} These perspectives were capitulated in a circulated petition at the OU Student Union citing “Save Little Red.” The petition read, “May it be known to all men that the undersigned hold these beliefs and believe them to be true. We believe in the rights of minority groups and do not intend this petition as a confrontation. We believe in the integrity of all men, not to exclude the American

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{42} “Having a misrepresentative called Little Red on the football field is not a constant reminder to the white man of ‘an Indian heritage of which all people should be proud.’ Probably ninety per cent – or more – of the people who attend the OU football games know little or nothing about the Indian’s true cultural heritage and actually have many misconceptions about the Indian in America’s past . . . How many Oklahomans know that Oklahoma’s ‘proud Indian heritage’ is really a bigger shame than Hitler’s concentration camps?” White, Margaret. “Dance Not Authentic.” \textit{Oklahoma Daily} 13 Feb. 1970: 1. Print.
\bibitem{43} One OU Graduate student wrote, “The OU mascot is no more an insult to the Indian than the OSU mascot is an insult to the cowboy.” Ewbank, James B. “Don’t Eliminate Red.” \textit{Oklahoma Daily} 13 Feb. 1970: 1. Print.
\end{thebibliography}
Indian, this being a reaffirmation of their faith. We believe that Little Red is exemplary of the rich Indian heritage of Oklahoma and should not be held to be demeaning to the Indian spirit or Indians as a whole. We steadfastly and emphatically believe the benefits to be received by all the people associated with the University of Oklahoma would be far greater if Little Red was again included as a respected institution at the University of Oklahoma. We also believe that Little Red should not fulfill his role as a special spirit-raiser under the name of mascot but should be reinstated as the school representative filling the role of a spirit-raiser both on the field and off. We further feel that Randy Palmer should be excused for his actions at the Oklahoma-Wisconsin game of 1970 as we felt that his actions were in accordance with the feelings of these petitioners and were not blameful.

Randy Palmer appeared before the student court on September 25, 1970, and pled not guilty to the charges of contempt of court for his continued representation of Little Red. Meanwhile, Floyd Harjo, assistant Chief of the Oklahoma Seminole Indians, filed a petition with the Cleveland County District Court against the NIYC, the OU American Indian Student Office, and OU Student Association seeking to prevent further action against “Little Red” and Randy Palmer. This action further signified the disagreement among different Native American groups concerning the direction that the NIYC went in pushing for the removal of Little Red. Amidst

47 “[The NIYC] admitted to me at Albuquerque, and some members admitted to me last year that there was a two-pronged approach to [removing Little Red]. They were sincere in wanting to get rid of Little Red; he was not the kind of image they wanted to appear out there on the football field. On the other hand they were trying to start the NIYC at OU where we had had an Indian club (Sequoyah Club) since 1914. They needed immediate publicity, and this was a neat gimmick to use to get it. They got state and national publicity on it.” Timmons, Boyce. “A Matter of Individual Choice.” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 3, 22-23. Print; The NIYC states that “we Indian students are not on the ‘warpath’ against Little Red. We of the National Indian Youth Council are on the ‘warpath’ against the literal and cultural genocide of Indians that the white man is practicing today. Poolaw, David. “Mascot Issue ‘Trivial.’” Oklahoma Daily 12 Sept.
the turmoil and court actions, Phil Waller, the first “official” Little Red, appeared at that weekend’s game against Oregon dressed as the infamous mascot to show his support of Randy.\textsuperscript{48} By October 5, 1970, the NIYC and the American Indian Student Office had asked the Student Court to drop the charges against Randy Palmer.\textsuperscript{49} Dave Poolaw, an Oklahoma City Sophomore and president of the OU chapter of the NIYC stated, “Little Red has never been the major thrust of our activities. We are (dropping the charges) because Mr. Palmer has been subjected to an unreasonable amount of pressure from outside this institution and no man, especially an incoming freshman, should have to be placed in this kind of situation. We wanted to avoid the kind of circus situation which has arisen here . . . “\textsuperscript{50} All charges were dropped by October 6, 1970, including those that had been brought in District Court against the OU Student Association (UOSA) and OU Chapter of the NIYC.\textsuperscript{51}

**Short-Lived Backlash**

Randy Palmer persisted in his representation of “Little Red” and went on to try out for the official position with the cheerleading squad in October of 1970.\textsuperscript{52} However, despite Palmer’s persistence and Governor Dewey Barlett’s prediction “that the banished mascot . . .
may make a comeback,\textsuperscript{53} Randy Palmer’s reign signified the final time that “Little Red” appeared on the football field in full regalia. Petitions for reinstatement were disparate and short lived, which included protests years later by Phil Lamebull\textsuperscript{54} and by former “Little Red” Phil Waller. “In fact, Waller had numerous chiefs of Oklahoma tribes sign a petition supporting the concept of Little Red as a mascot. And, over the years, numerous O-Club members and OU alumni requested that Waller continue his attempts at bringing back Little Red.” "He worked just about all his life to get Little Red reinstated . . . ."\textsuperscript{55} The era of “Little Red” had ended.

\textsuperscript{55} Harper Justin. “OU’s Little Red Dies of Leukemia.” \textit{NewsOK.com} 8 July 2005; Also, Waller, a Kiowa Indian, was Little Red from 1957-60, and in 1970.
### University of Oklahoma Timeline

- **~ 1908**

- **1914**

- **~ 1930s**
  - A Native American began to perform ceremonies at halftime of homecoming show, where a crowned Indian Princess and young Indian dressed and danced in full regalia. An American Indian on the band dressed in full regalia, then became known as “Little Red.” Article states that every Indian has been at least part Indian, and actually there is a ¼ minimum requirement. (Hilty, Wendy. “Is Little Red Mascot Wanted? Only His ‘Public’ To Decide.” *Oklahoma Daily* 19 Nov. 1969: 1-2. Print.).

- **~ Mid 1930s**
  - American Indians on football team began to be known as “Big Red.” This moniker became the name of the full team. (Hilty, Wendy. “Is Little Red Mascot Wanted? Only His ‘Public’ To Decide.” *Oklahoma Daily* 19 Nov. 1969: 1-2. Print.).

- **1957**
  - Phil Waller, a Kiowa Indian, was Little Red from 1957-60, and in 1970. (Harper Justin. “OU’s Little Red Dies of Leukemia.” *NewsOK.com* 8 July 2005).

- **1966**
OU surrendered the Little Red headdress after defeat to OSU, but it was returned when a copy war bonnet was made. OSU students expressed dissatisfaction, “So, why shouldn’t their Indian go bareheaded until they beat us?” (“Rivalry Prompts Prize Confusion.” Daily O’Collegian 30 Nov. 1967. Print.)

1969

February 1969

March 26, 1969
- A Human Relations Committee was established resulting from the Ohm Committee investigation of charges of discrimination in the basketball program described above. The function was to “deal with complaints and charges of discrimination.” (Pipps, Val and Ruggles, Connie Burke. “Little Red: What is at Issue?” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 1-2, 21-22. Print.)

October 1969
- Regarding a national conference for Native American Indians: “Albuquerque is the national headquarters of the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC), and they were discussing at that time that OU was going to be a target for their national convention at which time they hoped to abolish Little Red.” (Timmons, Boyce. “A Matter of Individual Choice.” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 3, 22-23. Print.)
- “They admitted to me at Albuquerque, and some members admitted to me last year that there was a two-pronged approach to this. They were sincere in wanting to get rid of Little Red; he was not the kind of image they wanted to appear out there on the football field. On the other hand they were trying to start the NIYC at OU where we had had an Indian club (Sequoyah Club) since 1914. They needed immediate publicity, and this was a neat gimmick to use to get it. They got state and national publicity on it.” (Timmons, Boyce. “A Matter of Individual Choice.” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 3, 22-23. Print.)
- “Little Red was a non-issue until it was raised by the National Indian Youth Council, which held its 1969 conference at OU. The Council's primary aim was to bring attention to the social needs of Native Americans and to encourage schools and colleges to do more to stimulate support for providing good educational opportunities to American Indians. Little Red was an easy target.” (Ruggles, Connie. Interview. 1 Oct. 2012. Email.)

October 11, 1969
- Ron Benally makes his first appearance as Little Red. Became Little Red because he was interested in “Indian affairs” and after speaking with Kirke Kickingbird, he figured this was a way to get involved. Took dancing lessons from Conney
Gailey, and Native American dancer. Article stated he will be playing with the Navajo Tribal Band in the Rose Bowl Parade. Article states he was 1/2 Navajo, 1/4 Chickasaw, and 1/4 “Oklahoma and Arizona” (“Mascot At Home on Gridiron.” *Oklahoma Daily* 30 Oct. 1969: 4. Print.)

- **October 14, 1969**
  - “Indians for Indians,” a show moderated by Boyce Timmons, director of Indian education at OU, airs on Public Access Television. He states that the purpose of the show “is to involve more Indians in the life of their communities, economically and socially. In our TV programs we contrast both cultures to show that Indians today can live in both without giving up tribal traditions and ceremonies.” (“Indian Show Aired Again.” *Oklahoma Daily* 14 Oct. 1969: 1. Print.)

- **November 1969**
  - The petition stated “Little Red, mascot, serves as a symbol of the physical oppression and cultural degradation that American Indians have suffered in past years.” (“Little Red Dances Again at OU Game.” *The Altus Times* 23 Nov. 1969. Print.)

- **October/November 1969**
  - 15 “OU Indian students” sent a letter asking that Little Red be abolished. “The students said they feel the ‘continuation of this farce will be yet another instance of the American Indian being given a royal rapping by Whitey.’” Stated that the letter closed with, “Fellow Redmen, the time has come to again don the war paint and gather the tomahawks to help America finish her unfinished business.” (“Indian Students Reaction Fired by OU Mascot.” *Daily O’Collegian* 15 Nov. 1969. Print.)

- **November 12, 1969**
  - Informal gathering of American Indian students discussing the removal of “Little Red.” Steve Pensoneau of the Sequoyah Club made it very clear it was not their organization. One student declares Little Red is a “clown.” Ron Benally stated, “Little Red is a symbol of the Indian culture. I want to show my pride in being an Indian by dancing out there on the field.” (Monroe, Kay. “Little Red to Get Axed?” *Oklahoma Daily* 14 Nov. 1969: 1-2. Print.)
  - Ron Benally performed as Little Red. But he did not dress in “semi-pseudo Indian garb that has been traditionally worn on gridirons across the nation for a number of years,” but rather regular school clothes. Article saying fight was not against him, but what Little Red represents. (Monroe, Kay. “Little Red to Get Axed?” *Oklahoma Daily* 14 Nov. 1969: 1-2. Print.)
November 14, 1969
- Letter to the editor from group of Native American students at OU. “The ‘feathered image’ of the forsaken American belongs on the tribal ceremonial grounds, not on the gridiron.” “This distorted picture of the pseudo-Indian mascot represents the ludicrous, contemptible attitude that the vast Anglo-Saxon community has toward the contemporary Indian.” “We will attempt to educate the masses as to the true identity of the American Indian of today.” “This long-overdue involvement at the O.U. scene is in no way directed against the past or present ‘Little Red’ personalities.” (Monroe, Kay. “Little Red to Get Axed?” Oklahoma Daily 14 Nov. 1969: 1-2. Print.)

November 21, 1969
- “If they would give him a real knife instead of that two cent rubber one they got second-hand from the Fire Department last Christmas, he could get some scalps even if the Big Red doesn’t.” “I sure do hope the Sooners keep Little Red for a mascot. Then he can dance on the field every Saturday. Maybe he’ll get his dances mixed up and do a rain dance instead of a victory dance.” “One OU student said Little Red was a clown and she didn’t want to be represented by a clown.” “If we give Little Red a real knife, tomahawk, and bow and arrows and we give Pistol Pete real bullets then they could have a real cowboy and Indian fight before the game . . . .” (Mires, Ralph. “Beat the Hell Outa OU.” Daily O’Collegian 21 Nov. 1969. Print.)
- Article states that Red Elk, campus representative for the NIYC, will be delivering letter to Hollomon. “He said the essential issue is whether OU will support a stereotype that is abusive and insensitive to American Indian identities and cultures.” (Martin, Kay. “Indian Council Asks Little Red Decision.” Oklahoma Daily 21 Nov. 1969: 1-2. Print.)

November 22, 1969
- Ron Benally, Little Red at the time, danced at the Nebraska game. This was in part to test out response to the NIYC’s request to remove mascot. (“Little Red Dances Again at OU Game.” The Altus Times 23 Nov. 1969. Print.)
- The petition, signed by 32 individuals, was forwarded to Dr. E. Kenneth Feaver, Chairman and the Human Relations Committee by President Hollomon. (“‘Little Red’ Petition Sent to Committee.” Oklahoma Daily 22 Nov. 1969. Print.)

