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CHAIRMAN ENGELBRECHT: Good morning. My name is Bill Engelbrecht, I currently serve as the chair of the Board of Trustees. I would like to welcome you to this special intake session this morning on the dialogue on Chief Illiniwek. For the record, I need to say that this is not, that this is a special intake session, moderated by Judge Louis Garippo and it is not a regular meeting of the Board of Trustees.

I would like to introduce the members of the Board of Trustees, on by left, Martha O'Malley, Roger Plummer, to my far right, Trustee David Cocagne, Doctor Kenneth Schmidt, Melissa Neely and Judith Reese.

As you know, the first phase of the dialogue is given over to listening to as broad a spectrum of opinion as we could possibly muster. We have received more than 10,000 letters and e-mail messages since we began the dialogue process on January 13. In the fall, we will hold a response session and offer you our views on the issues that all of you have raised.

We will be listening today intently to the various presentations and I hope all of you
will as well. This session presents all of us
with a unique opportunity to hear the many diverse
points of view.

I hope that you will all leave today's
session with an enhanced sense of each other's
view on this very challenging issues. Judge Louis
Garippo has agreed to moderate this session and to
present the Board of Trustees with a report late
this summer. It will summarize the various
communications in ways that permit us to respond.
We are grateful to him for this undertaking on
this very challenging assignment. Judge Garippo
is an attorney in private practice with Cahill,
Christian and Kunkle, Ltd. He is a former Circuit
Court judge in Cook County. He earned his law
degree at DePaul University and a bachelor's
degree from the University of Notre Dame. I would
like to turn the proceedings over to Judge
Garippo.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Thank you, Chairman.
I knew I could draw a real crowd here today. I am
glad that there is enough support staff here to
constitute somebody to listen to us. But I am
sure as the day goes on, that people will come in
and hopefully somewhat fill this auditorium to
listen to the dialogue on this issue which has
generated so much interest on campus and off of
campus.

My function is to present a report later
this summer which will clearly and fairly
articulate the arguments on both sides of this
issue. And I will not have fulfilled my mission
if when I prepare my report if that, if any
position is not fully and fairly stated.

It is my hope to begin today in this
dialogue session to try to pull together all the
sources available to me in order to generate this
report.

Now, this intake session is just a
fraction, although a significant fraction, of what
will go into formulating the various opinions on
this subject. We will have the, the sources will
be the e-mail, the e-mails to the dialogue, the
dialogue web site, and the letters, past
correspondence, the internet just contains a vast
amount of information. And I welcome anyone
sending either directly to me or through the
University, any suggestions that you might have to
completely air this, air this problem.

Now, in selecting the speakers today, there were more speakers than we had time, than we had time to a lot to them. So I enlisted the aid of people on both sides of this issue in order to pare down the list.

On the pro-Chief side, Howard Wakeland of the Save the Chief organization was helpful to me in identifying those people who could identify and articulate their, the point of view that his group was coming from.

On the other side, I enlisted the aid of Paula Ostrovsky and Michael Haney who actually happen to be in Chicago and they came to my office. And we went over the list and there were far more organizations than we had time for. If we gave all the time to the organizations, there wouldn't be time for individuals.

So the organizations were limited, however, many, most of the organizations are still represented as individuals on the list. So we, we are trying to allocate the time fairly and we are going to have a procedure today whereby we will use two microphones. They will be alternating,
not necessarily always back and forth, but I will
announce who will be at each microphone and we
will have a speaker for a microphone and we will
have someone in the on deck position ready to go
so that when we switch back and forth so the
microphones, we will be able to not lose any time
so that most of the time can be spent with the
actual dialogue.

Actually, none of us is experienced in
conducting a hearing like this, so perhaps the
first few speakers, there may be a few hitches in
our procedure, bear with us. I am sure by the end
of the day we will be experts. So we will begin.
And I would like Howard Wakeland to be at
microphone No. 2, Debbie Reese to be at microphone
No. 1. And the person following Debbie Reese at
microphone 1 will be Rick Legue and the person
following Howard Wakeland at microphone will be
Charlene Teters.

Mr. Wakeland, if you represent an
organization, as you speak, if you will identify
the organization that you are representing.

MR. WAKELAND: Thank you, I represent
the save the Chief organization and copies of my
statement are here on the edge of the platform should somebody want one.

A little over a year ago I had the privilege to address the Board of Trustees on this issue. A copy of my presentation is attached to this handout. At that time, we presented over 1500 petitions from more than 200 Illinois cities and more than 30 states supporting the retention of the Chief. I do not desire to use my time to repeat that information.

The heat of battle tends to bring out the worst in us. In this confrontation, the anti-Chiefs have not hesitated to pervert University functions to their advantage, regardless of the consequences to the University. Except for an accreditation visit last fall by the North Central Association, which was totally perverted by the anti-Chiefs, we would not be here today. We would not be here today.

I feel compelled to share with you the facts about that incredulous North Central Association process. Had their report limited itself to the quality of education at this University, which was their charge, this hearing
would not be held. Facts about the NCA visit illustrates how we can be sidetracked in our quest for high quality education by divisive actions of special interest minority groups. There is strong evidence that the NCA visit was focussed and lobbied before and during their visit by the anti-Chief group. They clearly placed their agenda above educational quality at this University.

The NCA accreditation group of 12 members visited the University for three days in the fall of 1999, with a goal of assessing the quality of our educational programs. Accrediting agencies must follow nationally established criteria, a copy is attached. The criteria requires evaluation of specific educational sectors, curricula, faculty, facilities, support services, et cetera.

The anti-Chief group used a criteria clause referred to as third party concerns to flood the visiting team with more than 100 letters of concern. This was obviously a well planned, well directed, focussed effort. The NCA report, in the report it is stated, "No letters in support
of the Chief were received. And no letters on any
other topic were received."

Hundreds of pro-Chief documents existed,
but were not asked for by NCA prior to the visit.
Further in the report, they state, "The team
agrees that a school mascot per se is not an
accreditation issue, but it does feel that
educational consequences of the policy, tied to
NCA criteria, are within the purview of the
accreditation review." This visitation team was
so unprofessional as to not recognize they were
being lobbied and used by a special interest
group. In my opinion, NCA also went beyond the
professional and ethical bounds of the criteria.

During the visit, the NCA team became so
focused on the Chief issue, that they canceled
scheduled meetings designed to review the quality
of the UIUC education so that they could spend
time instead reviewing the Chief issue.

Specifically, they canceled a session
with Director Thurston, College of Education,
which related to "Information Technology and
Instructional Computing." And in another session,
with the "Weston Hall Exploration Living/Learning
Community Project" to attend their own impromptu
Chief sessions.

Further, they also requested
cancellation of a meeting with Robert Rich, Chair
of our Senate Council. The meeting topic was to
be about "Invest in the People, Our Faculty."
That was the topic to be discussed with Robert
Rich.

Professor Rich is our academic faculty
leader, selected by his peers, but NCA visitors
wanted to spend more time on the Chief issue
instead of meeting with him. Only through the
insistence of Robert Rich was a meeting held and a
single NCA team member attended that session.

I view this as an insult and blatant
disregard for our Senate and the faculty of this
institution. The Chief was more important to the
NCA than Information Technology, Instructional
Computing, the faculty, or the Senate. That is
fact. The NC Accreditation team became so
focussed, so intent on investigating a bogus
educational quality issue that it in fact
endangered the public perception of the quality of
education at this University.
I believe the NCA action to be overtly unprofessional, misdirected and that there should be a State of Illinois investigation to insure the other institutions of higher learning in Illinois are not subjected to such unprofessional evaluations, which might involve student dances, cheerleaders, student newspapers. Further, I believe they acted in conflict with the national criteria guidelines.

This outrage is caused by the lobbying tactics of the anti-Chief group. Put simply, NCA was used by the anti-Chiefs. The anti-Chiefs previously have called for carte blanche administrative resignations and in this case have not hesitated to interfere with the University accreditation process to advance their personal agendas. That does not illustrate concern for the University.

Whether for or against the Chief, the Board of Trustees needs to take a firm stand and not vacillate on this issue. Once that stand is taken, it should not vary, short of state or federal legislation or duly executed court decisions.
I firmly believe the Chief is an honorable symbol that brings respect and honor to the University and to the heritage of the Illinois tribe, which otherwise will soon be forgotten.

I and hundreds of others are disturbed by the McCarthy type actions of a small group that infers we are racists and uses tactics that place their personal goals above those of the University. The majority of students and faculty and public interested in this University are in favor of the present stance taken by the Board to maintain the Chief. I urge them to listen to the masses and to continue their present support for the Chief. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Debbie Reese.

MS. DEBBIE REESE: Good morning, my name is Debbie Reese. I am Pueblo Indian. I would like to introduce you to the fellow native students that are on the campus at this time. This is John McKinn behind me. He is Pima. Also standing with me is Diana Stimpel, she Ojibway. A fourth student, Doug Singleton couldn't be here with us today.

I address you today in my role as
president of Red Roots, a registered UIUC student organization whose members are Native American students with strong ties to our tribal nations. Throughout the day, I expect you will hear from individuals who claim they have Native blood from a grandmother or a grandfather. But their lives are such that this Native heritage is not a part of their daily lives. Some will speak in support of the Chief telling you how they feel honored by this symbol.

It is important, we believe, that you understand we are simply not another section of the anti-Chief voices that you will hear today. We are Native students who have chosen to attend this University. At present there are four of us who have direct experience with our Native heritage. I, for example, was born at an Indian hospital. I grew up on a reservation in northern New Mexico. The students I represent do not seek our Native identity, it is who we are, based on our daily lives, our lived experiences as members of a tribal nation.

As students, we pursue our degrees, we take classes and in the case of the graduate
students, we conduct research and we teach for the University. Since 1988, Native students at the University have formed a student organization that has, without fail, issued position statements opposed to the use of the symbol or mascot known as Chief Illiniwek.

At its peak, the student organization has numbered no more than 12 to 15 students with this direct connection to their Native roots. Again, I refer to students with a meaningful tie to their Native heritage. We can tell stories that no one else can. We enrich the conversations on the campus in ways that no one else can, because of a lived experience of contact, daily contact with our roots.

Because we can tell these stories, we are often invited to speak to various organizations on campus, invited to speak to various classes on campus and in the community. There's a tremendous need for that kind of information. The community is looking for information they can't get at present at the University because there are no formal programs in existence.
Today, I want to ask that you listen to
the Indian voice, the Indian voices in the
community of Champaign-Urbana, to the Indian
voices that are part of this University. We
aren't part of an alliance. We are students. We
are educators. We are parents. We are not
activists, and we not been agitating solely for
the removal of the Chief. As a group of Native
students, we have proposed and worked in good
faith in the last 12 years, indeed in times in
partnership with the University administrators for
these three items.

One, a Native American studies program
that would provide the opportunity for all UIUC
students to take course work about American Indian
culture.

Two, the hiring of an assistant dean in
students services whose primary responsibilities
would include overseeing the needs of Native
American students and the recruitment of
additional Native American students.

Three, establishment of an Native
American cultural house that would serve as a
meeting place for Native students, but would also
serve the community through cultural programs and
activities that would enhance the educational
experience of all students on the UIUC campus.