~ November 22-25, 1969
- “Indian students did stage a protest outside the university president's office, but it was clear they had little experience at protests. The president's secretary was married to an Indian and knew the Indian students. In setting up their protest, the students came to her at her desk in the president's office to see if they could borrow some Scotch tape for their protest signs. She was mortified that they did not see the irony of the situation. Several of the Oklahoma tribes signed a petition to retain Little Red, but this was a time of rapid social change, and small groups were able to accomplish big things within that environment.” (Ruggles, Connie. Interview. 1 Oct. 2012. Email.)
• November 25, 1969

• December 1, 1969

• December 5, 1969
  o Petition requesting an injunction was filed against Little Red and freshman cheerleaders at UOSA Superior Court. Petition expressed desire to press charges against Oklahoma Student Association because Little Red and cheerleaders were not selected properly. (“Petition Names ‘Little Red,’ Cheerleaders.” Oklahoma Daily 4 Dec. 1969: 1. Print.)

• 1970

  • January 12, 1970
    o “Little Red” is a topic at a meeting hosted by the Cleveland County branch of the NAACP. (Izen, Shel. “In Case of Discrimination…” Oklahoma Daily 01/14/70)

  • January 30, 1970
    o The Ohoyohoma Indian Women’s Club, organized in Norman to study and preserve Indian culture and history, writes a letter to the editor in support of “Little Red” whom they say “symbolized the contribution Indian culture has made to the state of Oklahoma.” (Letter to the Editor. “Indians Still for Red.” Oklahoma Daily 30 Jan. 1970: 12. Print.)

  • February 6, 1970

    o Human Relations Committee comments in report to President Hollomon that they received reactions from three primary groups: Indians, white-Indians (“individuals stating that they had a small amount of Indian ‘blood’”), and white reactions. “Those representing the white-Indian groups ‘generally failed to see or appreciate the psychological and cultural concerns implicit in the request to

- Activities Office Opens for Native American students. It’s purpose is to “suggest and recommend policies or programs that the University can put into effect that will better accommodate the American Indian students on campus and also coordinate the activities of the students.” (Mitchell, Fred. “Committee Proposes to Abolish Little Red.” *Oklahoma Daily* 6 Feb. 1970: 1-2. Print.)

- February 10, 1970

- February 11, 1970
  - Karen Vineyard, editor of the Oklahoma Daily, writes, “We want to keep Little Red as a symbol of Oklahoman and Indian heritage. We do not want him to be a cultural misrepresentation and therefore we ask the Indian students to help Little Red become the authentic symbol they desire. We ask them to design the proper Indian dress and to instruct Little Red in the proper dances. And we ask all Indian students to realize we are not laughing at them but rather we respect them and their contributions to OU, Oklahoma, and this nation.” (Vinyard, Karen. “Little Red: A Symbol of Pride.” *Oklahoma Daily* 11 Feb. 1970: 8. Print.)

- February 13, 1970
  - OU Graduate student writes, “The OU mascot is no more an insult to the Indian than the OSU mascot is an insult to the cowboy.” (Ewbank, James B. “Don’t Eliminate Red.” *Oklahoma Daily* 13 Feb. 1970: 8. Print.)
  - Another student writes, “Having a misrepresentative called Little Red on the football field is not a constant reminder to the white man of ‘an Indian heritage of which all people should be proud.’ Probably ninety per cent – or more – of the people who attend the OU football games know little or nothing about the Indian’s true cultural heritage and actually have many misconceptions about the Indian in America’s past . . . How many Oklahomans know that Oklahoma’s ‘proud Indian heritage’ is really a bigger shame than Hitler’s concentration camps?” (White, Margaret. “Dance Not Authentic.” *Oklahoma Daily* 13 Feb. 1970: 8. Print.)

- February 14, 1970
  - A former OU Student responds to Karen Vineyard’s statement on February 11. “White people are just so proud of us Indians. They cherish us and care about us. This is why a lot of us are living on proud reservations in proud sub-standard housing. If we were loved any more, we’d all be dead. We are loved so much that we are hardly ever seen off our reservations except when we are proudly displayed as decorations at heritage day celebrations in our ‘fuzz suits’ . . . . It’s too much to explain why we Indians feel that ‘Little Red’ is out of place. It’s hard

• February 20, 1970
  o President Hollomon calls a meeting with OU Indian students to discuss American Indian opportunities and issues on campus. (“Indian Group Sets Meeting.” Oklahoma Daily 20 Feb. 1970: 7. Print.)

• February 25, 1970
  o Freshmen OU student points out, “[Y]ou go to the bookstore to buy a notebook. On its cover is a caricature of Little Red. OU’s ‘symbol of pride’ is interpreted, or more accurately, misinterpreted to be a slovenly, splay-footed, lummox . . . If [this] is a demonstration of your pride and respect, then how do you show disrespect? . . . [Likewise,] if you really respected us, you wouldn’t incorporate part of the Indian religion into one of your forms of entertainment.” (Monroe, Kay. “Little Red Debate Still Continues.” Oklahoma Daily 25 Feb. 1970: 8. Print.)

• April 7, 1970
  o After not receiving an answer to whether he was going to sign the recommendation of the Human Relations Committee, Indian students sit-in at President’s Office until President Hollomon promised them that he would announce the “fate of Little Red within 10 days.” Among the issues they presented when finally taken to the President’s home: a culture house where Indian students could visit and Indian studies provided in the university curriculum. (Vinyard, Karen. “Indian Students Sit-in at President’s Office” & “Now We Must Wait.” Oklahoma Daily 08 April 1970: 1-2. Print.)

• April 17, 1970
  o Hollomon officially abolishes Little Red as a mascot. Hollomon issues statement accepting Human Relations Committee, and states ”If Indians are chosen as cheerleaders and if they wish to participate in such activities, they may, of course, do so in ways acceptable to them and their Indian community. We are removing only the official recognition of Little Red as the OU mascot.” (Pipps, Val and Ruggles, Connie Burke. “Little Red: What is at Issue?” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 1-2, 21-22. Print.)
  o Hollomon states, “It is degrading to Indians;” “To me, this issue is one of human dignity;” “No institution should countenance hurt or injury to an individual or group of individuals in the official name of the university.” “I realize that many friends and alumni of the university valued the Little Red mascot . . . . There was surely no intent when the administration of the 1950’s created the symbol to do harm to anyone.” “Times have changed since then . . . . If the country is to overcome much of the alienation within it, people from all groups must be sensitive enough to imagine what it feels like to be a member of another group.” (“OU Mascot ‘Little Red’ Is Abolished.” Daily O’Collegian 22 April 1970: 1-2.
In an article entitled, “A Black Student Looks at Little Red,” Annette Gilliam wrote, “If you try and belittle the significance of Little Red, you are forgetting the manner in which people think and reason. As one US Senator recently said in the Carswell debate, ‘We have to remember in America, the importance of the symbol.’ And that, people, is what it’s all about – the SYMBOL [sic] . . . We know now, as Hitler knew before us, that propaganda given out over and over at fixed intervals unconsciously causes one to gradually accept and BELIEVE [sic] this material. The wild whooping Indian . . . all reinforce stereotypes that people have. . . All ethnic groups must get rid of old, trite, white man-imposed images (symbols) before they can assert their humaneness . . . . So I say that the fate of Little Red should rest of the opinions of the Indians and not of the white majority.” (Gilliam, Annette. “A Black Student Looks at Little Red.” Oklahoma Daily 17 April 1970: 17. Print.)

- September 10, 1970
  - “Although we find nothing ‘degrading’ in the Little Red costume or his demeanor at the games, we feel that the governor should respect our duly-appointed commissions on this campus to deal with such disputes.” S. Livermore, editor of the Oklahoma Daily. (Livermore, S. “OU is Curious (Little) Red.” Oklahoma Daily 19 Sept. 1970: 12. Print.)

- Prior to September 18, 1970
  - Randy Palmer, an 18-year old Kiowa Indian from Anadarko, said he had his dance costume ready and would appear as a mascot for the Ruff Neks, a men’s pep club.” (Martin, Kay. “‘Little Red’ Return Restrained by Court.” Oklahoma Daily 19 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)

- September 18, 1970
- Temporary restraining order issued. Hearing scheduled for September 25.
- The restraining order prevented the mascot from appearing was issued by Tom Williams of the general court. Hearing was set for Sept. 25 for permanent restraining order against Palmer or any student attempting to appear as Little Red. (“OU Court Rules Red Can’t Dance.” *Daily O’Collegian* 19 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.) (Martin, Kay. “‘Little Red’ Return Restrained by Court.” *Oklahoma Daily* 19 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)

  - September 19, 1970
    - NIYC holds panel on “Little Red” issue as a part of an NIYC Convention held at OU. The NIYC was intending to use the panel to clarify the NIYC’s position. (Mendenhall, Margaret. “Panel Prepares to Discuss ‘Little Red.’” *Oklahoma Daily* 18 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)
    - Randy Palmer issues a statement that, while earlier in the week he stated he would dance at the OU-Wisconsin game, he would not now because of a temporary restraining order. “If I didn’t [obey the restraining order], I would probably be arrested and thrown in the clink and it’s not worth it.” (Martin, Kay. “‘Little Red’ Return Restrained by Court.” *Oklahoma Daily* 19 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)
    - Dixon Palmer also contributed much to the Kiowa exhibit at the Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian. (Smithsonian Museum photos, 10/08/12)

    - In response, NIYC holds parade demonstration against Randy’s performance. Signs read “Little Red died for your sins” and “Stop the Governor’s War on Indians” (“‘Little Red’ Served Summons by UOSA to Appear in Court.” *Oklahoma Daily* 22 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)

  - September 21, 1970
    - Palmer presented with a summons to appear before the Student Court for defying restraining order. Palmer was faced with two charges of contempt of Court. (“‘Little Red’ Served Summons by UOSA to Appear in Court.” *Oklahoma Daily* 22 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)

September 22, 1970


David Poolaw of the NIYC states, ‘‘Little Red’ is no longer an issue at OU. What the NIYC is concerned with now is getting economic and social equality for all Indians.” (‘‘Little Red’ Exits Turf for Court.” Oklahoma Daily 24 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)

September 23, 1970

The NIYC states, ‘‘we Indian students are not on the ‘warpath’ against Little Red. We of the National Indian Youth Council are on the ‘warpath’ against the literal and cultural genocide of Indians that the white man is practicing today. The Indian wars have stopped, true, but now the US government seems to be bent on waging a bureaucratic war against Indian self-determination. In other words, the white man wants to legally kill us and our culture.” (Poolaw, David. “Mascot Issue ‘Trivial.’” Oklahoma Daily 23 Sept. 1970: 12. Print.)

Bobby Gray sees “Little Red” as something that kids are fascinated by—in a positive way. This fascination, he claims, turns into desire to learn, and a desire to learn turns into real learning. Once they begin to learn about Indians, they will soon realize the realities facing modern Native Americans. Once they begin to learn about “the problems demanding solution,” they can begin to help develop solutions. These solutions are all inspired by their admiration for Little Red. (Gray, Bobby. “‘Little Red’ A Reminder of Heritage.” Oklahoma Daily 23 Sept. 1970: 12. Print.)

“Suppose the situations were reversed. Say the Indians were in the majority. At every lacrosse game there would be a white man dressed in the popular conception of what a white man should look like. Every time the home team would score a goal, the white man, in front of his alter, could raise the Host and recite the words of Consecration. The mob could whoop it up and yell at the ‘Whitey’.” (Mercer, Mary. “Oklahoma Land of ‘Whitey.’” Oklahoma Daily 23 Sept. 1970: 12. Print.)

September 24, 1970

Terry Walker, Oklahoma Seminoles Chief, states “I am 100% for ‘Little Red.’ We Indians ought to share other’s views and let ‘Little Red’ stay in. All of us ought to sit down across from each other and talk. We should try to understand each other.” (‘‘Little Red’ Exits Turf for Court.” Oklahoma Daily 24 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)


Petition circulates the OU Student Union to students, fans, and faculty citing “save Little Red.” The petition reads: “May it be known to all men that the undersigned hold these beliefs and believe them to be true. We believe in the rights of minority groups and do not intend this petition as a confrontation. We believe in the integrity of all men, not to exclude the American Indian, this being a reaffirmation of their faith. We believe that Little Red is exemplary of the rich Indian heritage of Oklahoma and should not be held to be demeaning to the Indian spirit or Indians as a whole. We steadfastly and emphatically believe the benefits to be received by all the people associated with the University of Oklahoma would be far greater if Little Red was again included as a respected institution at the University of Oklahoma. We also believe that Little Red should not fulfill his role as a special spirit-raiser under the name of mascot but should be reinstated as the school representative filling the role of a spirit-raiser both on the field and off. We further feel that Randy Palmer should be excused for his actions at the Oklahoma-Wisconsin game of 1970 as we felt that his actions were in accordance with the feelings of these petitioners and were not blameful.” (“Save ‘Little Red.”” *Oklahoma Daily* 24 Sept. 1970: 6. Print.)