None of our efforts have borne fruit.

In 1997, we responded to an invitation from
student services administrators to work with them
in the drafting of a job description for an
assistant dean to serve Native American students.
After months of work that culminated in the
interviewing of six candidates for that position,
we selected a candidate and expected her to be on
campus within one month's time. Instead, the
position was canceled due to lack of funds.

Just prior to that, we were told that we
would be given a meeting place on campus. We
expected it would be a private office area or a
physical location similar to those enjoyed by the
other ethnic minorities on campus. However, when
we went to the place, it turned out to be two
desks pushed together in the lobby of the Student
Services Building.

As graduate students, we have networks
and universities across the country through which
we have learned that Native American professors at
major universities would not come here if a
position were available, nor do they counsel their
students to come here. Each person we have spoken
to cites the Chief as the major reason for his or
her actions.

Clearly, all our efforts have been for
naught. We believe this is directly related to
the Chief. We believe the, quote, honorable image
of the Chief has led to the derogatory treatment
of Native students on campus. The attitude that
embraces the Chief simultaneously denigrates and
marginalizes our very existence on campus.

If there were a Native studies program
and an assistant dean and a Native house, there
would be more Native students here. However, a
greater Native presence would also be a greater
voice that would, in effect, become a threat to
the romanticized notions of what it means to be a
Native American, thereby it would be a threat to
keeping the Chief.

Again, none of our efforts have been
successful. We believe a true dialogue on this
issue would mean talking to the people who are
most directly affected, that means inviting we the
Native students on campus to meet with the Board of Trustees for a conversation, a conversation about the many issues that we confront and deal with as students here.

In numerous venues, you have stated your commitment to Native students and your commitment to diversity on campus. Please hear our voice. Hear our request as Native students on campus, we live here, we work here, we study here. Invite us to your table for this conversation. Once again, we are offering our assistance, our help to you, the University. Invite us to talk with you, therein, we believe is the true honoring of the Native students on campus.

We urge you to retire the Chief and begin the healing process that needs to be begun, begin it here at home with your students. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: May I ask you a question, do you regard the, is your argument like two issues, in other words, is the Chief part of only the problem, or is the Chief one issue and all these other --

MS. REESE: We believe the Chief is the
major obstacle to achieving the other things that
need to be in place.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: If everything that
you requested were granted, I have no authority to
do any of those, but if everything that you
requested were to be granted, and the Chief would
stay, would that still be a, represent a problem
with your organization?

MS. REESE: I believe that if the Chief
stayed and efforts were made to actually have a
Native students program, a Native house, recruit
additional students, increase the Native presence
on campus, then there would be a greater
educational opportunity for everyone on campus to
learn what it is to be a Native American. And
through that process, people would come to
understand why the Chief is a negative,
problematic stereotype.

And I can point to an example from
yesterday. A former, a graduate of the University
wrote to me, he was a 1963 graduate, his name is
Dan Airand, he is currently in Connecticut. He
wrote to ask what was our position on our
experience here. I described it to him. He was
outraged, he said if he had known any of the
information that I shared about what it is to be a
Native student, what it is to be here, he would
ask for the removal of the Chief also.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Thank you. Charlene
Teters.

MS. CHARLENE TETERS: I am Spokane, I am
from Washington State. I am also an alum of the
University of Illinois. I cannot be semantically
divided, a symbol here, a mascot there. I am
neither. I am Indian because that is the racial
classification adopted by the United States of
America. It is what you will call me. But we are
not here to pleasure anyone. We are not
stereotypes. I am Spokane.

At the turn of the century, my
grandmother was born February 2, 1900, and given
the reservation name Nancy Moses. The end of the
19th century saw continued great change to the
environment and to the original people of the
northwest, where I am from.

Treaties were written and broken and
within one generation entire villages disappeared.
My people were confined to reservations by not
just the United States Army, but also vigilante groups. Starvation was the reality of my grandmother's and grandfather's generation, less than a hundred years ago.

Boarding schools that followed in the early 20th century were designed to destroy the family unit and thereby the nations. Our children were gathered up, sometimes by force and taken to boarding schools where many suffered and many of them died. My grandmother had 12 children and only four lived to be adults. And that was not unusual during that time period.

The trauma of this time that I am talking about broke our traditional support systems apart. And the religion of my grandparents was made illegal. The regalia, the bundles, the feathers that were part of the way they spoke to the Creator, were gathered up in some cases and burned or sold into collections.

This is the same kind of regalia that you have in your mascot. So this is my grandmother's generation. This is also Fools Crow's generation. He was born only days after the massacre at Wounded Knee.
I share this slice of history because the pro-Chief people often will use this name of our spiritual leader in connection to support of the mascot. And Fools Crow himself was a survivor of this very traumatic time period.

After generations of violent subordination, policies of genocide, forced removals, starvation, forced assimilation, why does it surprise anyone that some of our people will participate in their own oppression or who will do what they need to do to survive or to buy some peace for future generations, our future generations, as Fools Crow was a peacemaker.

So it really disturbs me that you continue to use his name in support of the mascot, because you shame his family, his name, his people when you connect it with a cheerleader, Illiniwek.

It's taken generations for Native people to come back from this trauma that they described. My mother with an 8th grade education had six children. And at age 73, she still gets up everyday and goes to a job that many would call basically menial labor. She's a maid. Her hands are among the many brown hands that invisibly
clean the floors and empty the trash across America. At 73 years of age, I consider her job, her work has always been honorable.

She had six children and I am the only one that has a college degree. Coming from this background to the University of Illinois was a dream come true for me and for my family and for my people. And it was a dream that very quickly turned into a nightmare after I got here because of the images that permeated this community. I bought this at campustown when I was here. So these are the kinds of things that I faced when I came here.

Our universities, our schools owe all of our students, no matter what background they come from, a safe environment without the distractions, without the additional burden of bigotry. University presidents, board of trustee members, must set the tone for that environment of respect. And if not, the message is clear, it need not exist for all people. That safe environment will never exist here as long as you have a race-based mascot. There should be no doubt that race, ethnicity, religion, cultural markings and
national origin are at the core of our objections. Does anyone not recognize this image as supposedly representing Indian people. We are not confused that this is Asian or Jew, even the support the Chief people will say look at our honorable symbol representing Indian people. My family is honorable. This is not.

When a stereotype is being put forward by an educational institution, it interferes with the true mission to educate. And it's irreconcilable to use lies to educate. So powerful is this publicly supported stereotype that Natives who come here are not allowed to define themselves. They are predefined by Chief Illiniwek.

You have basically a litmus test here, because when they find out we are Indian people, they ask us, what is your position on the Chief? Do you support it or not.

The Irish freedom leader Gerry Adams recently wrote, "Colonial culturalism seeks to substitute men and women for mere objects. Objects have no allegiance, they are for sale," end of quote. This University is engaging in
cultural colonialism.

I want to tell you that it's important to remove these things because they are in our way from people seeing us for who we really are. Let us show you and share with you who we are.

Over and over again we have been in this place, we have spoken to the Board of Trustees a number of times, and again and again we say the same thing. The same thing that was said to Columbus, the same thing that we said to Andrew Jackson and we are saying it again to you, we are human. We are human beings. We are not mascots or fetishes to be worn by the dominant society. We are human beings.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Thank you. I skipped a speaker, Rick Legue, microphone No. 1. Those who represent groups, if you will identify your group in your speech.

MR. RICK LEGUE: Members of the Board of Directors, Board of Trustees, excuse me, fellow alumni, future alumni, ladies and gentlemen, good morning, I am proud to say I saw the sunrise this morning. My name is Rick League, from Barrington, Illinois, class of 1968, I am a proud former Chief
Illiniwek and represent the former Chiefs.

First let me state that although I am 54 years young and might mistakenly be perceived as an old timer, my days here on campus seem not so long ago. It's just the years that seem to speed by. This is not only my alma mater, it is my birth place, I grew up in Urbana. I have a son I am proud to say who graduated from this University. When I come home to U of I, I truly come home.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak to you, the Board of Trustees, and do so this morning on behalf of the former Chief Illiniweks who proudly served as Chief while students at the University. Those opposed to the Chief Illiniwek have made their objections heard for some time now and will do so again today in this dialogue.

I am here on behalf of the former Chief Illiniweks that have proudly portrayed the Chief to testify that it is not what they claim, it's never been, it has never been intended to be, if it were, I and we would not be voicing our concerns or making this supportive statement.
I am not here to wag or to wave the flag of tradition or of the past. From his first appearance in 1926, by careful design, the Chief was to symbolize the University and its namesake, a proud tribe of Native Americans Indians, from Illinois. The Chief is an artistic, positive, artful symbol whose portrayal has been carefully decided and managed with integrity and with the highest regard and honor for the group of Americans it portrays.

The Chief has, with the University of Illinois Alma Mater in which it has been portrayed, has in fact been embraced and supported by, among others, the Illiniwek tribe itself in 1995. Also, several Chiefs over the years have been invited to Native American communities to learn more about the culture, to be in touch, to learn their history, and have done so.

Great care has been taken to assure that the Chief and its symbol and its symbolic portrayal is dignified, sacred and an honored one. The Chief is truly a symbol.

We used to always point out there are nine, now ten, mascots in the Big 10. There is
only one chief. And there is nothing like the
Chief Illiniwek in this country. And that's
because we have done it right and continue to do
so with good guidance and careful leadership.

The Chief is not a mascot. Not a
Buckeye, not a Badger, running the sidelines,
leading cheers, arms waving, not an Irish
leprechaun doing the same, no. The Chief in his
performance is an honored event, a personification
of the spirit of the Illini.

When the Three-In-One music began, when
I was Chief, I left my personna, I wasn't Legue
anymore, I could have been Henry Kissinger or Eddy
Murphy himself. That's what it's all about.
Portraying a spirit. And a symbol with dignity
and honor. My goal was to somehow sneak into the
marching band, unseen, so that when I burst onto
the field and performed the celebratory dance down
the field, I was the spirit of the Illini. A
spirit that could be seen and felt.

And when I raised my arms, I could
believe it, I believed that everyone could feel
the presence of that spirit. That bond we all
share at this great University, the dance at mid-
field and the Chief, arms folded, proudly marched off, disappearing. I feel that spirit in the room today. A symbol and a spirit present and visible for just those fleeting moments and then gone again, a reminder.

And there's the linkage four capsulized years of memories, life long friendships, loyalty, pride in Illinois in its excellence, in its Noble prize winners, distinguished graduates portrayed and relayed through proud Chief, a proud symbol, an honored symbol of the University and its traditions. And when I was Chief, I was also an ambassador of the University, I communicated the history of the Chief, the honored position it held.

I spoke at Alumni Association functions, University functions, Boy Scout jamborees, schools, libraries, faculty events, so many to recall. I remember speaking at the invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Krannert at the Indianapolis Alumni Club in 1967. We are certainly grateful for their support and loyalty to this great University.

There are hundreds of times the Chief has been such an ambassador. That symbol of the
institution, the symbol of its pride, of its
excellence and loyalty.

In recent years that has changed
somewhat. However, the Chief is very restricted,
no speaking engagements, silenced. Rarely is the
Chief's logo displayed on University literature or
athletic uniforms. And the University has done so
in recent years I am sure with the intention of
more clearly defining the appropriate role and
reduce the debate.

Unfortunately, it has served to confuse
the public. More importantly, confuse the
students of the past ten years and those students
on campus today. Isn't the Chief, isn't the Chief
Illiniwek still a symbol of the University of
Illinois? Yes. It still is. Didn't this Board
of Trustees just a few years ago vote in support
in retention of the Chief? Yes. So why are we
sending mixed messages? Why is the administration
low keying the Chief?

A recent Sun Times poll showed 86
percent of those polled support the Chief. And
there are hundreds of thousands of people from
this great University that agree that the Chief is
a great symbol and vital asset to this University. A symbol that has served the institution well and can continue to do so. Supporters of the University of Illinois want to retain the Chief.

We urge this board to make it clear, I hope the Alumni Association will do so too. The Chief Illiniwek is still a beloved and honored symbol of the University, not a stereotype and needs the support and wholehearted commitment of the Board. We surely want the Chief to be the best.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Thank you. Dawn Neisen and Mike Drish, Hank Hanneken will be after Michael Haney at the other microphone.

MS. DAWN NEISEN: Good morning, my name is Dawn Neisen, I am the current President of Students for Chief Illiniwek. And today I will speak about my first experience with Chief Illiniwek and how Chief Illiniwek inspired me to further my awareness of Native American issues. Then Mike Drish, Chairman of Research and Alumni Relations for Students for Chief Illiniwek, will discuss our organization's purpose and the prominent role we have played in maintaining Board
policy on this issue.

Chief Illiniwek, the honorable and dignified symbol of the University of Illinois. I will never forget the first time my eyes witnessed the Chief during his half-time performance at a men's basketball game. I was just a freshman at the time and I often wondered if I truly fit in here. You see, I was eager to meet new people, but that isn't always such an easy task at a large University such as this one. I remember following everyone else onto the court, clueless as to what I was about to experience.

Chief Illiniwek came running onto the court and the whole arena watched in complete awe. Upon completion of the performance everyone linked arms to join in singing the Alma Mater. I was one among strangers and hesitant at first, but no one else seemed to mind. As the chorus rang throughout the arena, at that very moment, I knew I belonged.

At that moment, I realized what it meant to be an Illini. Not because I was at a sporting event, but more than that. At that moment, I entered the circle of not only those current
students amongst me, but also of all those who
have ever called themselves Illini. I experienced
the true spirit of the University of Illinois.
And it instilled in me a pride that I have not yet
experienced since.

It is important for me to note that
Chief Illiniwek is a symbolic representation of
the University of Illinois.

He is a fictional character created by
the legendary football coach Robert Zuppke. It is
not intended to be an accurate historical
portrayal of the Illinois Indians, but rather a
representation of the Illini spirit.

Chief Illiniwek has sparked my interest
to further my personal knowledge on Native
American issues. This past spring break, while
many of my friends were packing out to head for
the sunny beaches of California and Florida, I
opted to travel to Pine Ridge Indian reservation
in South Dakota.

While there, I met and worked with many
Lakota Sioux Indians. I participated in
rectifying a peace garden, tutoring Native
American children and helping with other community
I also received the opportunity to visit the historic site of the massacre of Wounded Knee. Unfortunately, I also witnessed many of the current hardships such as their struggles with poverty, alcoholism and suicide.

But the thing that amazed me the most is that even after all of this, there was still an inspiring people who firmly held onto their heritage and traditions with great pride. They had such an admirable characteristic of strong faith that they would overcome these struggles. And they played an active role to improve the way of life on the reservation. All the way while maintaining a strong connection to their past.

I am so grateful for this experience, because it truly enhanced my knowledge and appreciation of Native American culture and spirit. And I can wholeheartedly say that I would have never taken this trip if it wasn't my personal connection to Chief Illiniwek.

Therefore, I urge the University to utilize Chief Illiniwek as an educational tool for the State and the University of Illinois to increase awareness regarding the past, present and
future of Native American cultures.

    It is with this thought in mind that I stand here before you today and express my support for the retention of Chief Illiniwek as a revered symbol of this University. It is a 74-year-old tradition that is a great source of pride for those linked to the University and the State of Illinois.

    And I cannot conceive of any other symbol that I would want to represent the University of Illinois. With that said I would like to leave you with something that was once said to me and these words still ring through my ears just as the Alma Mater did on that day I first witnessed Chief Illiniwek. He said hold onto your traditions, for that is what makes you who you are.

    And now I will turn the second part of our presentation over to Mike Drish.

    MR. MIKE DRISH: Thank you, Dawn. Good morning, as Dawn said, my name is Mike Drish and I am Chairman of Research and Alumni Relations for Students for Chief Illiniwek. My half of the speech will outline the purpose of Students for
Chief Illiniwek, what has been done on the campus level concerning the Chief issue and what we believe the principal course of action should be regarding the Chief.

Students for Chief Illiniwek is an organization that serves many important purposes at the University of Illinois. The first is to support the honorable tradition of Chief Illiniwek as a respected and revered symbol of the University. The second is to provide an outlet or resource for students to acknowledge their support for the retention of the Chief. And the third purpose is to present and promote accurate information to the University of Illinois faculty, staff and student body regarding the tradition and significance behind Chief Illiniwek.

One of the most important aspects of Students for Chief Illiniwek is the tremendous support our organization has received from the University student body. This support is evident in the fact that we are the largest registered student organization on the Urbana-Champaign campus with well over 4,000 members, our organization constitutes over 10 percent of the
student body. That number is continually growing every day as more and more students register their support for the symbol of the University, Chief Illiniwek.

In this past week alone, over 400 students showed their pride for Illinois and their belief that the Chief is a dignified, respectable and honored symbol by joining our organization and becoming involved in the cause to save the Chief. I believe that to be outstanding and a great showing of the tremendous support for the Chief that this dialogue session has inspired in most of the student body.

This dialogue session will set the course for the future of Chief Illiniwek as the symbol of the University. Students for Chief Illiniwek believe, regardless of the decision that will be made by the Board of Trustees, that this session should bring closure to the issue. A strong stance needs to be taken by the University, and the outcome of this dialogue should be the final say on the issue. And it should never come up for discussion again.

When considering this decision, we
believe the Board will make the correct decision. It would be unfortunate, if you, the Board chose to be influenced by those that oppose Chief Illiniwek and believe the symbol creates a hostile learning environment. With the tremendous support for Chief Illiniwek shown by current students, faculty, staff, and not to mention the tremendous backing from alumni and people across this great State of Illinois and the entire nation, it would be a shame to see an honored and respected symbol that is held in admiration by so many at this University to be removed due to comments and protests by a cause fought by so few, most of which do not attend this University, therefore lack a complete understanding of the symbol, its meaning and the situation surrounding it to begin with.

I want to stress to everybody here today that Students for Chief Illiniwek supports the Board of Trustees, respects their decisions and will continue to respect the integrity of the people that formulate University policy. I, along with all members of Students for Chief Illiniwek, and those people that respect and revere the
symbol, believe that the Board has handled this issue in the past with the best interests of the University at heart and I am confident that you will continue to use sound judgment and base this decision also on what is most beneficial for the University and its students.

On behalf of Students for Chief Illiniwek, Dawn Neisen and myself, I would like to thank the Board of Trustees for this opportunity to speak on the issue of Chief Illiniwek. I would like to once again commend the Board on its past actions concerning this matter and also remind you of the importance of your decision.

The conclusion you reach on this matter affects thousands of students, faculty and staff, and alumni that are an intricate part of the University and citizens of the State of Illinois, because this is the flagship school. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: That was brinkmanship on the time. If we can get Faith Smith and Gene Edwards ready on microphone two. Michael Haney. Bill Roberts ready.

MR. MICHAEL HANEY: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Michael Haney, I am the
executive director of the American Indian
Arbitration Institute. Yes. Thank you. I have
been asked to represent the 478 tribes in the
United States.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: I appreciate it. If
you just make this part of the record. It's very
distracting to have it held there. So if you will
just roll it up and make it part of the record.

MR. HANEY: Yes, sir, I will be glad to
give you copies of that.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: All right. Thank
you.

MR. HANEY: Show the audience what he is
objecting to there. Actually it's a list of
tribes, federally recognized tribes in the United
States, 478 of them, that are going on record and
saying that they want Chief Illiniwek to be
abolished. They think it's racist, it encourages
racial stereotyping.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Mr. Haney.

MR. HANEY: Thank you very much. We
will put that way. Your Honor, I would like to
introduce, before I begin my talk, a group of
Philadelphia tribal members that traveled all the
way from Philadelphia, Mississippi, all night long
to be here. They just came to say that they
support our efforts to abolish Native imagery and
protect Native culture everywhere. I really thank
them for coming. We have people from all over the
United States this morning, Your Honor, that have
come to join with us in this effort to protect the
future of our children.

I would like to make an announcement to
the press and perhaps to the Board of Trustees,
good morning to the Board. Is that I have heard
often about the Peoria tribe that you say that the
Illiniwek has its support in Oklahoma from the
Peoria tribe. Chief John Miles had made a video
approximately five or six years ago, saying he
didn't have an objection. He didn't see a lot of
the dances and some of the antics that went on.
And that's been used by the various Chiefs and the
other organizations that support racism here in
the University of Illinois, what they call
pro-Chief people.

I find that very amusing in the sense
that we are chief of the highest office that we
have within our culture just by the very fact they
are saying they are pro-Chief, they are pro-
Indians, in the fact that they are diametrically
opposed to actions of Native growth within this
institution.

But what I would like to announce to the
media is that last Wednesday, April 4 of year
2000, the Peoria tribe has joined with every other
tribe in America, make it unanimous, there is no
tribe in the United States that supports the
University of Illinois.  I would like to read
this.

The Peoria tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
request the University of Illinois to cease the
use of Chief Illiniwek as a mascot.

Whereas, the Peoria Tribe of Indians of
Oklahoma is a federally recognized tribe of
Indians;

Whereas, the Business Committee of the
Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma is authorized
to enact resolutions and act on behalf of the
Peoria tribe;

Whereas the Peoria tribe of Indians are
descendants of the Kaskaskia, Peoria, Piankeshaw
and Wea Tribes, a group of tribes known as
Illiniwek, or Illini or Illinois nations, whose members were removed from their homes and forced to move first to Missouri, then to Kansas and finally to the northeastern part of the Indian Territory now Oklahoma;

And whereas, the image portrayed by Chief Illiniwek does not accurately represent or honor the heritage of the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma and it is a degrading racial stereotype, degrading racial stereotype that reflects negatively on all American Indian people;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Peoria Tribe of Indians does not endorse nor sanction the characterization of Chief Illiniwek as a mascot for the University of Illinois, and be it finally resolved the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma request the leadership, Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois to recognize the demeaning nature of the characterization of Chief Illiniwek and cease the use of this mascot.

How about that? Your Honor, we have a message from the Chief. The General Secretary of the tribe said, "I find the Chief Illiniwek hurtful and I think is a stereotypical, demeaning
and dehumanizing."