Both NIYC and Pro-Little Red Native Americans show up to the Union protest in favor of their position while students arrive to sign, or refuse to sign, the petition to “save Little Red.” (Hollander, Michael. “Little Red Protest on Saturday.” *Oklahoma Daily* 25 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)

September 25, 1970


Randy Palmer was represented by Oklahoma State Senator, and former attorney, John Young (D-Sapulpa). He argues that Palmer’s right to “peaceful demonstration” in appearing as Little Red was being violated. (Shurr, John. “Court Grants Continuance to ‘Little Red’ Defense.” *Oklahoma Daily* 26 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)

“Tribal leaders representing 200,000 Oklahoma Indians made it plain Friday [September 25] they don’t consider it degrading that the University of Oklahoma’s athletic mascot is a dancing Indian. The approximately 125 chairmen and other leaders of about 20 tribes adopted a resolution—with only three dissenting votes—as asking that the banished mascot, Little Red, be reinstated to stir


- September 26, 1970
  - Randy Palmer was known for being a champion Kiowa dancer and his attire was “not comparable to past ‘Little Red’ costumes.” (Shurr, John. “Court Grants Continuance to ‘Little Red’ Defense.” *Oklahoma Daily* 26 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)
  - Palmer does not appear at game against Oregon, but former Little Red, Phil Waller, does. He was also informed he was violating a student court order and issued a subpoena to appear before Student Court Monday September 28 at 5pm. Even though he graduated, he was still taking classes at the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education, which put him under the jurisdiction of the OU Student Court. (Pipps, Val and Ruggles, Connie Burke. “Little Red: What is at Issue?” *Sooner Magazine* Oct. 1970: 1-2, 21-22. Print.) (Klein, Karen. “‘Little Red’ Trouble Doubles.” *Oklahoma Daily* 29 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)
  - Editor of the Oklahoma Daily, S. Liverman, asks why the NIYC keeps persisting against Little Red rather than spending time, energy, and money in court or in protest. “Indian or non-Indian, who are genuinely concerned about the welfare of the American should be trying to alleviate the problems by direct action.” (Livermore, S. “Little Red Suffers for Indians.” *Oklahoma Daily* 26 Sept. 1970: 16. Print.)
  - Mary Lou Olsen challenges Poolaw, stating ”In your own words, Mr. Poolaw, consciously or not, you are trying to tell Randy Palmer and other ‘apples’ how to be Indian! How should an Indian today live? They’d have a hard time forsaking all of ‘whitey’s’ culture because it’s not just white or black or red. It’s all of our culture that we’re living in now!” (Olsen, Mary Lou. “White’s Position on Little Red Issue Defended.” *Oklahoma Daily* 26 Sept. 1970: 17. Print.)

- September 27, 1970
  - Randy Palmer fails to attend cheerleading tryouts, which “was the only chance Palmer had to ever dance as Little Red legally.” (Klein, Karen. “‘Little Red’ Trouble Doubles.” *Oklahoma Daily* 29 Sept. 1970: 1-2. Print.)
• September 29, 1970
  o NIYC announces that they have succeeded in attaining an American Indian Student Office to coordinate Indian student activities, American Indian Cultural Lounge, an American Indian library, Indian tutors to help slow the high attrition rate of Indian students, an NIYC office, and Native American studies courses offered by Indians at OU. (Poolaw, David. “Indian Youth Council Lists Many Achievements.” Oklahoma Daily 29 Sept. 1970: 12. Print.)

• September 30, 1970
  o Floyd Harjo, assistant chief of the Seminole Indians, filed a petition was filed in Cleveland County District Court against the NIYC, the American Indian Student Office, and the Student Association General Court to prevent them from blocking the appearance of Little Red. Harjo, in another petition to the OU Student Court, requested that no further action be taken against “Little Red” Randy Palmer. Palmer's attorney, State Sen. John Young, filed a similar petition at the State Supreme Court. (Pipps, Val and Ruggles, Connie Burke. “Little Red: What is at Issue?” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 1-2, 21-22. Print.) (“Little Red Returns to General Court.” Oklahoma Daily 2 Oct. 1970: 1-2. Print.)

• October 3, 1970

• October 5, 1970
  o NIYC and the American Indian Student Office ask the Student Court to drop charges. Dave Poolaw, Oklahoma City sophomore and president of the OU chapter of the National Indian Youth Council states, “Little Red has never been the major thrust of our activities. We are (dropping the charges) because Mr. Palmer has been subjected to an unreasonable amount of pressure from outside this institution and no man, especially an in-coming freshman, should have to be placed in this kind of situation. We wanted to avoid the kind of circus situation which has arisen here ...” (Pipps, Val and Ruggles, Connie Burke. “Little Red: What is at Issue?” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 1-2, 21-22. Print.) (“General Court Drops Charges on ‘Little Red.’” Oklahoma Daily 6 Oct. 1970: 1-2. Print.)
  o Palmer’s Counsel withdraws counter suits in District Court against UOSA in response to the Student Court dropping contempt charges against Palmer. (“General Court Drops Charges on ‘Little Red.’” Oklahoma Daily 6 Oct. 1970: 1-2. Print.)
  o Poolaw conceded that the argument over Little Red possibly had alienated some Indians around the state, stating, "they have very open minds, and I'm sure when we talk they will understand what we are trying to do. There is so much to do.”

- Poolow states, "Little Red is a minor and somewhat questionable part of the Indian heritage. We say now to the white people, you can have your mascot. All we want is an Indian studies program, our cultural lounge, scholar-ships and encouragement and help for Indian students ... Little Red will never feed hungry Indian children; Little Red will never help more Indian students come to OU...” (Pipps, Val and Ruggles, Connie Burke. “Little Red: What is at Issue?” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 1-2, 21-22. Print.

- Poolow states, "We ask the chiefs of the Five Civilized Tribes, instead of being worried about Little Red to help preserve the Indian cultural heritage on this campus and others around the state. To our Indian brothers who have opposed us, we ask only for moral and financial help to help other Indians. We want to preserve our ethnic identity, yet become economically and socially successful too." (Pipps, Val and Ruggles, Connie Burke. “Little Red: What is at Issue?” Sooner Magazine Oct. 1970: 1-2, 21-22. Print.)

- October 9, 1970

- Prior to October 13, 1970
  - Palmer went to State Supreme court to request that he be allowed to dance. (“Mascots Court Plea.” Mount Airy News 13 Oct. 1970: 1. Print.)

- October 22, 1970
  - Sooner Rally Council was holding tryouts for “Rally leader(s),” the council had contacted Randy Palmer. (Mendenhall, Margaret. “‘Rally Leader’ to be Chosen on Thursday.” Oklahoma Daily 21 Oct. 1970: 1-2. Print.)
  - Randy Palmer was chosen, along with Brian Beachwood, who will be dressed as a raccoon. Randy had appeared as Little Red at the OU-Oregon State game. (“Palmer is Back as Rally Leader.” Oklahoma Daily 24 Oct. 1970: 3. Print.)

- 1973

- After 1973
“In fact, [Phil] Waller had numerous chiefs of Oklahoma tribes sign a petition supporting the concept of Little Red as a mascot. And, over the years, numerous O-Club members and OU alumni requested that Waller continue his attempts at bringing back Little Red.” "He worked just about all his life to get Little Red reinstated," Cross said. "It was just a handful of students here at OU that thought (the mascot) was degrading to Indians. The masses thought it was great." (Harper Justin. “OU’s Little Red Dies of Leukemia.” NewsOK.com 8 July 2005)
The Origins of the Indian Mascot

There are various unconfirmed stories of how the name “Indian” first attached to Stanford University’s athletic teams, but the name itself was most likely first inspired by the large Native American population that once lived in the Bay Area. An article from the Stanford Illustrated Review in January 1931 explains that Dr. T. M. Williams, a 1897 alumnus, a former Varsity football player, and a member of the Board of Athletic Control, first conceived of naming Stanford the “Indians” in 1923.1 Dr. Williams, determined to attach the name to the University, hired Mr. A. Phimister Proctor, a famous sculptor, to design an image of a Native American man’s head. Dr. Williams’ wife arranged to have the image of the head embroidered on the Stanford football players’ team blankets. The undergraduate student body, however, was apathetic toward the design, and it was removed from the players’ blankets at the end of the 1923 season.2 Regardless, Stanford was still referred to by that name by the newspapers and sports cartoonists for the remainder of the decade. The reinforcement of “the Stanford Indian” in the media resulted in an increase in the name’s popularity among the student body. During the Big Game3 in 1930, a society of Stanford Indians referred to as “The Scalpers” marched a drum to the cheerleader’s stand and began performing war chants.4 Further, Glenn Scobey “Pop”

---

1 Petty, Claude and Amyx, Darrell “Stanford Goes Indian.” The Stanford Illustrated Review, January 1931: 177, 195. Print. The article, after listing the many animal inspired mascots of other Western United States universities, states that the Native American was the “original lord and conqueror” of these animals, and connects the Indian name with one of superiority. The “Indian” idea occurred to Dr. T. M. Williams of Palo Alto, in 1923, two years after the construction of the Stanford Stadium.
2 Ibid. With the apathy of the student body toward the mascot, Mr. Proctor also cancelled plans to built a large concrete Indian sculpture for the team.
3 Ibid. The Big Game is the game played against Stanford’s rival, the University of California Berkeley.
4 Ibid. The war chants were recorded as: “Stanford Indian, scalp the Bear, scalp the Golden Bear. Take the Axe, to his lair; scalp the Bear, Stanford Indian.”
Warner, the head coach for Stanford’s football team from 1924-1932, used the name as a mascot for the 1930 Big Game. In 1930, the Indian name was unanimously voted as the official mascot of the University by the Executive Committee.

During the height of its use, the Stanford Indian was a prevalent mascot for the University’s sports teams, and many other Indian symbols accompanied its use. Although the standard image of the mascot varied, the Indians were often represented by a caricature of a small Native American man with a large nose. A profile view of a Native American man in a headdress was also used, albeit less frequently. For nineteen years, Timm Williams, a member (and later Chief) of the Yurok Tribe of California, played “Prince Lightfoot” during Stanford athletic events, continuously performing traditional Yurok dances in traditional dress. While his performances halted with the removal of the mascot in the 1970s, Mr. Williams was a strong supporter of the Stanford Indians mascot, and of his role as Prince Lightfoot, until his death in 1987. In addition, the outfits of the Stanford Cheerleading team, known as the Stanford dollies, encompassed Indian-inspired designs.

The Removal of the Indian Mascot

Few Native American students were enrolled at Stanford between 1930 and the early 1970s. Native student enrollment increased in 1970, to twenty-six students when twenty-two

---

Native Americans joined the freshman class, and the Stanford American Indian Organization (SAIO) was created that same year. On November 22, 1970, the first petition to remove the mascot was filed with the Dean of Students by the SAIO. This petition objected to the Indian mascot and the live performances of Prince Lightfoot, and demanded their removal. In response to this petition, the administration dropped the caricature of the large-nosed Indian, but the Indian remained Stanford’s official mascot and the Timm “Prince Lightfoot” Williams performances continued.

In 1971, the University hired Gwen Shunatona as the Associate Dean of Students to advocate for the interests of Native American undergraduate students at Stanford. In a telephone interview on October 1, 2012 with Ms. Shunatona, she described the disturbance felt by the Native students at Stanford to the use of this mascot: many had come from traditional backgrounds, and found themselves immersed at Stanford in an atmosphere of cultural insensitivity and insult to their backgrounds. She was not able to recall a Native student who was not offended by the Indian mascot and the performances of Prince Lightfoot. Ms. Shunatona explained the way Native students and non-Native Stanford students joined together in support of removing the mascot from the University. As Associate Dean of Students, she helped

---

13 Stanford Student Affairs. “Native American History at Stanford: California Timeline.” Stanford Student Affairs. Stanford University, 2012 <http://studentaffairs.stanford.edu/nacc/history>. The petition referred to the logo as a “false image of the American Indian”, and described Timm Williams’ performances as “a mockery of Indian religious practices.” At the same time, Native Stanford students prepared an assessment for Stanford Administration addressing the needs of isolation and culture shock of Native Americans at Stanford. The document advocates for the creation of a community center, theme residence, Native American Studies, retention services, and increased recruitment of students, staff and faculty. In response, Stanford conducted its own Native American needs assessment. This report’s author, John Black, finds the Native American students to be more “needy” that the first report has estimated.
articulate the concerns of the students to the Ombudsman, Lois Amsterdam. Ms. Shunatona believed that members of the student body had questioned the mascot’s use prior to 1972, but the movement to remove the mascot did not make any progress until that time. She further emphasized the respectful nature of the student protests on campus locations, including White Plaza, and the respectful nature of the petitions and documents submitted to the University by the students. As she explained, the campaign to have the mascot removed was carried out mainly by the organization of student discussions and by educating the student body on Native American culture in general, emphasizing and explaining in what ways the current mascot was very offensive to Native American students at Stanford.

In January 1972, a second petition denouncing the use of the Indian mascot as a representation of Stanford’s athletic teams and urging the University to “show a readily progressive concern for the American Indians of the United States” was signed by fifty-five Native students and filed with Ms. Amsterdam. On February 3, 1972, Ms. Amsterdam accepted the petition and transferred the petition to Stanford’s President, Richard Lyman. In a letter attached to the petition, she urged Mr. Lyman of the issue’s intensity and expressed her hope for a quick removal of the Indian mascot. Despite Ms. Shunatona’s statement that she could not recall any Native student that was not offended by the mascot and the performances of Prince Lightfoot, Ms. Amsterdam’s decision to accept the petition generated a torrent of letters and

15 Native American Stanford Community. “Petition Presented to the Ombudsman of Stanford University,” January 1972. Print. The petition stated that the Stanford community was not sensitive to the humanity of Native Americans; that the lack of understanding displayed by the name of a race being paced on its entertainment, and that a race of humans cannot be entertainment. Native students maintained that the mascot in all its manifestations was stereotypical, offensive, and a mockery of Indian cultures. The group suggested that the “University would be renouncing a grotesque ignorance that it has previously condoned” by removing the Indian, and by “retracting its misuse of the Indian symbol” Stanford would be displaying a “readily progressive concern for the American Indians of the United States.”