The new chief of the Peoria Tribe says, "My personal opinion is that the Chief Illiniwek is a clown." Where did that former clown go? I mean former Chief Illiniwek. "My personal opinion is that Chief Illiniwek is a clown. I have never seen any Indian dance like that and I have been to quite a lot of Indian dances on this 50 years in this little planet. They want to call him Illiniwek, if he wants to look like an Illini," this is an Illini speaking now, "Then we need to take of all of his clothes except for an apron and we need to tatoo him from his head to his toes to make him historically correct and then we will see how many folks line up to be Chief Illiniwek."

All right?

I further would like to say, "I don't know what the origination or reason was for the University to create Chief Illiniwek. I don't think it was to honor us, because hell, they ran our butts out of Illinois." This is the Chief talking. All right?

What I am saying is that after you have run the people that inhabited, the people that
welcomed your ancestors to Illinois, teach you how
to exist, fed you, the first welfare line in
Illinois was your ancestors. We fed you. We
offered you our resources. And in return you
named Chief Illiniwek after us. In return, after
you hunted the Mesquaki, Chief Blackhawk, after
you hunted the Sauk and Fox people to their death
like animals, hunted them, killed man, woman and
children, then you named ice hockey teams after
them and you think we should be satisfied. I
wonder why they call them outside agitators. I am
from Oklahoma, but I wouldn't be from Oklahoma if
your ancestors hadn't run my people out of
Illinois.

I represent all those Native people that
are opposed to what is going on here. We want
this to cease. We will keep coming, we will keep
coming and we will keep coming until this is over.
Until you change that racist symbol, we will never
give up until the institution finally recognizes
that we are human people too, that we do have
feelings. And I guarantee you that the American
Indian movement, I guarantee that the Choctaw
nation, I guarantee you that the people of St.
Louis and the people of Chicago, will not cease until Chief Illiniwek is dead.

What I think is conspicuous is that there are no, that 95 percent of all faculty are not here, there are no religious organizations here. There are no politicians here to stand behind you. I think you are all jumping off this ship. My time is up. I want to thank you, Your Honor. I want to encourage the Board of Trustees to eliminate Chief Illiniwek and call off what I consider the longest undeclared war in history, that's the war against the American Indians here in our own homeland.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Mr. Haney, first I want to thank you and Miss Ostrovsky and Mr. Wakeland for assisting me in identifying the groups here. When you were in my office the other day, you indicated to me that there is some middle ground here. And I asked you if you would present that, present your proposal today.

Now, you didn't do it during your address, but I am going to give you extra time now to address the issue of where do you think a middle ground might be?
MR. HANEY: Sir, I accept the sentiments of the organization called the Red Roots, the Native organization led by Debbie Reese that talked about establishing a Native American studies department. I firmly support the establishment and endowment of a Native American studies chair. I also would like to encourage a scholarship fund be implemented to perhaps maybe fund, through the merchandising of the images that the University finds so successful marketing our image. We also, we have, we have children that would love to come to this University. We would identify those. I chair my education committee back home. I would love to send my gifted and talented people here.

You develop, we would offer our resources, offer the consultation of our educational officers to help develop a comprehensive education improvement program. We also would encourage the development of course work and the aggressive improvement of Native students. We would join with that if there was a dialogue we can talk, because we have never sat down and talked before, sir. We are standing
ready to put our minds and our resources together
to come to a conclusion that everyone wants here.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: As I understand you
and Miss Reese, then the Chief could stay, that
the -- if you got these other things that you
asked for, the Chief could stay and it would be
then through the educational process that over
time you would feel that the Chief would die as a
result of greater educational opportunities on the
campus, is that correct?

MR. HANEY: Yes, sir. We realize it's
been 500 years. We realize that the University is
a slow learner. But yes, we think they will come
to that conclusion.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Thank you very much.

MR. HANEY: I would like to finally, I
would like to ask, they talk about the headdress
that was given by Chief Fools Crow. Sir, I am a
Dakota, we would like to have that returned to our
nation. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Thank you. Hank
Hanneken.

MR. HANK HANNEKEN: Good morning. My
name is Hank Hanneken. I am the current president
of the University of Illinois Dad's Association.
And it is in that capacity that I make my comments
this morning. Please allow me to begin my remarks
by first commending the University of Illinois and
the Board of Trustees for their willingness and
commitment to dialogue on the Chief Illiniwek
issue. Open discussion and the ability to outline
one's position on any subject with varying
viewpoints is a tradition in our country and I
believe it is weaved in the fabric of operations
at this University.

For the record, it is the Dad's
Association's understanding that the following
process has been established to assist the Board
of Trustees in a decision or in determining the
direction the University will take on the future
of the Chief Illiniwek activities: A senior legal
professional has been retained to compile all the
testimony and submissions by the May 31 deadline.
It is our understanding that a three-part report
will be prepared consisting of an executive
summary, a distillation of these arguments into
specific points to which the Board of Trustees
will reply, and an appendix of all the transcripts
of this sessions and all other communications that
have and will be received by the 31st of May.

We also understand that all members of
the Board of Trustees will receive a copy of this
document by August 1, and that the Board will
reply at a special response session in early fall.

The Dad's Association appreciates being
invited to participate in this determination
process. And would also appreciate being notified
if there are any changes in the above process as
designed by the Board of Trustees.

The Dad's Association represents the
oldest organization of its kind in the United
States. For over 75 years this organization has
existed as a link between the parents and the
University of Illinois. This organization with
the Mom's Association represents 6,000 annual and
continuous members, many of these parents are also
graduates of this University. The years of
support and service to the students, parents and
University, has become a tradition with the Mom's
and Dad's Association. With this long history of
service, the Dad's Association reserves the right
to speak in relation to any and all activities and
traditions of the University of Illinois.

The Dad's Association wishes to speak in favor of keeping Chief Illiniwek as a revered and honored symbol of this University. The Dad's Association urges the preparer of the three-part document and the Board of Trustees to consider the intent at the time of Chief Illiniwek's inception. Consider the intent since that day or those days. Consider the intent in the present day ceremonies of Chief Illiniwek. And consider the intent of any future ceremonies or appearances of the Chief.

Today's question of what some people view as political correctness, possible racism, mocking, dehumanizing, oppressing, poking fun at and being disrespectful of the culture of the Native Americans can only be answered by evaluating the intent through the years of the Chief Illiniwek tradition. Was the intent of the founders and the Marching Illini band through the years to depict the Chief, his people and Native Americans in a demeaning fashion? A study through history clearly show that this was not the intent.

History legends and stories tell of a chief born out of friendship on a grassy field
before a University of Illinois football game. A
member of the Marching Illini dressed as a Native
American led the performance in a gesture of
friendship. Since that day, the Chief has always
been a symbol of honor, pride, strength, courage
and friendship that is the University of Illinois.

Over the years the University has
represented the Chief in only the most respectful
and dignified of ways. The term Fighting Illini
stands for the strength and pride, and in that
manner, can be anything but a disrespectful
activity toward the Illini people. Ninety percent
of the respondents to a Dad's Association poll are
in favor of retaining the tradition of Chief
Illiniwek. A similar Mom's Association poll
resulted in an 86 percent retention favorable.

It is the position of the Dad's
Association that the Board of Trustees must
determine the fate of this revered, honored and
enduring symbol based on intent. It is the
position of the Dad's Association that the Board
of Trustees have only to look at the intent to
reach a well known conclusion, a well known and
accepted conclusion by an overwhelming majority of
the persons ever associated with this University.

They, the Board of Trustees, will reach
the well known conclusion that this tradition is
the University of Illinois and all should be proud
to stand for and stand up to the minority that
would destroy such tradition. I thank the Board
of Trustees for this Opportunity to be a part of
this dialogue. And I hope that all parties will
abide by your final determinations. Thank you
very much.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Mr. Roberts.

MR. WILLIAM ROBERTS: Hello. I am here
speaking on behalf --

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Identify yourself.

MR. WILLIAM J. ROBERTS: William J. Roberts. I am here speaking on behalf of James
Yellow Banks. My name is William Roberts. I am
from the Potawatomi nation. I lived in Chicago
all my life, born and raised. And I don't have
really nothing prepared to say, but I am just
going to wing it, speak from the heart. When I
was young, when I was growing up, people in my
neighborhood, the Indian people, we are harassed
for being Indian. There was a lot of people when
they were young, they never wanted to tell anybody they were Indian.

And I think one of the reasons for that is because things like this, like this mascot prancing around a football field ridiculing our race. And there is a great deal of suicide, suicide rates is high, alcoholism is high, and that comes from depression. Depression comes from low self-esteem and that low self-esteem comes from seeing our identity prancing around a football field. It's just really hard looking at that sometimes. And you know, me being from Illinois, my people used to be all up and down these parts. I never remember, I don't remember seeing no headdress on anybody here. And he's supposed to be this member from this other tribe, but he doesn't resemble nothing from that, from them people. He's all on his own. And that's basically just what I have to say for now. I didn't really have nothing really more to say than that.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: You had plenty to say.

MRS. JEAN EDWARDS: My name is Jean
Edwards, I am chairman of Citizens for Chief Illiniwek. When this symbol of honor and dignity that we respected, the spirit of the University of Illinois started being challenged nine years ago, I was outraged. I kept hearing all about it over the radio, through the paper and I felt that somebody had to do something. Somebody had to speak up on behalf of the town people and the alumni who love the Chief and didn't want to lose him.

As I contemplated what I as an individual could do, I decided to form a group called Citizens for Chief Illiniwek. It would be the voice of those who were not connected to the University, the many who felt as I did, but didn't know what they could do. I thought if everyone wrote a letter to various Board of Trustee members telling them of their support, it would give them an idea of how many people backed the decision to retain the Chief.

We sent over 4,000 hand addressed letters, names culled from every source we could think of. The result was very positive. Each Board of Trustee member received about 1500
letters. Many of those people then wrote to me
and told me stories of their University experience
and how much the Chief meant to them. Businessmen
said they had a picture of Chief Illiniwek hanging
in their office and it reminded them of their
University years and the honor the symbol of the
Chief instilled in them. I do not consider myself
an activist. I am just an alumni who cares a
great deal about keeping this symbol.

And to me, it honors all Native American
Indians. Over the past years, both the University
athletic office and I have watched for anything
being sold in the market that is derogatory of the
Chief and seen to it that it is no longer for
sale. We will not tolerate caricatures.

Let's look at some of the problems we
face. The Chief is a white person acting as a
Native American Indian. There are others dancing
in pow-wows around the United States who are a
friend of the tribe or who live with them. It's
not unusual for that to happen. The dance is not
authentic. Well, why must it be? It is a form of
fancy dancing that has evolved over the years just
as an early Native American dance evolved from
person to person. It is not a religious or a war
related dance, but one to inspire confidence and
ability in a sporting event.

Our Chief does not run around the
football field and act crazy and allow
cheerleaders to touch or pick him up. He never
wears his regalia until he arrives at his
destination. When he dons his regalia, he does
not talk to people or sign autographs. He acts
with dignity at all times. He brings to us the
spirit of a proud Illinois tribe that is almost
all gone, giving us encouragement and strength and
pride.