16 Lois Amsterdam. “Stanford Indian Symbol; Native American Program.” Office Memorandum – Stanford University, February 3 1972. Print. Letter states, “Stanford’s continuous use of the Indian Symbol in the 1970s brings up to visibility a painful lack of sensitivity and awareness on the part of the University. All of us have in some way, by action or inaction, accepted and supported the use id the Indian symbol on campus. We did not do so with malice, or with intent to defile a racial group. Rather, it was a reflection of our society’s retarded understanding, dulled perception and clouded vision. Sensitivity and awareness do not come easily when childish misrepresentations in games, history books and motion pictures make up a large part of our experience.”
comments from students and alumni, including Native Americans, supporting the Indian Mascot. On the other hand, many students, professors, and community members outside of Stanford that wrote in support of challenging the mascot challenged these dissenting voices. After the initial confusion of who was qualified to make such a decision—the administration or the student body—the Stanford student senate voted 18-4 to drop the Indian name and symbol on March 2, 1972. President Lyman then decided to submit the decision to review by a Senate Committee established to review the issue. The Committee included representatives from the student body, alumni, the Stanford Buck Club, the Athletic department, the Native American Students Association, and the Associated Students of Stanford University (ASSU), and sided with the president and ruled against the mascot. The decision led to some discontent in the student body, and a group of students drew up a petition demanding a referendum that included over six hundred signatures. This referendum was held and resulted in

17 Ilves, Luukas. “Anatomy of a Revolution: A brief history of the Stanford Indian.” *The Stanford Review* 36.4 17 March 2006. <http://stanfordreview.org/old_archives/Archive/Volume_XXXVI/Issue_4/Features/features2.shtml>. Refers to letters sent to the University following L. Amsterdam decision to remove the mascot: Letter from L.R. Garner ('50), Navajo Alumnus, in which he states that “Stanford community should take care not to be misled by the hasty advice of a small group of Indian students who clearly do not represent mature Indian Opinion” (Daily letter to the Editor, 2/8/72); Letter from Robert Ames, ('51), Hopi Alumnus: “I am proud that Stanford chose the Indian as its symbol and that the University and its students have in the past years displayed the intelligence and courage which I believe the symbol represents.”
18 *Ibid.* The anthropology department sent a letter signed by 22 students and 15 faculty members stating, “It is the tenet of anthropology that each culture – and each Native American Tribe – should be appreciated on its own terms and respected for what it is. Stanford’s use of the “Indian” images makes a mockery of the proud peoples of this continent” (2/9/72); Chicanos in the School of Education Association wrote to voice their solidarity with Native Americans and protesting that “the fun and games and college students should be meaningful to the most disfranchised group of people in this country just does not follow” (3/31/72), Letter from Chris Hocker, alumnus: “People tend to forget that the full name of Stanford athletic teams has been the Stanford Athletic Indians, not merely ‘the Indians.’ This is not just a picky semantic point; rather, to use the term ‘Stanford Indian’ is to use the ethnic label of all Indians . . . who are at Stanford. These Native Americans have requested, unanimously, that their name not be used. Dropping the Indians as mascot is no matter of emotion, it is a matter of right.” (3/28/72).
58% of students voting against eliminating the mascot, but President Lyman was not persuaded by this result.  

In response, the University announced, “any and all Stanford University use of the Indian Symbol should be immediately disavowed and permanently stopped.”

**Backlash**

Since the early 1970s, the administration has reaffirmed its commitment to its prior decision by refusing to allow a vote to reinstate the mascot. In her letter supporting the 1972 petition, Lois Amsterdam had expressed her hope that “the Alumni will be proud when the University removes any vestige of a symbolic use which degrades and insults members of our community.”

The University’s view has not stopped groups of alumni and other individuals attached to the Indian mascot to carry out unsuccessful campaigns to reinstate the Indian as a mascot, or, as in 1975, to replace the big-nosed caricature with a more “noble” image of a Native American man. Despite the failure of those attempts and the University’s refusal to reinstate the Indian mascot, disparaging representations of the Stanford Indians can still be seen, particularly around the time of the Big Game. The campaign to reinstate the Indian symbol, or the denial of its removal, has not been limited to the years following it. On January 3, 2012, the caricature of the big-nosed Indian, that was abandoned in 1970, appeared again in the Palo Alto Day news in a flyer that read: “Good ‘Luck’ Stanford Indians – Give’em the axe.”

Likewise, on

---

22 Ibid. The Committee’s decision led to some discontent in the student body, and a group of students drew up a petition demanding a referendum. This petition received more than six hundred signatures, more than enough to force a plebiscite on the mascot in the April ASSU elections, but ASSU President McHenry refused to accept the signature and the referendum went unheld. When the new ASSU President held a referendum on May 10, 58% of voted against eliminating the mascot, but President Lyman ignored the results.


October 8, 2012, a variety of shirts, stickers, pins, and other sports memorabilia, all bearing either the caricature of the big-nosed Indian, or other representations and caricatures of Native American people appeared in an online blog covering the Stanford homecoming football game.\textsuperscript{27} Some of the t-shirts represented the Stanford Indian alongside “Cardinal Council,” which is the student-athlete representative body that acts as the liaison between Stanford athletes, the Athletic department, Stanford University, and the NCAA, as if the Indian mascot were still officially sanctioned by a University committee.\textsuperscript{28}

One Native-inspired element not included in the decision to remove the Indian Symbol: the Stanford Axe, also known as the Berkeley axe, is the trophy awarded to the winner of the annual Big Game between the Berkeley Golden Bears and the Stanford Cardinals.\textsuperscript{29} The Stanford Axe Committee website makes no reference to the Indian Origins of the Axe,\textsuperscript{30} and sources of information on those origins are rather scarce. However, a 1931 article from the Stanford Illustrated review makes it clear that the Stanford Axe is indeed an Indian symbol, referring to it as an “Indian Tomahawk”\textsuperscript{31} and to its use as a bear-scalping tool.

Obviously, some Indian symbols have been left behind . . . .

\textsuperscript{27} Adrienne K. “When Offensive Indian Mascots Hit Too Close to Home.” \textit{Native Appropriations}. Web. 10 October 2012. \\
<http://nativeappropriations.blogspot.com/2012/10/when-offensive-indian-mascots-hit-too.html> \\
This is not the first time the old Indian mascot has appeared on an online blog, as it was also referenced on indianz.com in March 2006. “Mascot Debate Re-ignited at Stanford University.” Web. 17 March 2006. \\
<http://www.indianz.com/News/2006/013031.asp> \\
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{29} Image 7 – The Stanford Axe. \\
<http://www.realclearsports.com/lists/college_football_trophies/stanford_axe.html> \\
<http://www.stanford.edu/group/axecomm/cgi-bin/wordpress/?page_id=139> \\
\textsuperscript{31} Petty, Claude and Amyx, Darrell “Stanford Goes Indian.” \textit{The Stanford Illustrated Review}, January 1931: 177, 195. Print. “It was around Big Game time, when Bear-scalping was all the mode. Our Indian’s Tomahawk, known more familiarly to us and to disgruntled Californians as the “Axe,” had come home again.”
Stanford University Timeline

• 1898

• 1923
  - The “Indian” idea occurred to Dr. T. M. Williams of Palo Alto, an alumnus of ’97, a varsity football man, and one of the original members of the Board of Athletic Control. (Petty, Claude and Amyx, Darrell “Stanford Goes Indian.” The Stanford Illustrated Review, January 1931: 177, 195. Print.).

• 1930s

• November 25, 1930
  - Stanford officially adopted the name “Indians” after a unanimous vote by the Executive Committee for the Associated Students. The resolution that was passed read: “Whereas the Indian has long been unofficially recognized as the symbol of Stanford and its spirit, and whereas there has never been any official designation of a Stanford Symbol, be it hereby resolved that the Executive Committee adopt the Indian as the symbol of Stanford.” (“Athletic Department.” GoStanford.com. Web. <http://www.gostanford.com/school-bio/stan-nickname-mascot.html>).

• 1931

• January 1931
  - The Stanford Illustrated Review published article Stanford goes Indian, which gives background to the history of the Stanford Indian mascot name. (Ilves,

- October 10, 1931  

- 1970


- October 21, 1970  

- November 22, 1970  

- January 1971  
  - The Native American students met with President Lyman to discuss the end of the mascot performance. This first collective action established the Stanford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • First Assistant Dean of Students (Gwen Shunatona) is hired with University money as an advocate for Native American undergraduate students. (Stanford Student Affairs. “Native American History at Stanford: California Timeline.” *Stanford Student Affairs*. Stanford University, 2012 <http://studentaffairs.stanford.edu/nacc/history>.)  
| 1972 |  
| • The Indian symbol was dropped following meetings between Stanford Native American students and President Richard Lyman. 55 students, supported by the other 358 American Indians enrolled in California colleges, felt that the mascot was an insult to their culture and heritage. (“Athletic Department.” *GoStanford.com*. Web. <http://www.gostanford.com/school-bio/stan-nickname-mascot.html>.)  
| January 1972 |  
| • Petition to get rid of the Indian mascot, signed by 55 Stanford Native American students, was presented to the Ombudsman of Stanford University, Lois Amsterdam. The petition urged that the “use of the Indian symbol be permanently discontinued”, and that the University “fulfill its promise to the students of its Native American Program by improving and supporting the program and thereby making its promise to improve Native American education a reality”. The group suggested that the “University would be renouncing a grotesque ignorance that it has previously condoned” by removing the Indian as Stanford’s symbol, and by “retracting its misuse of the Indian symbol” Stanford would be displaying a “readily progressive concern for the American Indians of the United States.” (Native American Stanford Community. “Petition Presented to the Ombudsman of Stanford University,” January 1972. Print.) |
| February 1, 1972 |  


President Lyman gave an interview with the campus radio station KZSU, in which he said that he found the Native students’ arguments against use of the Indian symbol “more persuasive as time goes by, rather than less”. “I will at the very least receive the petitions with an open mind and with a good deal of sympathy. I think there is bound to be misunderstandings, particularly in the alumni community, if we do make a change … but that’s not a sufficient reason to stand in the way by itself.” (Stanford University News Service. 3 February 1972.)

- February 2, 1972
    - Article announces that the American Students’ Group at Stanford University is demanding that the team name and mascot be removed. It reports that the student organization is circulating petitions to the university administration through Ombudsman Lois Amsterdam demanding that “the tradition dating back to the 1930s be ended,” and quotes the Native American Students’ Group that the mascot is a “gross misconception of the Indians.”
    - Tom Newell, the alumni association secretary is quoted that “a significant number of older alums will be saddened, disappointed but not very upset. But a good many old traditions are giving away these days.”
    - Article refers to campus bookstore stopped selling souvenir items bearing a Native American caricature more than a year before the article’s date.

- February 3, 1972
  - Lois Amsterdam, Ombudsman of the University, accepts the petition and transfers the Native student petition to the President of Stanford University, Richard W. Lyman. She attaches a letter supporting Native American students to her acceptance of the petition, where she summarizes the issues it raises. Footnote at the end of her letter:
    - “Because of the intensity of feeling of our Native American Community with regard to the Indian symbol, the obvious justice of their grievance, and the relative simplicity of the remedy, I hope that we can move quickly on the matter. For that reason, I do not recommend the kind of committee consideration which might be appropriate for a more complex matter or one as to which various segments of the Community ought to be consulted. A committee may be appropriate, of course, to choose a new symbol; but neither a committee nor the input of popular opinion seems to be appropriate on the question whether the University should cease to use a debasing racial symbol.” (Stanford University News Service. 3 February 1972.)
  - The University received about 150 letters on this issue. (See end of the timeline).


- (The historical record is clear that Prince Lightfoot was engaged in championing the Indian cause. He served as an elected leader of the 300-strong Klamath River Yurok Tribe, Chairman of the California Rural Indian Health Board, and director of the California Indian Assistance Project).

- February 11, 1972
  - Following disagreements within the University as to who had the power to make the final decision concerning the removal of the mascot, ASSU president Doug McHenry suggested to the Senate to eliminate the mascot and then allow the student body to vote on a new mascot. Was reluctant to allow the student body a vote on the mascot itself: “The Students are ignorant of what institutional racism is all about. This could be a problem of a democratic system squashing the rights of a minority” (Ilves, Luukas. “Anatomy of a Revolution: A brief history of the Stanford Indian.” The Stanford Review 36.4 17 March 2006. <http://stanfordreview.org/old_archives/Archive/Volume_XXXVI/Issue_4/Features/features2.shtml>.

- February 12, 1972
    - Article reports that a campus referendum will be held to allow the students – and not the university president – from choosing the mascot of the student body.
    - Article also reports that a group of 55 Native American students urged that the Indian symbol, which was chosen in a 1934 student referendum, be abolished because it was demeaning.
    - The article explains that the “mascot, as embodied by a 47-year-old Yurok Indian known as ‘Prince Lightfoot.’ Dances in full regalia at university athletic events.”