I would like to quote from a letter of a
former Native American Indian football player.
"It was at the game during the Rose Bowl year, it
was half-time and we had played badly and were
losing. It was time for Coach Elliott's half-time
speech. He said we had more pride and spirit than
what we showed in the game. He said we were not
like other Big 10 teams. He said we weren't the
University of Wisconsin where they had Badgers or
animals that dug holes in the ground. He said we
were not the University of Iowa who were Hawkeyes
or birds who flew in the air. He said we are not like the team from Ohio, who are Buckeyes who are a bunch of nuts. He said we were the Fighting Illini, a team of fiercely proud men who deserved victory. As we rushed onto the field, Chief Illiniwek and the dance had already started. We went wild with the crowd too and won the game and went to the Rose Bowl."

At basketball games, the Chief is anticipated with excitement. Everyone stands up while he is performing. And as he leaves the floor after his dance, they are quiet in reverence and respect. How can 16,000 people not show you by doing this that they are thrilled to be part of that spirit that unifies them with the dignity of Chief Illiniwek?

Claims that the controversy is having an adverse effect on academic performance surely is only in the minds of the opposition, they are the ones that bring it up. Forbes Magazine rates the University of Illinois numerous’ departments in the top 10 in the entire country.

Two years ago Citizens for Chief Illiniwek circulated a petition for support of the
Chief and in two months we had collected 15,750 signatures. They came from 250 Illinois towns and almost every single state in the union. We felt that it was so important we wanted the Board of Trustees to know, so on October 16, 1998, we took the petitions to the Board meeting. This is a unique symbol among colleges and universities. Why can't we build on it and have greater education about Native American people instead of fighting about it all the time?

The intent is to honor and appreciate Native American Indians who lived on this land in the State of Illinois. It is not done with any derogatory intention. The group Chief Illiniwek Education Foundation was formed with the idea of learning more about Native American culture and way of life.

Two years ago we invited three men from the Hopi tribe from Second Mesa, Arizona, to visit with us. Because they didn't want to be involved with any type of demonstration, we were unable to advertise their being here and had only 65 people instead of a possible 350 at the meeting, where they talked about their family life. It was a
fine meeting and it was sad that more people couldn't have been there.

We must find an answer to this controversy. Our state is full of Indian names, of towns, rivers, natural areas, can we not help but perpetuate the past history of these people through the honor, pride and dignity that we show them? The enormous support of the Chief must count for something. I surely hope we can and I want to most earnestly ask the Board of Trustees to continue their support of Chief Illiniwek as our honored spiritual symbol of the University of Illinois. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Again, those people who have prepared remarks, if you please leave them for the court reporter.

MS. BROOKE ANDERSON: Good morning. My name is Brooke Anderson, I am a senior here at the University of Illinois and the Co-Coordinator of the Progressive Resource/Action Cooperative on whose behalf I speak to you today.

The PRC is a multi-issue, multi-tactical activist organization committed to peace with social justice. The PRC has been at the forefront
of the effort to eliminate Chief Illiniwek as the
University's mascot and logo since the inception
of the anti-Chief movement in 1989. And, with the
exception of the vote to retain the Chief in 1990,
the Board of Trustees has been silent on this
issue as we have talked, argued, pleaded and
screamed for a hearing.

The PRC has participated in the
international anti Columbus demonstrations in
1992, the infiltration of the Chief tryouts of
1994, the lawsuits filed with the Illinois
Department of Education in 1995, and the first
real Chief debate in 1996, as well as the airing
of a documentary "In Whose Honor" in 1997, and the
First National Conference on the Elimination of
Racist Mascots in 1998. And finally, the first
and second annual convention of the People's Board

But where has been the Board of
Trustees? At each of these pivotal moments in the
history of the anti-Chief movement, the Board has
ignored the voices of the anti-Chief movement and
the people of conscience who have sought dialogue
with them on the status of Chief Illiniwek. Now
that the Board has finally decided to listen, how
can we possibly hope to recreate in eight short
minutes the many and diverse voices of opposition
that we have heard throughout the course of the
past decade of our struggle. We simply cannot,
although we are obligated to try.

On behalf of the PRC, I speak before you
today to demand an immediate and unconditional end
to Chief Illiniwek, and an end to the tolerance
for racial hatred that he promotes and he
represents in our community and beyond. First,
you say the Chief is a tradition here and that he
is meant to honor. But honor is not an honor when
those whom it is purported to honor continually
ask for its discontinuation. As with slavery,
tradition is never a justification for the
perpetuation of injustice.

Second, Chief Illiniwek's half-time
performance is undeniably unauthentic. The Chief
tradition began as an extension of a 1926 Boy
Scout project. The drum beat is pure Hollywood
and the dance reinvented annually by the
individual student portraying the Chief each
particular year. The University administration
knows this. They know the Chief is unauthentic and has admitted such in intra-administration communications obtained by the PRC through the Freedom of Information Act.

Because they know this, the University has done everything they can to sanitize the Chief's image, including the discontinuation of Illini beer, Chief boxers and toilet paper and the Chief's presence in the homecoming parade. We count these changes as victories for the anti-Chief movement but understand that the Chief remains a distorted and derogative caricature of Native American peoples which destroys their universal and unalienable right to and dignity integrity, self-determination and cultural autonomy.

As such, the next logical step and indeed the only responsible one is to immediately retire Chief Illiniwek.

Third, even if the Chief were authentic, what business would the state's flagship University have parading Native American sacred cultural and spiritual elements around its football fields and basketball courts as half-time?
entertainment. No business at all.

Fourth, this injustice against Native Americans sets a dangerous precedent of acceptance for the racist and stereotypical representation of any and all other social groups targeted for oppression. If it's acceptable to mock and degrade Native American culture, why not also have the Tibetan Lama, a Jewish survivor of the Holocaust, or a Kosovar woman raped by a Serb entertain us at half-time? Or as one prominent Native American scholar suggests, how about adding Illinois Honkeys, Sambos, Drunken Papists or Jungle Bunnies to half-time entertainment. If these analogies sound ridiculous and dehumanizing, then so is your Chief.

Fifth, the maintenance of your Chief has repeatedly taken precedence over democracy, non-discrimination and multicultural education at this University. The University's mission statement reads, "The commitment of the University of Illinois to the most fundamental principles of academic freedom, equality of opportunity, and human dignity requires the decisions involving students and employees be based on individual
merit and be free from invidious discrimination in all its forms."

Yet, the Board has repeatedly violated their own commission statement in handling the Chief issue. As just one example among many, in 1998, the U of I Board of Trustees member Tom Lamont told Native American students who wrote in protesting the Chief that if you didn't like the Chief, perhaps he ought to find another school.

The Chief has become important, more important to the Board than the voices of Native students and more important than the voices of national Native organizations that have requested the Chief's removal.

Sixth, it is will of the University community and of people of conscience worldwide that the Chief cease to be the mascot of the University of Illinois. With a majority of student organizations representing African-American, Latino, Asian Pacific American, Southeast Asian students have all denounced the Chief, as well as religious organizations, congregations, clergy representing Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Catholic and Muslim peoples.
Further, faculty and staff at the U of I Departments of Anthropology, History, Sociology, Psychology, Education, Social Work and English, as well as the University's Counseling Center, School of Life Sciences and College of Medicine have all passed resolutions condemning Chief Illiniwek.

On a national level, we have found support from everywhere from such publications as Sports Illustrated, Chicago Sun Times, The Lakota Times and Indian Country Today, as well as from such organizations as the American Indian Movement, United Indian Nations, and Reverend Jackson's Rainbow Coalition, and from such individuals as the former chair of Amnesty International and our Big 10 opponents Wisconsin and Iowa.

On an international level, KOLA, a Native American human rights organization, has brought the issue to the attention of the international media, the European Parliament and the United Nations.

The Board simply cannot continue to ignore the diversity and magnitude of this local, national and international outcry against the
In conclusion, the racist tradition, inaccurate portrayal and inappropriate use of Chief Illiniwek, as well as the precedent it sets for discrimination against other historically oppressed groups, the violation of non-discrimination policies, and the defiance of the will of the community constitute indisputable reasons for the Board to immediately discontinue its use of Chief Illiniwek as the school's symbol and mascot. Official bodies such as the Board of Trustees have a moral and political obligation to speak out against racism and injustice wherever and however it manifests itself.

I challenge you in your decision to hold yourselves accountable to your own mission of standards and fairness. I also challenge you to initiate similar dialogues on the numerous other campus issues which you have so conveniently ignored. Talk to your Native American, Asian American, African-American and Latino students and faculty about better funding for existing cultural houses and studies programs, about the creation of new programs and about increased recruitment and
retention rates of students and faculty of color on campus.

Take immediate action to stop the severe shortage of child care facilities on campus. Stop pretending that rape whistles are enough to protect women on this campus from being sexually, and finally, negotiation with the GEO.

But regardless of the outcome of the dialogue process, we will continue organizing around this issue and continue to recruit new generations of activists to pick up the struggle and maybe one day the retirement of Chief Illiniwek and the induction of another symbol will represent a new era of cultural sensitivity and racial harmony on this campus. Please do the right thing. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: John Mamminga.

MR. JOHN MAMMINGA: Good morning, I do have some prepared remarks, but I would first off just like to make a few comments based on what I have seen so far this morning. Is Charlene still in the room here? I know we are looking for some common ground today. I think one thing that everybody in this room can agree with is that
Chief Illiniwek toilet paper is something that is shameful and embarrassing. I think we can all be glad that's gone out of existence.

Second of all, is Michael Haney still in the room? Michael is gone too also. Michael requested that the headdress be returned to the Dakota, we do have a letter here, I would be happy to share this, that that headdress that was presented by Fools Crow has been indeed returned to the family. And then finally --

MODERATOR GARIPPO: When was that done?

MR. MAMMINGA: This is 1991. And finally, I would like to welcome the people, was it Mississippi, that are here from Mississippi; is that right? Outside again. Also I would just express my disappointment that all the prominent leaders of apparently the anti-Chief movement are not here to fully listen to this discussion. But I would like to welcome -- the dialogue session is going on right now. But I would like to welcome and invite all the people that are here today from Mississippi --

MODERATOR GARIPPO: I think the remarks should be addressed to the Board.
MR. MAMMINGA: I would like to invite
the people that are here from Mississippi, I don't
believe many attended the game, I would like to on
behalf of Chief Illiniwek to share in our
tradition at a game with us next fall on behalf
the Educational Foundation. Now I will continue
with my prepared remarks.

When French explorers first journeyed
onto this great land that we now call Illinois,
you were befriended by a people who called
themselves Hileni or Illiniwek. And it is from
this first people of the land that our great state
is named.

Today, while no Indian nation resides in
Illinois, a journey throughout this land will
reveal numerous towns, rivers, counties and
historical places whose names bear honor and
tribute to the Indian people who lived, worked,
fought and celebrated in the land of Illinois.
From Lake Michigan and the Kaskaskia River to the
Cahokia Mounds and Starved Rock State Park, from
Kankakee and Iroquois Counties to the great cities
of Chicago, Peoria, the people of Illinois take
great pride in Illinois' vast Indian heritage.
And because of this Indian heritage, it is only meaningful and appropriate for the University of Illinois, the flagship academic institution of this great state, to be represented by the dignified symbolism of Chief Illiniwek. And no matter where you stand on this issue, nobody in this auditorium should doubt that the performance of Chief Illiniwek stirs feelings of pride, honor and loyalty in many of Illinois' 11 million people, many of whom, like myself, proudly refer to ourselves as Illini.