- February 27, 1972
  - President Lyman gave speech at an Alumni Conference in Los Angeles: “The facts are that the American Indian on the reservation has the highest alcoholism rate, the highest death rate, the highest rate of impact of many kind of diseases, the lowest income and the lowest education level of any ethnic minority in the country. These facts are simply not known to the Americans who are happy to
think about the Indian as a kind of heroic figure from the past.” (Wascher, Jim. “Senate Abolishes Mascot.” Stanford Daily, 2 March 1972: 10. Print.)

• End of February 1972
  o Attached to the petition was a letter from Dorothy Haberman, Secretary-Treasurer for the Tribe. Was pretty harsh: “If the students were insulted or incensed by the word ‘Indian’, the solution could perhaps be handled by changing schools rather than changing the symbol.” She said that opposing the name “Indian” was a “selfish act” by Native American students who “somewhere in their makeup are evidently ashamed of their beautiful Indian blood to the point that the word ‘Indian’ incenses them when it reminds them of what they are.” (Ilves, Luukas. “Anatomy of a Revolution: A brief history of the Stanford Indian.” The Stanford Review 36.4 17 March 2006. <http://stanfordreview.org/old_archives/Archive/Volume_XXXVI/Issue_4/features/features2.shtml>.)

• March 2, 1972
  o After repealing the legislation, the ASSU passed (17-2) a legislation supporting the Council of Presidents in establishing a committee to review the decision, to implement the decision, and to decide upon a new mascot. The committee includes representatives from the student body, alumni, the Stanford Buck Club, the Athletic department, the Native American Students Association, and the ASSU Senate. Committee sided with the Senate and the President and ruled against the mascot. (Wascher, Jim. “Senate Abolishes Mascot.” Stanford Daily, 2 March 1972: 10. Print.)

• March 2, 1972
    ▪ Resolution to abandon the Indian mascot and any Indian symbol
Resolution to set up a Committee to review the decision, to implement the decision, and to agree on a new mascot.

- March 4, 1972
    - This article was also published as “Tradition Bites the Dust: Stanford Buries the Hatchet – Also Its Indian Nickname.”
    - On March 2, 1972, the Stanford student senate voted 18-4 to drop the Indian name and symbol.
    - The article quotes that Stanford student Native American groups did not want the ‘‘somewhat commercialized and always somewhat fake representation’ of the Indian tradition.”
    - A group of Native Americans from the Klamath River-Yurok Tribe urged the school to retain the mascot.
    - The article summarizes the student senate vote of 18-4 to abandon the Indian symbol.
    - Announces that a committee will be named to select a new symbol for Stanford and its athletic teams.

- March 5, 1972
  - Sports section of the Los Angeles Times refers to Stanford’s sports teams by the school’s name, noting that the university “recent lost its nickname (Indians) after the school’s traditional mascot was outlawed by a vote of the student government.”

- March 11, 1973
    - Stanford is mentioned as recently changing their name to the “Cardinals” and returning Tim “Prince Lightfoot” Williams, who the article states to also have been referred to as “Uncle Tom Tom” by some Native American students.

- March 14, 1972
    - The possible implications of Stanford dropping the Indian symbol are questioned as the author of the article cites examples of fans of other teams with symbols related to Native Americans expressing apprehension that their team names as well could be in jeopardy. These include the Cleveland Indians and Washington Redskins, for example.

- March 16, 1972
  - *Los Angeles Times* publishes Letters to the Editor under the topic Stanford’s Nickname. Four letters to the editor are published, all against removing the mascot.

• Sometime during the Committee Review of the decision (confirmation of the removal of the mascot) in March 1972 and May 1972.
  - Committee decision led to some discontent in the student body. Group of student draws up a petition demanding a referendum. Petition obtains more than 600 signatures, enough to force a referendum on the mascot in the April ASSU elections.

• May 10, 1972

• 1975

• December 3-4, 1975
• 1987


• November 25, 1987
    ▪ The article laments the effect of Native American Halloween costumes on the general American perspective of Native American people and culture
    ▪ The article also describes the effect athletic team names and mascots based on Native American culture, and urges the general public to stop “offending Indian people whose lives are all too often filled with economic deprivation, powerlessness, discrimination and gross injustice.”

• 2012

• January 3, 2012

• October 10, 2012

Lois Amsterdam’s acceptance of the petition led to Stanford University receiving about 150 letters, either supporting the mascot or supporting its removal. Here is a representative sample of the content of those letters:

  o Letters and comments from students and alumni supporting the mascot:
    ▪ February 8, 1972
      • Letter to the Editor from L.R. Garner (Class of 1950), Navajo Alumnus: he felt that the “Stanford Community should take care not to be misled by the hasty advice of a small group of Indian

- **February 8, 1972**
  - Letter to the Editor from Native American alumnus, including Robert Ames (Class of 1951 and member of the Hopi Tribe): “I am proud that I had the opportunity and good fortune to attend and graduate from Stanford; I am doubly proud that Stanford chose the Indian as its symbol and that the University and its students have in the past years displayed the intelligence and courage which I believe the symbol represents.” (Ilves, Luukas. “Anatomy of a Revolution: A brief history of the Stanford Indian.” *The Stanford Review* 36.4 17 March 2006. <http://stanfordreview.org/old_archives/Archive/Volume XXXVI/Issue 4/Features/features2.shtml>.)

- **Date unknown**
  - University received a petition signed by 107 members of the Yurok tribe that requested the retention of the mascot. (Wascher, Jim. “Senate Abolishes Mascot.” *Stanford Daily*, 2 March 1972: 10. Print.)

  - Several Stanford students and professors wrote in support of abolishing the mascot:
    - **February 9, 1972**

    - **March 28, 1972**
      - Letter from Chris Hocker, alumnus: “People tend to forget that the full name of Stanford athletic teams has been the Stanford Athletic Indians, not merely ‘the Indians’. This is not just a picky semantic point; rather, to use the term ‘Stanford Indian’ is to use the ethnic label of all Indians … who are at Stanford. These Native Americans have requested, unanimously, that their name not be used. Dropping the Indians as mascot is no matter of emotion, it is a matter of right.” (Ilves, Luukas. “Anatomy of a Revolution: A brief history of the Stanford Indian.” *The Stanford Review* 36.4 17 March 2006. <http://stanfordreview.org/old_archives/Archive/Volume XXXVI/Issue 4/Features/features2.shtml>.)
March 2006.

- March 31, 1972
  - Chicanos in the School of Education Association wrote to voice their solidarity with Native Americans and protesting that “the fun and games and college students should be meaningful to the most disfranchised group of people in this country just does not follow”. (Ilves, Luukas. “Anatomy of a Revolution: A brief history of the Stanford Indian.” The Stanford Review 36.4 17 March 2006. <http://stanfordreview.org/old_archives/Archive/Volume_XXXVI/Issue_4/Features/features2.shtml>.)

- November 11, 1972
  - Letter from David Thomson, Resident Fellow in Loro (former Native American Theme house), in which he explains that he finds offensive “the paternalistic racist argument that we Anglos are really using the Indian’s name in a way that is good for them and will bring honor to them and why don’t they understand our good intentions? I hope that most of us have lost enough of our racial naïveté to recognize this elitist view of what it is.” (Ilves, Luukas. “Anatomy of a Revolution: A brief history of the Stanford Indian.” The Stanford Review 36.4 17 March 2006. <http://stanfordreview.org/old_archives/Archive/Volume_XXXVI/Issue_4/Features/features2.shtml>.)
Dartmouth College

By Ashley Rorrer and Corsica Smith
Glushko-Samuelson Intellectual Property Clinic

History of Dartmouth Indian at Dartmouth College

The foundations for the establishment of Dartmouth were first laid in 1743 when a young Mohegan Indian, Samson Occom, asked Eleazar Wheelock to teach him to read. Wheelock agreed to instruct Occom and which led to Occom entering Wheelock’s Latin School. This led to a life-long commitment on the part of Wheelock to recruit Native American youths to enter first his Latin School, then Moor’s Charity School, and, finally, Dartmouth College. In 1769, the Dartmouth Charter was signed, with the stated purpose of the school’s founding being “the education and instruction of youth of the Indian tribes in this land in reading, writing, and all parts of learning.” However, it would be six years before a Native American would graduate from Dartmouth. Often, Wheelock’s public pronouncements concerning his commitment to focusing on the education of Native Americans did not match up to Wheelock’s actions. Wheelock often used funds that were donated to the Charity School for the education of Native Americans to fund Dartmouth College. Between 1767 and 1775, while 4,258 pounds was spent on Native American students, 3,000 pounds of the donated funds was spent on English students.

---

2 Wheelock established the Indian Charity School around in 1754. Instrumental in the establishment of this school was the work of Occom, who traveled to England to raise funds. This also was an important factor into the establishment of Dartmouth College as it was the relationships and funds cultivated by Occom that were used to found Dartmouth. Hill, William Carroll. Dartmouth Traditions: Being a Compilation of Facts and Events Connected with the History of Dartmouth College and the Lives of Its Graduates, from the Early Founding of the College, in 1769, to the Present Day. Hanover: Printed at the Dartmouth, 1901. Print.
By 1808, there was only one Native American student attending Dartmouth, while three Native Americans attended the Charity School.

Even during this early period in Dartmouth’s history, depictions of Native Americans were present around the campus. One historian, while visiting Wheelock, noticed a tree that had a portion of its bark removed and a depiction of a Native American painted on the bare portion of the trunk.\(^5\) As time passed, depictions of Native Americans on school property and during school events became an increasingly frequent occurrence. Starting in the mid-1800s, students began gathering around an old stump on class day. Some historical accounts claim the pine stump was where Wheelock taught his first class and/or where three Native Americans had gathered to smoke the pipe of peace and bid one another farewell. When meeting at the stump, students would address the stump and then the class would sing a song and smoke pipes meant to imitate smoking a peace pipe, followed by smashing or laying the pipes on the stump.\(^6\) It was around this time that the poet Richard Hovey, a graduate of Dartmouth, wrote a poem which would inspire a series of murals almost half a century later that would come to be the source of much conflict and strife. The poem addressed Wheelock’s desire to educate Native people, including lines saying Wheelock had gone into the woods with “five hundred gallons of New England rum” to find any Native Americans that could be recruited as potential students. Following the pattern of escalating associations between Native people depicted as a sort of mascot for the school both in sports and otherwise, in 1899 a cane topped with a carving of a Native American man’s head was adopted as the class cane.\(^7\) This was not a one-off incident, as this began a tradition that continued for many years.\(^8\) It was also not only white students who participated in the utilization of Native people as caricatures and mascots for Dartmouth. Charles Eastman, a Native Dartmouth graduate, pretended to be Samson Occom in a reenactment of Occom’s first meeting with Wheelock. This tableau was part of a commemoration ceremony, which marked the laying of the cornerstone of the new Dartmouth Hall, and also included white students

\(^5\) Ibid.
\(^6\) Ibid. at 133. The purpose of breaking the pipe was based on smokers’ habit of breaking off the end of a pipe after it becomes dirty through use. This was meant to symbolize graduating students’ clean break with Dartmouth. In 1993, mugs were substituted for the pipes, but were done away with entirely after injuries from the mugs. The Dartmouth, Lott: Break with Tradition, January 25, 2011, <http://thedartmouth.com/2011/01/25/opinion/lott>.
\(^7\) Ibid.
\(^8\) Ibid.
dressed as Native warriors participating in a “traditional Native dance” around the bonfire. In the late 1800s, as part of a committee whose goal was to encourage college spirit, a Dartmouth student wrote an “Indian yell” that became well known as Dartmouth’s college yell and was frequently heard during school events.  

Less than twenty years after Dartmouth formed a football team, the sports section of Dartmouth’s yearbook depicted Native warriors kicking footballs. From this point on, the idea of the Dartmouth Indians quickly began to infiltrate all areas of athletics on campus, as well as in sports and news publications. Outside of the College, the first time the Dartmouth football team was referred to as the Dartmouth Indians was by Boston-area sportswriters prior to the Harvard game in 1922. By 1928, “Indians” had started to appear on athletic uniforms. The following year, the first article about the Dartmouth Indian appeared in an alumni magazine. However, it would take until 1965 for the Indians name to first appear on football jerseys, and another five years before it would appear on the green, home-game football jerseys.

The Fall of the Dartmouth Indian

The demise of the Dartmouth Indian was not an overnight phenomenon nor did a single event prompt the change. The awareness of the disparaging nature of the Dartmouth Indian was equally a product of the political climate and a result of direct action by students. The civil rights movement and protest over the Vietnam War dominated the 1960s, and Dartmouth College was

10 The yell that was created was: “Wah-Hoo-Wah; Wah-Hoo-Wah; Da-di-di-Dartmouth; Wah-Hoo-Wah; Tige-r-r-r----”. It became so well known that the New York Times wrote of hearing the yell repeatedly during an alumni gathering. The yell also spread from Dartmouth to numerous other schools, such as The University of Virginia. Scott Meacham, *The Persistence of “Wah-Hoo-Wah,”* Dartmouth’s “Indian Yell,” at *The University of Virginia*, at 1.
11 Dartmouth first participated in football in 1881 and, by 1898, the yearbook contained this depiction; *Ibid.*, at 133.
not exempted from the effect of the social change that was occurring throughout country. The assassination of the civil rights leader Martin Luther King Jr. in April of 1968 and the resulting riots in urban cities, the Board of Trustees suggested, and later the College adopted, an aggressive program to recruit African-Americans and “other disadvantaged groups such as Indians.” The college further highlighted their renewed commitment to recruit more Native American students on March 1, 1970 when the newly appointed president, John G. Kemeny, emphasized in his inauguration speech the desire to live up to the original promise of educating Native Americans at Dartmouth. Thus, the late 1960s and early 1970s not only saw an increase of Native Americans at Dartmouth, but an increase of the political awareness of minorities’ civil rights as well.