And yet, while I believe it is appropriate that the University be represented by the majestic symbolism of Chief Illiniwek, I also believe that it is appropriate for those who champion American Indian issues, for those who seek to bring about a greater understanding of a complex and diverse people, and for those who seek to fight against the injustices brought against the Indian people, it is appropriate that these people see Chief Illiniwek not as a barrier, but as an opportunity.

I believe this because I am one of those people. I have seen firsthand the poverty and
alcoholism that ravages many of the Indian
reservations. I have danced at pow-wows and
experienced the overwhelming beauty of Indian art,
dance and music. And I am proud to support many
social justice causes currently advocated by those
in the pro-Native movement.

And maybe it is just my optimistic
nature, but I believe with all my being that the
presence and visibility of Chief Illiniwek gives
all of us a unique opportunity to promote a
greater understanding of Indian people. And an
opportunity for all of us to work together in an
effort to implement positive changes.

For example, since its founding less
than two years ago, the Chief Illiniwek
Educational Foundation has sponsored student
service projects to Indian reservations, furnished
libraries with books by and about Native
Americans, and contributed material and monetary
gifts to various Native American charities. Our
members have participated in Indian celebrations
and met with tribal leaders.

These are but a few examples of how
Chief Illiniwek has inspired our students and
alums, people like Dawn Neisen, to learn more
about our state's Native heritage and positively
involve themselves in contemporary Native issues.

And this is just a beginning. Every day
we are contacted by new students and alums whose
profound appreciation for the symbolism of Chief
Illiniwek inspires them to get involved in efforts
to benefit both the campus and Native American
communities. Our educational foundation is
constantly expanding our philanthropic activities
and we will explore new endeavors such as
scholarship funds and workshops.

On the surface, many of the Foundation's
activities seem to have little to do with Chief
Illiniwek, but remember, none of it would be
possible without the inspiration offered by Chief
Illiniwek. Chief Illiniwek is the impetus, the
reason for questions like why is the Chief a
symbol of our University? What is the state's
Native heritage? And perhaps most importantly,
what can I do to contribute to today's Native
community?

That is the value of Chief Illiniwek at
the University of Illinois. By evoking such
questions and desires, the Chief's preferences and
visibility has allowed our Foundation to
positively harness the enthusiasm of our students
and alums.

Unfortunately, I believe that many of us
who champion Indian causes are misguided in our
efforts if we believe that the way to further the
Indian cause on this campus is to do so on the
destruction of a tradition that is so revered by
countless thousands of people. I am perplexed by
the notion that this sought-after destruction of
this tradition could somehow bring about a greater
good.

If there is one thing that I have
learned from our personal interaction with Indian
people is that these people are loving people and
a people who hold tradition in the highest regard.
I cannot, I do not and I will not believe that the
majority of Indian people would want to destroy,
family's, my Illini family's revered tradition.

So today, I challenge those of you who
champion Indian causes, I challenge you to not
fight and antagonize the hundreds of thousands of
those who love and revere this tradition, but to
work with us. To those of you who revere this
great symbol, I challenge you to reach out to
those of us who support the Indian cause to
welcome us and to support us in our efforts.

In conclusion, the majestic symbolism of
Chief Illiniwek at this world class institution
presents all of us here with an extraordinary
unique opportunity. Will we destroy this
tradition and squander the opportunity? Or
instead will we build on it and harness its full
potential. I believe that we should work together
to build on this tradition. If we do, I sincerely
believe that we can and we will accomplish the
extraordinary. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: The next speaker
will be Christine Redcloud and then we will take a
15 minute break.

MS. CHRISTINE REDCLOUD:

Animikik-quadoo-e-quay sa da ijinikas. Nin
anishinabe e-quay. My name is Christine Redcloud,
I am of the Ojibway Nation and I am here today on
behalf of the American Indian Center of Chicago.
The Indian Relocation Act of the 1950s,
along with the federal policy of selective
termination of tribal status, was a concerted attempt to break up the reservation system. Implementation of the Relocation program sent thousands of Native Americans to the city to face difficult challenges in an unfamiliar environment.

In response to these needs of the new Chicago community, the American Indian Center was formed and has been operating continuously since 1953. It is the oldest urban Indian Center in the country.

I am an enrolled member of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, I say that so there is no doubt that I am an American Indian. My family came to Chicago on the relocation program and I was raised in Chicago. I currently serve on the Board of Directors of the American Indian Center. And I say that so there is no doubt that I represent the Chicago American Indian Center, its Board of Directors, its staff and its membership.

Our message is simple: We are not honored by Chief Illiniwek. And we believe he should be retired as the symbol of the University. One of the most common arguments for having and keeping Chief Illiniwek is that he is honoring
Native people. On behalf of the American Indian Center of Chicago, I am here to say that we are not -- that you are not honoring us.

You say that you are doing this out of respect for Indian people. Well, it appears that you do not respect us enough to listen to us. How many times in how many ways and for how long do we have to say that we are not honored by Chief Illiniwek?

You say you want to honor us, how about honoring our feelings. There are generations of us here today from elders to young people to tell you that we are indeed offended by Chief Illiniwek.

A second purpose as stated on the Chief Illiniwek web site for having and keeping Chief Illiniwek is that most knowledge of Native culture will be lost. Somehow you believe that you are keeping Native culture alive by dressing up and pretending to be an Indian, not an Illini, but your concept of what an Indian should look like. He has exaggerated the dance and the face paint and is not dressed appropriately for those people who you claim to be honoring. He is dressed in
the plain style, reminiscent of all the old western movies, that showed tepees set up down in the southwest. It is inaccurate.

Does this institution of higher education really want to be known for teaching inaccuracies, mocking other cultures and that racism is acceptable? Chief Illiniwek is not keeping Native culture alive, he is keeping a stereotype alive.

Part of the mission statement of the American Indian Center reads, "To create bonds of understanding and communication between Indians and nonIndians in this city."

The American Indian Center has been working with the University of Illinois at Chicago for the last three years to host our annual pow-wow at their facility. UIC, by the way, changed their sports name to the Flames. We value this relationship because we are sharing our culture our way.

We also have good working relationships with the College of Lake County, Joliet Junior College and the College of Du Page, because they too are understanding and respectful of the
traditions that we hold dear.

Last year we began a cultural tour program for schools and other groups throughout Chicago and the suburbs to come to the Indian Center and learn about traditional and contemporary Native America. Over 100 groups with school age children have visited the Center so far. One school teacher remarked that this tour should be mandatory for all third graders.

In fact, today, April 14, as this hearing is going on, the American Indian Center is housing 150 Chicago area cointegrating school teachers who want to learn about Native people from Native people.

It will take time before these school age children attend this University, when they get here, will we be having this same argument? I believe the answer is yes. As long as Chief Illiniwek is here.

Once again, the message from the American Indian Center of Chicago is simple: We are not honored by Chief Illiniwek and we believe he should be retired as a symbol of the University. Thank you.
MODERATOR GARIPPO: We will now take a 15 minute break.

(A break was taken, and the intake session continued as follows:)

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Please take your seats.

MR. ENGELBRECHT: Thank you for coming, for those of you who have come in late, my name is Bill Engelbrecht, Chairman of the Board of Trustees. All the Board here at 8:00 this morning were introduced, but through some travel problems I would like to introduce one additional trustee who has just come to join us, over on my far left Arun Reddy, Trustee, University of Illinois at Chicago and I might add just recently, elected for his second term just as of yesterday.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: At microphone No. 2, if we could have Anthony Enright.

MR. ANTHONY ENRIGHT: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Anthony Enright, on behalf of the College Republicans at the University of Illinois, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to speak to you today in support of your retaining Chief Illiniwek as an honored
symbol of the University.

I would like to begin today by reading a letter to the Board of Trustees from State Representative Rick Winkle, dated April 12, 2000.

"To the University of Illinois Board of Trustees:

I respectfully draw your attention to the following statute concerning Chief Illiniwek, which passed both Houses of the Illinois General Assembly and Governor Jim Edgar signed it into law.

"Chief Illiniwek: Consistent with a longstanding, proud tradition, the General Assembly hereby declares that Chief Illiniwek is and may remain the honored symbol of a great University, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

"As the sponsor of the legislation that created this law and an alumnus of the University, I once again declare my support for the symbol of Chief Illiniwek. I encourage you to remain steadfast and reaffirm that Chief Illiniwek shall remain the honored symbol of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and not abdicate your responsibility to make the decision on the issue."
"Thank you for the opportunity to be heard and for your consideration of all points of view, sincerely, Richard J. Winkle, Junior, State Representative."

The College Republicans are an organization of more than 500 individuals dedicated to the involvement of students in the policy making process at the national, state and local level. We respect and support the fact that the Board of Trustees shall make any decision regarding Chief Illiniwek, and we trust that the Board will do what it is best for the University.

In addition to the statement from Representative Winkle, we have also received statements from the offices of Congressman Tom Ewing and State Representative Tim Johnson acknowledging their support for Chief Illiniwek and stressing the importance of the Board's decision.

Because the decision on this matter will affect people across the nation, we feel that it is very important that we express our sentiments on the issue. For 74 years, Chief Illiniwek has personified the achievements and challenges known
to the University, as well as the honor, pride and
dignity shared by the alumni, students, staff and
faculty members.

While other universities represent
themselves with animals that mean very little off
the footfall field, we choose to represent the
University of Illinois with a symbol that commands
genuine respect and promotes a sense of pride, not
just in our athletic achievements, but in all that
we have accomplished and will accomplish in the
future.

The fact that we are represented by a
symbol of such great honor as Chief Illiniwek
reflects the higher standard to which we hold
ourselves at the University of Illinois, and shows
we will not settle for anything less than the very
best.

The enthusiasm expressed by the
participants in today's intake session reflects
the strength of the passion that Chief Illiniwek
instills in the hearts of many men and women
associated with the University of Illinois. It is
this passion that motivates our professors to
provide the best education available. It is this
passion that motivates our athletic teams to strive to be the very best. It is this passion that motivates our alumni to use their Illini educations to achieve what was before thought impossible and to invest in the University to provide a better future for tomorrow's Illini.

Finally, it is this passion that reminds U of I students that we can achieve anything. Chief Illiniwek demonstrates that the University of Illinois sets itself apart from other institutions, that the achievements of the U of I are Illini achievements, made possible by a motivation and pride unmatched anywhere else.

Some say it is time to bring this era of great accomplishment, success and pride to a close by retiring Chief Illiniwek. To do so is to say that the Illini have accomplished all that they can and that we should no longer represent ourselves with a symbol that reflects such a high standard, that it is time that we settle for less.

Holding ourselves to a high standard requires us to face strong challenges. Any expression or symbol will always be subject to scrutiny and will always have opponents. It is
only natural that a symbol so strong as Chief Illiniwek has opponents who present a strong challenge.

But ladies and gentlemen, it is facing challenges such as this that has allowed the University and its alumni, students, staff and faculty members to achieve the great successes that Chief Illiniwek symbolizes. To retire Chief Illiniwek simply because his retention requires that we overcome obstacles is to send the message that we should not strive for greatness as we are not willing to face the challenges that we will meet in doing so; to retire Chief Illiniwek is to say that we will settle for mediocrity and the University of Illinois' strive for greatness is over.

We do not claim that the grievances of those who oppose the retention of Chief Illiniwek should not be addressed. On the contrary, the issues that they raise are of significant importance. Racial stereotypes do indeed dilute the recognition of individual merits and diminish the strength of individual choices and actions. Such stereotypes are a product of ignorance and
should be combatted with education.

Chief Illiniwek is a fictional character, a personification of the values important to the University of Illinois. He does not represent the views or beliefs of any individual or race of people. Rather, he represents the honor, dignity, pride, achievement, strength and courage of the alumni, students, staff and faculty members of the University of Illinois.

Chief Illiniwek has long been a symbol to which we look and remember that the accomplishments that this University has facilitated have been truly great. He reminds us that we hold ourselves to standards far above others in a way that no other symbol could. To retire Chief Illiniwek would be to end this era of great pride and respect for the University. No longer would students be able to say I am an Illini and an Illini can achieve anything. Without this, they would have to say, the Illini achieved greatness but they were from a different era at the University of Illinois. They held themselves to a higher standard.
The College Republicans at the University of Illinois believe that it is not time for this era to come to an end. We are dedicated and proud Illini and we want our opportunity to add to the achievements of the past and to take them to new levels. The Illini have experienced a history of greatness, but with all that we have accomplished, we have still only just begin.

Please allow Chief Illiniwek to remain the honored symbol of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and allow us to continue to achieve and succeed in his honor.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Will you please state your name.

MS. FAITH SMITH: Good morning I am Faith Smith, I am an enrolled member of the Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe Tribe in northern Wisconsin, I am also a resident of Chicago, and the president of NAES College, which stands for Native American Educational Services College.

NAES is a four year liberal arts college which serves the higher education needs of four Native communities, two in urban areas and two reservation communities. The central office and
The college was established 25 years ago in part to meet higher educational needs of Native people who were poorly served by conventional institutions.

At NAES, the basis of learning and instruction comes from the intellectual traditions and knowledge of Native communities, so that the link between student learning and the needs of the community are closely linked.

In our 25 years since NAES was started, we have been witness to tremendous change within Native communities, tribal and urban. Communities which once had no economic base which they could control, now have developed economies which contribute to the quality of life of tribal members, as well as supporting the economy in the regions where they are located.

Twenty-five years ago there were few people working at the community level with college degrees. Today community agencies and institutions commonly require college degrees and are able to recruit and hire qualified Native people to be a part of the work force.

When NAES was created, there were very
serious concerns about the continuity of Native languages and the spiritual and social lives of our communities suffered from 200 years of negative pressure from outside influences, including and particularly federal policy.

Today not only does NAES offer and require tribal language as a part of our graduation requirements, language retention programs and programs which strengthen the cultural and spiritual life of our communities, are cornerstones of community life.

These changes and many more have put Native communities in a position to radically change the poor economic and social conditions which have limited our development in the past.

An area where we have had very limited support and change actually is in influencing many of the institutions of larger society to educate themselves about Native issues and to integrate this knowledge into their ongoing work. This ignorance exists at the national, state and local levels.

Every time a new Congress is elected at the national level, national Native advocacy
organizations like the National Congress of American Indians, tribes, urban communities and other private organizations, must start anew to engage in a basic education with them about Native concerns and issues, so that we are not excluded as policy decisions are made.

Among higher education institutions, that same ignorance exists. For them there is no excuse. Like the University of Illinois, they have existed for many years and have made a public commitment to treat all of its students equitably, with respect, and in recognition of the diverse needs which new populations bring to their institutions.

The insistence of the University of Illinois to maintain the Chief Illiniwek symbol, a caricature of a Native American, seriously damages its relationship with Native students enrolled here and with the larger Native American community which seeks the same kind of educational resources that are available to other students.

As an accredited institution, the University must follow the principles adopted by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
of the North Central Association of Colleges and
Schools. According to the Commission's 1991
statement, this is from North Central, statement
on access, equity and diversity, "Regardless of
specific institutional practices, the Commission
expects an institution to create and maintain a
teaching and learning environment that supports
sensitivity to diverse individuals and groups.
"Further, the Commission expects an
affiliated institution to teach students and
faculty alike to see in proper perspective the
differences that separate and the commonalities
that bind all people and cultures."

For Native students and faculty at the
University of Illinois, the continued use of Chief
Illiniwek as a symbol of the institution creates
an atmosphere in which Native and other students
learn that sensitivity does not apply to Native
Americans, that our sacred symbols can be
appropriated without regard for Native feelings or
for our cultures, and that the only place for
Native consciousness within the University setting
is as a public spectacle that no Native people can
identify with.
According to the University's own strategic plan for the future, the University stated that, the University of Illinois, first we invest in people, the people who constitute our campus community at all levels represent an increasingly diverse population. Because we can see no visible investment in creating a positive learning environment for Native students, such as increasing the Native student population, offering a curriculum in which Native issues are an integral part throughout the disciplines of social science, increasing Native personnel, including faculty or working with the Native American community to understand the issues which all students should learn about Native Americans, we must assume that the framework for the future as defined by the University of Illinois does not include Native American.

The University issued the following statement in 1991, "Resolving, one, to eradicate prohibited and invidious discrimination in all its forms; and two, to foster programs within the law which will ameliorate or eliminate where possible the effects of historical discrimination."
In light of this statement, the Board must consider and respond to the way in which it denies Native American students the opportunity to fully participate in a nondiscriminatory learning environment by maintaining a symbol that was created 75 years ago, adopted in an era when it was felt that Native Americans were disappearing, when Native Americans tribes and community clearly had not disappeared.

Our strength today comes from resilience in the face of tremendous pressure to adopt majority culture and values and it comes from the strength and the intellectual capacity of our leaders to chart a course of survival which necessitates our speaking against the improper use of sacred symbols.

In the past, some of the institutions who have made these changes at high schools and other universities have also done it in the face of a lot of opposition from inside their institutions. But they have made the courageous decision to do so.

In the North Central report, three major points were made in conclusions about keeping the
Chief as a symbol. One is the use of the Chief as an educational issue, two, the controversy surrounding the Chief will not go away, and three, the institution appears not to be addressing the issue in a manner consistent with the policies and principles of its board, and its strategic plan.

The hearings today represent a small step on the University's part in taking this issue seriously. And in part this issue exists, with the whole of the State of Illinois --

M.G.: Your time is up.

Thank you. Roger Huddleston is up next and then Rosalyn LaPier on microphone No. 2 is to be ready.

You may proceed.

M.R.H.: Good morning. My name is Roger Huddleston and I am with the Chief Illiniwek Support Fund. The Illini Support Fund is managed and maintained by the University of Illinois Foundation and has been set aside specifically to go ahead and provide some of the funds to educate students Chief in Native American understanding.

I thank you for the opportunity to address the Board this morning.
In the fall of 1959, my dad took me to my very first Illinois football game. And that began a wonderful love affair with the University of Illinois. The game was against Army and I marveled at all the wonderful pageantry and tradition. The most memorable event of that day was at half-time when the crowd that I was a part of rose to their feet and welcomed Chief Illiniwek. Everyone greeted this honored symbol with respect.

The dignity displayed by John Forsyth, the Chief Illiniwek that year, caused a stirring in my soul that I would understand more and more in the years to come. To me, the Chief was never a specific person, but a personification of dignity, loyalty, tradition and inspiration that I have come to respect and cherish as I have grown older.

As a 12-year-old boy, my relationship with the University of Illinois and Chief Illiniwek did not have much substance. Other than something special that I sensed was good. I was just a boy. But the Chief was someone to be revered, because when he appeared, everything
seemed to stop. No one appeared to speak and the

crowd stood in respect.

He was different than school mascots,
because he wasn't one. He wasn't a Chief Wahoo
from the Cleveland Indians, he wasn't wild and
uncivilized, he wasn't a cartoon that encouraged
us to pretend we had tomahawks like Ted Turner's
Atlanta Braves. He was a personification of a
common, noble heritage. He was the symbol of an
unifying spirit that could cause a football crowd
of 80,000 individuals to become one spirit for a
few moments.

He did not speak. He had no opinions,
he was not a cheerleader, he was someone you never
thought to ask for an autograph. He never
appeared at grocery store openings, he didn't hold
small children while parents shook his hand. He
was and is the Chief. He is respected for not who
he is as the student who portrays him, or as a
historical individual. Chief Illiniwek is each
person's opportunity to affirm what is good about
the human race. The Chief is a measure of
excellence of what each of us should be if we
strive for dignity.
The Chief speaks volumes when it comes to pride of self, although he never says a word. The Chief is an unifying factor for a melting pot of people who find common bonds in what is good. The Chief encourages no matter what the score is, reminding all that our worth as humans is not determined by the winning or losing of an athletic contest and the Chief has the charismatic dignity to be afforded full attention when he appears.

But, if the Chief is good, why do other good people object to him? Why do Native Americans, who have sincere reasons to question every motive behind every portrayal of their ancestors, genuinely object? Why is the student called Chief Illiniwek wearing Sioux clothing and dancing a dance that is not historically correct?

If my position and my advocacy are valid, must I not only listen with my heart but with my head and soul to justify my passion for the Chief. To lay one's understanding down and seek truth is to become vulnerable, but a sincere effort to attain intellectual honesty and integrity demands this surrender.

The Chief's own character traits that I
revered for many years required the submission of
myself to ask questions that would lay my
perceptions open to change. I listened to others:
Opinion and conviction, emotion and passion,
legend and fact, bias and resolve, political
correctness and moral honesty. My personal
mission was to intellectually discover what was
and what wasn’t.

I was to take two steps back and look
with my imperfect heart for the perfect answer. I
studied what I could. I read editorials, essays
and papers. History provided more than I expected
as I learned about a vast confederation of
Algonquin people made up of many tribes. I
learned that these Illini that the French called
Illinois were a society and a culture of
subsoceties and subcultures, joined together by a
geographical area and common interest while
maintaining specific tribal difference.

I learned that the confederation came
together and in spite of their diversity were led
by a single leader, a Chief. We today are a
people defined by a geographic area we call
Illinois. We are a society wonderfully blessed by
a diversity of subsocieties and subcultures. We are a community that celebrates things right and condemns things wrong. What better symbol to represent all that we cherish and hope for in this world than a human being that we all treasure and hold as a measure of character and excellence.

What better symbol has historical significance and also shares identify with our whole state of Illinois. What better symbol of dignity, loyalty, tradition and inspiration can represent all of mankind in a sinful world that is still populated by people who without exception fall short of perfection.

It is to these ideals that I reaffirm my commitment to the Chief. It is to these character qualities that I dedicate this poem, "The Chief" that I humbly share with you.

Centuries back a noble spirit was born, honored champion greeting each prairie morn. Inspiring his people a legend bound, excellence was the standard to be found. Faithful to time his purpose would not wane, integrity and honor are his name. Love of his tribe, devotion to his own, loyal to all who call Illinois home. In
victory or the darkest of defeat, never wavering, leadership complete. Inherited tradition, year to year, warrior of great esteem who is held dear. Elect for all time, true and worthy one, kindred spirit for all in years to come." Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPOPO: Miss LaPier.