While the political climate in the United States prompted the need for change, direct action also played a vital part in the decline of the Dartmouth Indian. One of the first direct actions was taken by a group of Native American students who assembled during the winter of 1968 and demanded that the athletic department discontinue the use of the “Dartmouth Indian” mascot during sporting events. The Dartmouth Indian mascot dancing at games was a tradition that many dated as going back forty years. A member of the cheerleading team, the Dartmouth Indian mascot was known for performing elaborate imitation war dances and gymnastic flips. The Dartmouth Indian mascot tended to be shirtless with the letter “D” painted onto his chest and

---

wore a fake Mohawk.\textsuperscript{20} After a series of meetings with Native Americans students, the athletic department decided to no longer employ the Indian-style cheerleader at sporting events because of its offensiveness to Native Americans in the student body.\textsuperscript{21} Frank Everett Couper was the last person to be the “Dartmouth Indian.”\textsuperscript{22} The discontinued use of the Dartmouth Indian cheerleader did not extend to the Dartmouth Indian used in other capacities at the school, but it was a catalyst for the later fight to remove the Indian symbolism completely.\textsuperscript{23}

It would be four years before the Native Americans at Dartmouth (NAD), the Native American student group, appeared before the Dartmouth Alumnus Council asking to abolish the “Indian” name and associated symbols in January 1972.\textsuperscript{24} The Council recognized the importance of the issues presented by the students and unanimously approved a resolution to appoint a special committee to study the impact of the Indian Symbol at Dartmouth.\textsuperscript{25} The Council formed the Dartmouth Alumni Council Indian Symbol Study Committee, which was chaired by Robert D. Kilmarx.\textsuperscript{26} After talking to Native American students, college counselors, alumni, and numerous officials of the College administration, the Committee reported back its findings and suggestions in a June 1972 report, \emph{Report and Recommendations of the INDIAN Symbol Report}, pp. 1

\textsuperscript{20} Pre-1932, the Dartmouth Cheerleader wore an elaborate feathered headdress, but discontinued the use of the headpiece when it was found it was associated with the Sioux people of the Western Plains and not the Eastern Mohegan people connected with the college’s early history. See “Dartmouth Indian Changes Headdress.” \emph{The Washington Post}, 6 Mar. 1932. S8.

\textsuperscript{21} “Dartmouth Loses Its Indian Mascot: Cheerleader Falls Victim to School’s Real Indians.” \emph{The New York Times}, 12 Oct. 1969; Bill Yellowtail, a member of the Native American student group compared the Dartmouth Indian Cheerleader to an animal at the zoo, stating “old grads . . . used to get a big kick out of [the Dartmouth Indian mascot] every time they’d come back to see a game; they’d point them out to their kids or to their grandchildren, just like they’d point out a monkey at a zoo, ‘Look, look, there it is, the Indian.’ See Ralbovsky, Marty “An Indian Affair: American Indian Students Concerned About Nicknames, Mascots in Sports” \emph{The New York Times}, 14 Nov. 1971. Further, he and others demanded a end to this long standing tradition because it misrepresented what it means to be Native American, stating: “Too many people in this country still think of Indians as savages doing war dances and wearing feathered headdresses and having two-word vocabulary.” \textit{Ibid.}


\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Ibid.}
SYMBOL STUDY COMMITTEE - Dartmouth Alumni Council. The report not only dealt with the issue of the Indian symbol, but also the College’s commitment to Native American students generally. The report highlighted the College’s shortcomings in its original commitment to educate Native Americans and the need to admit more Native Americans, to hire more Native American faculty members, to create a Native American academic program, and to expand the Native American Center. The report reasoned that these changes needed to occur in order to go beyond just “educating” young Native Americans to make these individuals feel like they are an integral part of the school.

The report goes extensively analyzed the issue of the Indian symbol and concluded that, despite its popularity among students and alumnus, its use should be discouraged. The report cited several reasons for this finding including: (1) the Indian symbol represents a misleading reference to an unfulfilled commitment on the part of Dartmouth to Indian education; (2) the symbol is a caricature and lends itself to tasteless misuse both on and off the campus; and, (3) the symbol constitutes an inaccurate and romanticized portrayal, a misrepresentation of the sad realities of Native American life. Despite the recognition of the offensiveness of the Indian name and symbol, the Committee stopped short of “abolishing” or “repealing” the Indian name, and instead suggested no official action was required. The Committee asserted that a College governing body never adopted the Indian symbol, and thus no official action was required. The report emphasized the Indian symbolism will and has begun to disappear through voluntary mutual accommodations and changing values. Some examples of changes that occurred before and during the assembly of the report included: the college newspaper and radio station no longer using the term “Indian”; the athletic department’s discontinuance of the “Indian” football

27 Ibid.
28 Ibid. pp. 2 – 10
29 Ibid.
30 Ibid. pp. 5
31 Ibid. pp. 10 – 13. The report found upon alumni who chose to express themselves in writing, that the Indian symbol remains “a matter of considerable pride, honored for such commendable attributes as courage, strength, love of the out-of-doors, and manly bearing.” Indian Symbol Report, pp. 10 – 11.
32 Ibid. pp. 1 – 2.
33 Ibid. pp. 11 – 12.
34 Ibid. pp. 11.
cheerleader; the athletic department removing the Indian head from athletic fields and gyms; Hanover merchants selling their remaining stock and not reordering items that carried Indian symbolism; the Dartmouth’s Injunaries, an a capella group, changing their name to the “Aires”; and other groups taking steps to discontinue the use of Indian symbols on their stationery and bulletin letterheads.\(^{36}\) In 1974, the Board of Trustees affirmed the Committee’s decision declaring “the [Indian] symbol in any form [is] inconsistent with the present institutional and academic objectives of the College in advancing Native education.”\(^{37}\) Like the Committee, the College decided to take no action and just anticipated that the Indian symbolism would “disappear entirely” through “voluntary curtailment.”\(^{38}\)

**Aftermath of the College Decision**

The 1974 Board of Trustees’ decision brought both positive change and great opposition. There has been notable progress in the resources allocated to Native students at Dartmouth. The Indian Symbol Report not only brought to light the disparaging nature of the use of Indian symbolism, but also the inadequacy of the resources afforded to Native Americans.\(^ {39}\) Many of the changes suggested in the report, including further development of the Native Americans Studies program, recruiting more Native students, and relocating the Native American Center were implemented in the years following the report.\(^ {40}\) The Native American Studies program, which on May 8, 1972 was unanimously approved by the faculty of Arts and Science, has increased in faculty, and courses it offers.\(^ {41}\) Originally in 1972, the program was composed of two faculty members and offered two courses; now it is comprised of nine faculty members,

\(^{36}\) *Ibid.*


\(^{38}\) *Ibid.*


\(^{40}\) Indian Symbol Report, pp. 3 – 10.

many visiting scholars, over twenty-five courses, and supports both major and minor degrees. Further, according to the Indian Symbol report, the school’s admission goals in 1972 were to admit “15 Native Americans per class” and to have a total of “60 Indian students” enroll. After the Indian Symbol report, the College shifted its focus from target goals and quantum requirement and instead focused on recruiting and retaining quality applicants. The student body in 2009 – 2010 was composed of 4% Native Americans or about 168 Native students. In the class of 2016 alone, Native Americans make up 3.6% of the class or 40 students of the total class. In 1994, The Native American Center, which was previously at a smaller site at 18 North House, was relocated to a bigger former residential hall. The new center has the capacity to house more students, will allow the students to host dinners and functions there, a recreational area for social events, and a space to have speakers and small lectures. The Center, referred to as the Native American House, continues to be a popular selection for housing and serves as a space for cultural exploration and expression of traditional and contemporary aspects of Native American culture.

Beyond the changes suggested by the Indian Symbol Report, there have been a number of other positive changes to make Native students feel like they are a part of Dartmouth. One of these changes is the Dartmouth Pow-Wow that began to be held at the school in 1973. These Pow-Wows honor Native American culture through displaying traditional dancing, music,

43 Indian Symbol Report, pp 5-6
44 “Facts about Faculty and Students”, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, (last updated 03/08/10) http://www.dartmouth.edu/admissions/facts/faculty-students.html
45 “Class Profile: Dartmouth Class of 2016”, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, (last updated 10/08/12) http://www.dartmouth.edu/admissions/facts/class.html.
47 Ibid.
singing, arts, and food.\textsuperscript{50} This celebration contrasts with the school’s previous use of the Dartmouth Indian Cheerleader at sporting events, a symbol that was inaccurate and stereotypical. The Dartmouth Pow-Wow is now one of the College’s most prominent traditions and last spring celebrated its 40th anniversary.\textsuperscript{51} The College now has an assortment of student organizations for Native students including Native Americans at Dartmouth, First Voice publication, American Indian Science and Engineering Society, Native Dancing Society, Occom Pond Singers, Native Woman’s Group, Alpha Pi Omega, Sorority Inc., and Indigenous Living Languages at Dartmouth.\textsuperscript{52} In 1973, the College created the Native American Council (NAC), an organization whose membership is comprised of students, administration, and faculty. The NAC oversees all activities relating to Native Americans at Dartmouth.\textsuperscript{53}

While the school has made great progress in improving its relationship with Native American students, the discontinued use of the Dartmouth Indian was, and continues to be, an unpopular decision among many. A few years after the decision, in the winter of 1979, two students wearing green paint, feathers, and loincloths, resembling the previous Dartmouth Indian cheerleader skated onto the ice at a hockey game, garnering national and campus media attention.\textsuperscript{54} Similarly in 1983, freshmen ran up the stands of the football field during halftime, unfurled an Indian banner and yelled the offensive chant “Wah-Hoo-Wah” during a sporting event.\textsuperscript{55} In the 1980s, The Dartmouth Review, a rogue newspaper funded by a Dartmouth Indian loyalist alumnus, was started.\textsuperscript{56} The Review employs the Indian head on its publication, hands

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{52} Besides “Native Woman’s Group”, links to each organizations individual pages for further information can be found on “Student Organization” webpage at http://www.dartmouth.edu/~nap/studentorgs.html.
\textsuperscript{53} Calloway, Colin G. \textit{The Indian History of an American Institution: Native Americans and Dartmouth}. Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College, 2010. Print. at 159
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid. pp. 165
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid. pp. 167
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid. The Fossedal and Souza article outlines why Alumni created the Dartmouth Review, a instrument to voice their aversion over the policies passed under Dartmouth President John G. Kemeny administration including the decision to get rid of Indian symbolism at the institution. See Fossedal, Gregory A. and Dinesh D’Souza, “Dartmouth’s Restoration” \textit{National Review}. 18 Sept. 1981. ProQuest Central. Web. 30 Sept. 2012.

Tensions still exist over the College’s decision to discourage the use of the Dartmouth Indian. In 2006, a string of incidents, including fraternity pledges disrupting a Native American drum circle, the Development Office publishing an alumni calendar that contained a picture of an Indian head cane, and a “Cowboy and Indian” themed Crew party, led to the President formally apologizing to Native American students.\footnote{Dartmouth President James Wright sends an e-mail message to the student body formally apologizing for these incidents. “Dartmouth Apologizes to Native American Students”, \textit{Times Argues}, 25 Nov. 2006. Web. 10 Oct. 2012. <http://www.timesargus.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/RH/20061125/NEWS/611250328/1003/NEWS02 >. In that email he asserts Native American students “are members of this community . . . [a]nd they deserve more and better than to be abstracted as symbols and playthings.” Ibid. President Wright’s letter was not perceived well by everyone, Joe Malchow, a junior at the time, described the e-mail as “pandering” and a “weak-kneed concession to a political interest group while trying to insulate his office from criticisms from everyone else.” Malchow, Joe, “Time for Controversy, Again” \textit{Dartblog}, 29 Nov. 2006. Web. 7 Oct. 2012. <http://www.dartblog.com/data/2006/11/006630.php> For further information about the individual incident, Calloway’s book is a great source. Colin G. Calloway, The Indian History of an American Institution: Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 170.} The Dartmouth Review continues to hand out t-shirts to freshmen brandishing the Dartmouth Indian, and publishes articles campaigning for the return of the popular mascot. Despite these occurrences, Native Students have continued to be vocal about how they wish to be portrayed and have shown a desire not to bring back the Dartmouth Indian. Recently, a group of students formed Savage Media, a non-Dartmouth affiliated production group.\footnote{Colorlines Magazine provides a brief summary of how the group started. See Bogado, Aura “Savage and Alive: Native Students Respond on Indigenous Peoples’ Day”, \textit{Colorlines}, 8 Oct. 2012. Web. 30 Sept. 2012. <http://colorlines.com/archives/2012/10/savage_and_alive_native_students_respond_on_indigenous_peoples_day.html> Savage Media was founded by Native American students Autumn White Eyes, Preston Wills, and Taylor Payer. Autumn White Eyes, is on the board that puts on the annual Pow-Wow discussed above in this narrative and the writer of the popular poem, “A Letter to Urban Outfitters.”} Savage Media produces YouTube videos that highlight the continued
misconceptions about and stereotyping of Native Americans. Savage Media videos have garnered support and oppositional reaction from both people at Dartmouth College and in the general public.

The College’s decision was handed down almost forty years ago and the school by many accounts still has not gotten over losing the Dartmouth Indian. While the College is now known as the “Big Green”, a name employed before the “Indian” moniker, the College still lacks a tangible mascot that can be put on apparel, cheered for at games, and a symbol to attach memories to later be told to alumnus’ grandchildren. Throughout the years, there have been many surveys conducted in the search to find a new mascot; however, no tangible mascot has been implemented at Dartmouth since the Dartmouth Indian. The fact that the Dartmouth Indian itself was never abolished or repealed because of its unofficial status also leaves many still firmly attached to the symbol. While implementing a tangible mascot would satisfy the school’s need for an accessible symbol, it will likely not sever the College’s history with Native Americans.

---


Dartmouth’s Timeline

• 1743

  o Eleazar Wheelock began his quest to educate Native Americans when Samson Occom, a Mohegan Indian, asked Wheelock if he would teach him how to read. Occom then entered Wheelock’s Latin School.

• 1769

  o The Charter to Dartmouth College was signed. Of significance, the Charter stated that the College was erected for “the education and instruction of youth of the Indian tribes in this land in reading, writing, and all parts of learning”. However, it would be six years before Dartmouth graduated its first Native American student.

• 1770 - 1775

  o There were no graduating Native American Students in Dartmouth’s classes. Instead, Native American students were educated at Moor’s Charity School. (See Image from Moor’s Charity School.pdf)

• Spring of 1772

  o Five Native American registered students at Moor’s Charity School

• 1773

  o There were fifteen or sixteen Native American students at the Charity School.

• 1774

  o Visiting Dartmouth, a historian had dinner with Wheelock and noticed a tree that had a portion of bark removed, with a Native American painted on the tree.
• 1767 - 1775
  o Wheelock often used funds from the Native American school to fund Dartmouth College. During this time period, 4,258 pounds were spent on Native American students, and 3,000 pounds were spent on English students.

• 1777
  o First Native American student graduated from Dartmouth.

• 1779
  o Wheelock died and his son, John Wheelock, succeeded him.

• 1800
  o Only three Native Americans had graduated from Dartmouth.

• 1807
  o New Hampshire House of Representatives said “it has always been considered that Dartmouth College and Moor’s Charity School are different branches of the same institution and that the president of said College ever has been and ever should be president of said School."

• 1808
  o One Native American student was in attendance at Dartmouth and three were students at Moor’s Charity School. Native Heritage Project, *Dartmouth College Indians History*.

• 1829
  o The Moor’s School was suspended to pay debts owed to the estate of John Wheelock. Native Heritage Project, *Dartmouth College Indians History – 1800-1893*, June 23, 2012.
• 1837
  
  o The Moor’s School was reopened. Native Heritage Project, *Dartmouth College Indians History.*

• 1850
  
  o The Moor’s School closed permanently. Native Heritage Project, *Dartmouth College Indians History.*

• 1854
  
  o Starting around this time, graduating seniors on class day would gather round an old stump that reputedly marked where Eleazar Wheelock taught his first class and/or where three Indian students met to smoke the pipe of peace and bid each other farewell. A speaker would address the stump, the class would sing a song, puff on clay pipes, and then lay or smash them on the stump. Colin G. Calloway, *The Indian History of an American Institution: Native Americans and Dartmouth,* 2010, at 133. *(See image from Dartmouth_Stump.pdf)*

• 1881
  
  o Dartmouth began playing football.

• 1898
  
  o The sports section of the college yearbook depicted Indian warriors kicking footballs. *Native Americans and Dartmouth,* at 133.

• 1899
  
  o A cane topped with a carved head of an Indian man was adopted as the class cane and this custom continued for many years. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 133. *(See image from Dartmouth_Indian_Man_Cane.pdf.)*

• 1901
• Charles Eastman, a Native American graduate of Dartmouth, during celebrations at Dartmouth, acted out the role of Samson Occom in a series of tableaux staged by the Dartmouth Dramatic Club. Other “Dartmouth Indians” - white students dressed as Indian people - participated by dancing around the bonfire. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 126.

• 1904

• Charles Eastman played Occom again reenacting Occom’s first meeting with Wheelock during a commemoration ceremony marking the laying of the cornerstone of the new Dartmouth Hall. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 126.

• 1908

• A delegation of Dartmouth Students attended a gathering of Christian students from colleges and, at the conference’s celebration, when each delegation dressed in costume, the Dartmouth representatives wore Indian garb to represent their school. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 134.

• 1915

• Supreme Court of New Hampshire orders the funds from Moor’s Charity School be transferred to Dartmouth College. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 130.

• 1922

• Boston sportswriters and cartoonists began to refer to Dartmouth’s teams as the Indians prior to the Harvard football game. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 134.

• 1928

• Indians name appeared on athletic uniforms at Dartmouth. Paul E. Loving, Native American Team Names in Athletics: It’s Time to Trade These Marks, 13 Loy. L.A. Ent. L.J. 1

• 1929

• 1934

  o Walter B. Humphrey, class of 1914, painted a mural on the walls of the Hovey Grill, a room in the basement of the dining hall. The mural portrayed a song about Wheelock founding Dartmouth by bringing 500 barrels of rum to New England. The mural pictured stereotypical Indian men drinking rum and scantily clad Native women, one of whom held a book upside down while reading. *Native Americans and Dartmouth*, at 135. *(See images from Hovey_Mural.pdf)*

• 1965

  o Indians name appeared on football jerseys for the first time. At this point, only appeared on the white, away-game uniforms. *Native Americans and Dartmouth*, at 160.

• 1968

  o Howard Bad Hand, Duane Birdbear, Travis Kingsley and Ruck Buckanaga, students at Dartmouth, assembled the NAD group and demanded that the athletic department stop getting students to do imitations of war dances while dressed as Native Americans. *(See images from the Dartmouth_Indian_Cheerleader.pdf)*

• 1970

  o Dartmouth President John Kemeny announced that Dartmouth would enroll 15 Native students in the class of 1974 in order to achieve his goal of 60 Native Americans enrolled within four years. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 156.

  o The Indian symbol appeared on green, home-game football uniforms. *Native Americans and Dartmouth*, at 160.

• 1972

  o NAD appeared before the Dartmouth Alumni Council asking to abolish the Indians name and symbol. The Council appointed the “Indian Symbol Study Committee” to investigate the request. Loving, *Native American Team Names in Athletics*, at 6.
• 1973

  o Native American Council (NAC) was formed. It was an organization whose membership was comprised of students, administration, and faculty, including Native people and non-Native people. The NAC had oversight of all activities relating to Native Americans at Dartmouth. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 159.
  o Dartmouth host its first Dartmouth Pow-Wow

• 1974

  o Dartmouth’s Board of Trustees issued a statement calling for an end to the use of the Indian as a mascot. Vintage College Football Programs & Collectibles, The Indian on Dartmouth Football Programs. *(See examples of Dartmouth Indian football programs and collectibles from Dartmouth_sports_collectibles.pdf)*

• 1979

  o Winter. Two students wearing green war paint, feathers, and loincloths skated onto the ice at a hockey game, garnering national and campus media attention. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 165.

• 1980

  o The Dartmouth Review started. Primarily funded by alumni. It has no formal association with the college itself. The Review campaigns to bring back the Indian, even to present day. Give away T-shirts that say “THE INDIAN WILL NEVER DIE”. Also made Indian man-head canes, Indian patches, Indian symbol boxer shorts, and doormats for sale to parents and alumni. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 167.

• 1983

  o October. Freshmen ran up the stands of the football field during halftime, unfurled an Indian banner and yelled “Wah-Hoo-Wah.” Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 167.
• 1984

- The Dartmouth Review asked more than 200 chiefs of Indian tribes whether or not they thought the Indian symbol was offensive. By a margin of more than 10-1 the chiefs said Dartmouth’s Indian symbol did not offend them; many said it was a symbol of pride.

• 1992

- The graduating class’s Senior Executive Committee voted unanimously to abolish the practice of pipe smoking by the old pine tree stump. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 169.

• 2006

- November. The Native American Council, a group of Dartmouth faculty and staff with a few students, took out an advertisement in the student newspaper detailing a string of incidents including the disruption of a Native American drumming circle by fraternity pledges, the publication of an alumni calendar by the Development Office that included a picture of an Indian head cane, and a “Cowboys and Indians” themed Crew party. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 170.
- President of Dartmouth College apologized to Native American students for the series of incidents in the advertisement. Argus Times, Dartmouth Apologizes to Native American Students, November 25, 2006.
- About 3% of the student body at Dartmouth was comprised of Native Americans.

• 2009

- Fall. For the first time in Dartmouth’s history, Native American students comprised 5% of the entering class. Native Americans and Dartmouth, at 185.

• 2012

- Savage Media formed by current Native American Dartmouth Students. The group wants to have a voice so that they can portray Native Americans as they want to be portrayed. Named the group Savage Media because they want to Reclaim the word Savage. (See screenshots from recent YouTube video, “Savage That” from Savage_Media_SavageThat.pdf)
Featured Interview

Preston Wells ‘15
We interviewed Preston Wells on October 9, 2012. Preston is a current student at Dartmouth and a founder of Savage Media, a non-Dartmouth affiliated student operated group. Savage Media seeks to deconstruct offensive images and appropriations of Native people and others through YouTube videos and social network discussions.

How did Savage Media start and who are your members?
Savage Media started in the spring of 2012. The reason we started was, last fall 2012 a group called 1491, a Native American sketch comedy group, came to our campus. 1491 puts on comedic pieces about stereotypes and Native American culture. They also do a lot of advocacy. We collaborated with this group on a few videos and were inspired to do our own videos about issues we encountered as Native American students at Dartmouth. Basically we wanted to provide videos for the way we wanted to be portrayed. Savage Media was founded by myself (Preston Wills), Autumn White Eyes, and Taylor Payer.

How did you come up with the name Savage Media?
That was actually intentional. A lot of people like it and a lot of people hate it. A lot of older Native Americans do not like it, but the reason we chose it was to reclaim the word for ourselves. It’s not a mascot for us, we do not consider ourselves savages, we’re taking a savage approach to the way Native peoples have been portrayed. In 4 of our 5 videos, we are taking a savage approach to a misconception about Native Americans whether it be the Dartmouth Indian mascot, urban outfitters, or blood quantum . . . it’s about deconstructing those stereotypes and social norms that are very, very offensive.

What activities do you participate in to work towards your goal?
We make videos basically; we reach out through social media including YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter. We take comments whether positive or negative. Recently we got a comment from a professor from Dartmouth, who put our videos on his syllabus for his class.

As a current student, does the Dartmouth Indian seem like a remaining presence and how?
So it is . . . still a presence. I was talking to someone the other day about it from Colorblind Magazine, in my freshmen year, around the third week of classes the Dartmouth Review paper was delivered to every student door. The Dartmouth Review is a privately funded newspaper at Dartmouth who still use the Indian mascot and hands out free Dartmouth Indian shirts to freshmen every year. They are the only ones actively putting the image of the Dartmouth Indian out there. Alumni sometimes wear the shirt and have on other accessories containing the Dartmouth Indian because that was the mascot when they were there. Apart from that, anything Dartmouth administrative controlled, there is not any Indian symbolism. Still a lot of people,
myself included feel like the administration has not come down and said this was our mascot in the past, but we will not allow it anywhere on our campus now. They kind of just swiped it under the rug. They just pretend that was not really their mascot officially, despite the fact that it was on football uniforms.

**How do you feel about the argument that the Dartmouth Indian honors Native Americans and is not offensive?**

[Preston laughed.] For me personally, I do find it offensive because it’s a character, cartoonish image depicting what is perceived as being Native American. For instance the hair on the Dartmouth Indian was a Mohawk, but if they wanted to honor Native Americans, [then why not be accurate]. The Native American tribe that was located where Dartmouth College is the Abenaki and the Dartmouth Indian looked nothing like it. Another thing, the Dartmouth Indian puts Native Americans in the past as if they do not exist now. We have 200 native students here at Dartmouth and I guarantee you if you look at an image of them, you will see they look nothing alike. So basically where I am offended is, they are, whoever distributing the Indian image, who claim to be honoring us, they are portraying us the way they want to and not how we want to be portrayed.

**Your first video, “Savage That” which depicts a male wearing a Dartmouth shirt and a Native American female painting an X over it. What were you trying to convey and what if any backlash have you received?**

What we were trying to convey was that the Native American female in the video wanted the guy to know she was there, to notice her, to recognize her, but the man in the video does not. He does not realize the image on his shirt is supposed to portray the Native American girl speaking to him. There is a disconnect because the Dartmouth Indian does not represent native people and this is when the woman in the video paints an x on it. To symbolize that image does not represent her.

Yes, there were interesting comments on campus about the video. Surprisingly there was a big discussion about the girl ruining the guy shirt with the paint. Other people talked about it extensively and the Dartmouth Review wrote an article responding to it. The Women of Color Collective featured the video in one of their meetings to discuss cultural appropriations. We have professors from different departments who want to use our videos in their classes, and we have gotten donations to continue our work. I don’t feel like we make videos for just one group, but want to make a statement about identity.

**How do you feel about students and alumni trying to bring back the Dartmouth Indian?**

I don’t support any Native American mascot. And the fact that our mascot is the Big Green hurts us too because you cannot put this on a shirt. People have this obsession with mascots in America. Like over in England, with English soccer, you have teams like Arsenal, Chelsea, and Manchester United. These teams have nicknames but not mascots. In America, there is this fascination with schools being represented by animals or a tangible symbol, which doesn’t make
sense to me. As a result of this American fascination with mascots, when universities have controversial mascots like Dartmouth that they have to get rid of, these same schools must replace them with something tangible. There has been discussion about Dartmouth mascot becoming the moose because there are a lot of moose in the area. This is a mascot people support on campus but Dartmouth administration has not made it official. Maybe . . . we will see this become the mascot in a few years, but that is my alternative to combatting campaigns to bring back the Indian. This will solve problems not just on the administrative level, but also on the merchandising and school spirit level too.
Fabrication of the Saltine Warrior

Syracuse University’s (SU’s) Saltine Warrior mascot has an origin steeped in misappropriated Indian culture and student identity politics. SU was one of the first universities to use an Indian as its mascot; its adoption was rooted based on an idea of “noble savagery.”

The Saltine Warrior mascot’s origin can be traced to when SU first attempted to establish an affiliation with the Onondaga Nation in 1884. In reverence of that new bond, the student body named the first SU Yearbook, *The Onondogan*, in honor of the tribe and “the beautiful valley in which they dwell.” A survey of subsequent yearbooks reveals that students continued to feel a strong association with the Onondaga Nation. The origin of the phrase “Saltine Warrior,” however, can be traced back to a 1911 minstrel show in which a student penned a song in an attempt to bolster the university’s connection with the tribe and local mining activity. Moreover, although the Saltine Warrior later became synonymous with the name “Chief Bill Orange,” the name “Bill Orange” was a moniker that originated in another song written by a student in the 1800s.

In addition, while the Saltine Warrior eventually became associated with the color orange, SU originally adopted the color for different (and far more innocent) reasons. Prior to adopting orange as the school’s official color, SU first experimented with pea green and pink and

---

later with azure blue and pink. However, after some “cutting remarks” from an opposing team at a track meet, SU adopted the orange as the school’s official color. The decision was finalized by a vote from the Board of Trustees in 1889 and ratified by the Alumni Association in 1890.  

The Saltine Warrior mascot, under the alias of “Big Chief Bill Orange,” made his debut at SU in the October 1931 edition of The Syracuse Orange Peel, a student comedy publication. Prior to this debut, SU employed “Vita” the goat as its mascot. According to The Orange Peel, Native American artifacts, including some arrowheads and a painting of an Indian Chief whose name supposedly translated from Onondaga to English as “The Saltine Warrior,” were found next to a building on SU’s campus while building crews were relocating the women’s gymnasium. SU’s Director of Public Relations, Burges Johnson, “affirmed” the discovery of the painting and the artifacts despite criticism. The Saltine Warrior largely faded into the background for approximately twenty years, making the occasional appearance at sporting events.

The 1950s brought a reconceptualization of the Saltine Warrior. First, in 1951 an eight-foot tall bronze statue was placed at the location where the Saltine Warrior’s painting and

---

artifacts had been discovered. A member of the Onondaga Nation was commissioned to pose for the statue, which was then placed in different locations, usually near SU’s academic buildings. Second, the Pi Lambda Fraternity discovered a five-foot tall wooden Indian statue with a raised tomahawk, a relic from 19th century tobacco stores. It was adopted by the Alpha Tau Omega Fraternity and brought to football games to represent the Saltine Warrior. Students used this statue to tally football victories, with “scalps in the colors of Syracuse’s vanquished opponents” hanging from the wooden Indian’s belt. Subsequent mascot selection committees also encouraged selected warriors to choose from different sets of personalities, ranging from “a brave of fire-water frenzy” to “stern and brooding.”

The 1960s brought a more crude and offensive version of the Saltine Warrior. The Saltine Warrior was depicted with a leather Sioux bonnet, which is not only historically inaccurate, but also offensive to the Onondaga Nation. In 1962, Chancellor William Tolley envisioned the campus Indian as a symbolic representation of “the thinker,” as well as being a light-hearted figure. However, the Saltine Warrior became more of a farcical figure, sharing the same wild qualities demonstrated by the fraternities, especially Lambda Chi Alpha, who ran the selection committee for the mascot for decades. The debate and controversy surrounding the appropriateness of the Saltine Warrior heated up and came to a head in the 1970s.

17 “New Saltine Warrior to Lead Cheering at Games, Rallies.” Syracuse Daily Orange Sept. 25, 1951.
18 Ibid.
**Demise of the Saltine Warrior**

There were a number of considerations that came into play in the 1970s regarding the Saltine Warrior controversy: (1) mounting pressures from other schools that had abandoned their offensive mascots, (2) increased appreciation of racial/cultural respect, (3) financial contribution and alumni support, (4) cost for rebranding the university with a different mascot, (5) community relations with the Onondaga Nation, (6) community relations with the people of Syracuse, and (7) the potential for student unrest (on both sides).

Melvin Eggers, Syracuse’s Chancellor from 1971–91, recounted the behavior of this incarnation of the Saltine Warrior “took on more extreme forms of behavior that could be interpreted as making fun of the real thing, whether it be noises or antics of one sort or another . . . . He would take off into the stands and run around making the ‘whoopings’ sounds attributed to Indians and their war dance. He would go through a mock form of native Indian dancing.”

Two events in particular seemed to precipitate the removal of the Saltine Warrior. First, the American Indian Center of Cleveland’s lawsuit against the Cleveland Indians in 1972 prompted Charles Willie, the Vice President for Student Affairs at the time, to urge campus organizations and departments to reevaluate the use of Indian imagery. Willie’s initial pleading fell on deaf ears and the Saltine Warrior’s antics caused tensions to simmer for the next couple of seasons. Second, in March 1976, the university student newspaper revealed the apparently not-so-surprising bombshell that the alleged discovery of archaeological remains in 1931 was a hoax. Seaman Jacobs, editor of the *The Orange Peel* in 1931, confessed that Chief Bill Orange was a fabrication.

---

By the fall of 1977, there were two clearly defined camps arguing over whether to keep the Saltine Warrior.\(^{28}\) Supporters of the mascot included the fraternity community, older alumni, and according to a student newspaper poll, about two-thirds of the undergraduate population.\(^{29}\) They argued that the mascot was a binding figure of the Syracuse community and removing the mascot would remove that shared connection and history.\(^{30}\) They also asserted that the mascot was a noble figure.\(^{31}\) Opponents of the mascot included small, outspoken groups of Native American students, undergraduate students, and faculty.\(^{32}\) These opponents argued that the race-based stereotypes ill-served the interests of racial minorities and went against SU’s values and principles.\(^{33}\) Opponents of the Saltine Warrior also asserted that the mascot was disgraceful and dehumanizing.\(^{34}\)

The Syracuse administration was caught in the crossfire, especially then-Vice President of Student Affairs, Melvin Mounts.\(^{35}\) The parties reached an impasse in December 1977 when Lambda Chi Alpha’s offer of compromise was met with a flat-out refusal by the Native American students to accept anything less than full removal of the mascot.\(^{36}\)

By mid-January 1978, the arguments of those against the mascot, especially a memorandum written by the Onkwehonweha (SU’s Native American Student Association at the time) arguing that the Saltine Warrior was disparaging, had persuaded Melvin Mounts to


\(^{31}\) Ibid.


announce that the discontinuation of the Saltine Warrior starting in the spring semester of that year.  

**Post-Saltine Warrior World**

The first student responses to the mascot removal were published in the *Syracuse Herald American* in early March 1978. Some students responded with anger, while others appeared to be relatively passive about the mascot removal. One student in particular, who performed as the Saltine Warrior mascot, commented, “I treat the Saltine Warrior as an honor. It’s not racism at all,” and eventually stated, “I’m beginning not to like Indians,” in response to the removal. The sentiment behind the student’s reaction similarly emanated from some Alumni circles as well, who were officially notified six months after the removal and took it upon themselves to send disgruntled and sometimes racist letters to Melvin Mounts and the SU administration. However, SU’s decision to eliminate the Saltine Warrior had no immediate impact on the greater Syracuse area, as the local minor league team, local community college, and all of the high schools retained their Indian mascots.

In the meantime, SU cycled through a number of experimental mascots to replace the Saltine Warrior. The initial replacement was a Roman Warrior, who was supposed to continue serving as a Saltine Warrior, but just in a different context; this mascot did not last very long and was booed off the field soon after his inception. Egnaro the Troll, a Superman like figure, and a man in an orange tuxedo were some other short-lived and experimental mascots. Finally, in the early 1980s an orange with “appeal” entered the realm and soon became the mascot for SU that many fans cherish today.

---

42 Syracuse University Archives. “Syracuse University History: Syracuse University Mascots” Web. <http://archives.syr.edu/history/mascots.html>.
In addition to actually removing the mascot and refusing to backslide despite some the Alumni members’ chagrin, SU has taken some very unique and positive steps in the direction of strengthening its relationship with the Onondaga Nation. Chancellor Nancy Cantor, who supported the removal of Chief Illiniwek while serving as the chancellor at the University of Illinois, recently started an initiative to enable members of the Onondaga Nation to study free of cost if they qualify as members of the Haudenosaunee Nations. The program, known as Haudenosaunee Promise, provides students with financial assistance equal to the cost of tuition, housing and meals, and enables many members of the Haudenosaunee Nations to seek higher education. This program has played an integral role in the Onondaga Nation and SU’s strong relationship, and continues to foster good will between the two parties.

45 Ibid.
### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>First official football mascot, Frank Collins, whose nickname was “Collie.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>“Collie” graduates and the students shift to using a dog wearing a helmet as the new mascot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902–1914</td>
<td>University teams played sports, especially football and lacrosse, competitively against the Onondaga Nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Vita the Goat is adopted as a mascot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Hoax of Bill Orange (16th century “remains” found while constructing a gymnasium); Bill Orange adopted as a mascot. Only sporadically used Bill Orange as a mascot until after WWII when they “revived” the mascot by using a wooden Native American Statue to mark the number of teams that they had beat or “scalped.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Placing of a statue of Chief Bill Orange at the “discovery” site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Lambda Chi Alpha fraternity brother’s father who owned a cheerleading camp made a “Saltine Warrior” costume for his son to wear to games. Human mascot Bill Orange played by James Mosher, who had studied Native American culture himself and would accordingly do dances in accordance with what he had learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subsequent mascots, however, did not continue the tradition of learning the Native American culture and expressing it properly, and instead focused their actions on features of war. Melvin Eggers even remarked that the people serving as mascots no longer tried to perform according to the Native American art form, but instead just demonstrated wild behaviors.

- **1972**
  - February 1972
    - Charles Willie, the VP of Student Affairs, asked the University to think about re-evaluating its use of the Saltine Warrior as a mascot.

- **1976**
  - March 23, 1976
    - A Memorandum published by the News Bureau at Syracuse University debunked the story behind the Saltine Warrior’s remains as a hoax.
    - Chief Oren Lyons spoke out in the Daily Orange explaining that it is “all in the presentation. The thing that offended me was when I was there[,] there was a guy running around like a nut. That’s derogatory.”

- **1977**
  - November 2, 1977
    - The Native American Students Association (Onkwehonwneha) submitted a letter to Melvin C. Mounts, VP of Student Affairs, complaining about the use of the Saltine Warrior as both derogatory and stereotypical.
  - December 1977
    - Parties unable to compromise and reached an impasse - nothing less that the full removal of the mascot was acceptable.

- **1978**
  - Mid January 1978
    - Melvin Mounts decides that the Saltine Warrior would need to be removed as a mascot.
  - February 12, 1978
    - Saltine Warrior “sidelined” and search for a successor mascot ensued.
  - End of February/Beginning of March 1978
    - Saltine Warrior makes its final appearance at the SU Basketball game.
  - March 5, 1978
    - First student responses to the mascot removal made known in the Syracuse Herald-American.
  - March 27, 1978
    - First successor mascot proposal deadline.
• Summer 1978
  o Alumni notified of the removal of the Saltine Warrior six months after the change was made.
• Summer/Fall 1978
  o Alumni send derogatory and racist letters to Melvin C. Mounts.
• September 1978
  o Roman Warrior introduced as a mascot, booed off of the field after the University lost 28-0 to the Florida State University Seminoles.

• 1980

• March 1980
  o Roman Warrior re-cast as a Greek Warrior, but this mascot never gained any traction.
• April 4, 1980
  o Orange With “appeal” introduced by the Daily Orange as the mascot. This mascot would eventually go on to be known as “Otto the Orange.”