MS. ROSALYN LaPIER: Hello, my name is Rosalyn LaPier and I am the vice chairperson for the city of Evanston Human Relations Commission. The city of Evanston's Human Relations Commission is a nine member citizen body appointed by the mayor with the consent of city council. The purpose of the Commission is to foster, encourage and stimulate the improvement of human relations among and between citizens of all races, colors, creeds, national origins and economic and educational levels, so as to provide all individuals with an equal opportunity to grow, participate and share to the best of their ability in our economic, educational, political, social and judicial systems.

Our responsibilities include, but are not limited to, administering and enforcing the Fair Housing Ordinance, processing charges of
discrimination and conducting investigations;
providing mediation services through our
alternative dispute resolution program; addressing
and investigating activities such as hate crimes;
and facilitating and participating in a variety of
activities to include community wide dialogues on
race relations, civility, violence prevention,
community safety and accessibility.

On March 22, 2000, the City of Evanston
Human Relations Commission unanimously approved a
letter of support in retiring the University of
Illinois' symbol, Chief Illiniwek. I will read
that letter as well as the names of the
Commissioners and the Executive Director at the
end of this opening statement.

As a citizen of Illinois, I believe in
the critical role that public education plays in
developing community and cultivating citizenship
in a democratic society. Creating community
begins in the classroom. For most citizens, being
a classmate constitutes their first active
participation outside of their family in the
ongoing social construction of community.

Beginning in kindergarten, we learn the
complex concepts of community, such as learning to respect and have empathy for others, and learning to work with those different from ourselves. In kindergarten, we accomplish this by learning basic skills such as not calling people names, sharing with others and thinking about how we would feel in another person's situation. In these simple ways, a school teaches a child the expectations that the community has of its citizens.

These lessons learned and the vision of community that a school exemplifies can influence for life a student's ideas and expectations about fairness, justice, equity and public participation and their role as a citizen.

The use of Chief Illiniwek as the symbol of the University of Illinois does much harm in not teaching its students, its citizens the important values of community. We ask a great deal of students when they enter the University. We ask them to leave the familiar environment of home, to encounter peers and adults who may look, act, speak and think differently from themselves and their families and to fit in successfully with these strangers as learners, colleagues and
friends.

Yet, when students enter the University of Illinois, they learn that the University officially sanctions and endorses a mascot, a symbol capitalizing on people who are different from themselves. Unfortunately, students learn that one of the first lessons they had learned in kindergarten of not calling people names is acceptable conduct, even when it is offensive to a large number of people.

Names define who we are. For Native people who have a tragic history, naming is especially important. Names can define authority, status and value, or they can be used to denigrate and dehumanize. When used in conjunction with mascots or symbols such as Chief Illiniwek, they relegate Native people to anachronistic roles in American cultural milieu; Native voices are not only not heard, they are denied. The inability to hear the voices of others creates an atmosphere where stereotyping, bias and prejudice can develop and occur.

But if bias is a perspective learned from many sources and is extremely resistant to
change, what can an institution reasonably be expected to do?

First, institutions of higher education must be models of acceptance of diversity and of intolerance of prejudice.

Second, institutions of higher education must teach students how to think critically and develop the capacity to thrive in a diverse world. Learning to be a citizen in a diverse community means learning to understand how actions impact the greater community. It means learning how to accept other people's understandings of situations that impact them, even if the same exact situation does not impact others in the same manner.

What is the lesson in diversity that the University of Illinois wishes to impart to the state's future leaders?

The following letter by the City of Evanston's Human Relation Commission supports the retiring of Chief Illiniwek.

"Dear Mr. Engelbrecht, we are writing to support the retiring of the University of Illinois' Chief Illiniwek. The purpose of the City of Evanston's Human Relations Commission is
to foster, encourage and stimulate the improvement of human relations. As such, we resolve that the dishonorable symbol used by the University of Illinois needs to be exchanged for a symbol that will be both representative and inclusive of all groups in Illinois, or at the very least, not demeaning to any.

"We believe that an Indian mascot such as Chief Illiniwek is an anachronistic symbol. We believe it to be insulting and stereotyping of actual Native peoples. It is unethical and immoral for a public institution to appropriate another group's cultural history and symbols.

"Furthermore, we believe that Indian mascots develop and perpetuate racist perceptions of Native Americans, especially when mascots are used in sports events where students may dress like Indians and misuse subjects and/or symbols such as feathers, headdresses and drums that may have religious and cultural significance to contemporary Native groups.

"We believe the University of Illinois does actual harm to Native American citizens in the State of Illinois.
"Thirty years ago, both Dartmouth College and Stanford University provided leadership to other institutions of higher education by changing their Indian logos and mascots. Now is the time for the University of Illinois to provide leadership for the next millennium and transform its image. We urge you to retire the Chief. Sincerely, Hollis Settles, Jr., Chairman, Evanston Human Relations Commission, Nancy Bailey, David Bradford, Michael Cervantes, Mavis Hagemann, Leo Kirwan, Lloyd McBell, Hallie Rosen and Paula A. Haynes, Executive Director." Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Brian Silverman.

MR. BRIAN SILVERMAN: Good morning, my name is Brian Silverman, I live in Champaign, I am an attorney who practices law here. There are those who say I couldn't say hello in four minutes. I think, Judge, we ought to get one of those for closing article argument. I think it's really neat.

North Central Association for Accreditation came here with the mission of accrediting the University and its educational
mission. They deviated from what their role was
and went off on a tangent, were given some very
one-sided perspectives on the Chief. And instead
of just talking about the accreditation of the
University, they spent a good portion of their
report talking about the Chief and suggesting, and
the Board of Trustees took their suggestion, that
the University create a dialogue.

The problem with the term dialogue is
that it implies that there is give and take on
both sides. The term dialogue implies that people
will be willing to compromise, that if you start
out with one group at point A and the other group
at point Z, that somewhere along the line you are
going to meet at point M.

That isn't what is happening in this
debate. The debate is one-sided and one side will
not compromise. I have been at forums, and I have
argued with the anti-Chief people on several
occasions, publicly and privately. And every time
I have asked them if there is any compromise, any
compromise whatsoever that they would agree to
that would allow the University to keep the Chief
as its honored symbol, the answer is always no.
So there is no compromise, there is no point to a dialogue, because one side is not willing to give at all. The University needs to, in my opinion, put this behind us. We need to get on with the business of teaching. We need to get on with the business of the University. We need to get on with the University of what this is all about.

The University has to, the Board of Trustees that is, has to make a decision. They have to base that decision on whatever they want to base it on, base it on the thoughts of alumni, students, faculty, and friends of the University. Quite frankly a lot of people who come to this University and enjoy the Chief never went to school here and are not part of this University other than they are a friend of the University.

The Board of Trustees has to once and for all distill all of this information, decide whether the Chief is, as I believe, a revered and honored symbol, or whether as the opponents say the Chief is something that needs to be retired.

The Board of Trustees has to make a decision in my opinion, stick to that decision and
just say enough is enough, let's put this behind us and let's get on with things once and for all. I believe that the purpose of a dialogue is not being served here today. Because one of the sides is not willing to change at all. The pro-Chief people have long had a history of willing to say, we will make it more authentic, we will do whatever you think is correct so that the Chief is not demeaning. The opponents of the Chief will have none of it.

So I say to you, don't waste any more time, don't waste any more effort and certainly don't waste any more money on a dialogue that is meaningless and useless and is not going to accomplish a thing. Let's get this behind us and get on with the mission of the University. Thank you for your time.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Well, Mr. Silverman, you weren't here earlier today when actually two groups did propose some sort of compromise. So you know, maybe the dialogue might prove fruitful in that regard.

MR. SILVERMAN: If they are willing to compromise, I will glad to be proven wrong.
MR. R.J. SMITH:  Hello, my friends.  All of you in this room, my name is R.J. Smith.  I am Ojibway and Assiniboine.  I was born and raised in Chicago.  I am the proud director of the Urban Natives of Chicago Youth Council, this is a group of young Native Americans all who have grown up in Chicago who have faced the hardships of growing up in this city life away from their culture and away from their people, most of them.

This group came together about five years ago to promote Native American youth leadership and youth activism, within this five years, they have done many things for their community and in turn, their community has done many things for them.  Their community has told them that they have pride in their youth, that their youth are valid people, that they are part of the community and that they count.  And this group does many good things for their community, not only the Native community, but non-Native people as well.

In this five years, they have set up a Native American dance troop and a drum group, all
on their own doing. This is Native American youth trying to find out their own culture. And they have gone to the right people. They have gone to those people who know about their culture, those who possess that knowledge. They have gone to their elders and their families and they have asked for the permission to perform these dances and to sing these songs. I am not going to take up too much more time, I am going to turn this over to our youth representative, Miss Vanessa Casillas.

MS. VANESSA CASILLAS: I am Vanessa Casillas. I am a 19 year old full-time college student attending Truman College in Chicago. I am also the co-president of Urban Natives of Chicago Youth Council. Our purpose in coming here today is to influence the council and judge that the dehumanization placed on Native Americans on the Native American race by the appearance by Chief Illiniwek mascot has no place in society today, let alone a publicly funded university. Mascots playing dress up and want-a-be Indian are sadly sometimes the only representation other cultures see of us. It's stereotypes like
Chief Illiniwek that keep Native Americans from being respected at schools and work, oppressing Native Americans from reaching their full potential.

I have always been taught that my community, by my community that adults should be respected for the wisdom they carry. However, what I have witnessed by the supporters of Chief Illiniwek and the actions of the University sicken me. It sickens me that adults who will openly display such horribly racist views with such enthusiasm. Keeping Chief Illiniwek alive says to me that dominant society is actively trying to hang on to past decades when racist attitudes and slurs were commonplace.

In the past, racial slurs such as black Sambo and Frito Bandito have been eliminated by efforts of activists. Why society still accepts racial stereotypes and the degradation of the Native American race baffles me. When I see mascots being used to represent a race, it tells me that Native Americans are seen as a nonexistent race, our culture open to be taken up as a hobby.

It tells me that our feelings, worries and
cultures are not important and can be disregarded to suit dominant society.

Chief Illiniwek does nothing to help our traditions. Keeping Native American traditions alive is the sole responsibility of Native Americans. Chief Illiniwek holds no role in serving our culture. Instead, he causes misconceptions. Like the misconception that the Illiniwek people wore headdresses belonging to a Sioux, which does nothing to the Native American race. What he does accomplish is taking the culture of pride and turning it repulsive.

If what the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign truly wants to do is honor Native Americans, you can give us the rights of any other race, an equal opportunity to thrive. Get rid of Chief Illiniwek. To honor Native Americans, you can develop a Native American studies problem here at UIUC. Putting your educational resources to work.

If you truly want to honor us, then you will listen to us and treat these words with all seriousness, get rid of Chief Illiniwek.

MS. BLACKER: My name is Jayne Waupanook
Blacker and I am a full-time student at the University of Illinois at Chicago. I am from the Menominee and Potawatomi tribes.

And the only reason I did not even apply to this University is because of the Chief Illiniwek mascot. I did not even consider UIUC as an option. The Chief Illiniwek mascot puts up an unwelcome sign to me. Excuse me. The only way I knew I could succeed at this school is if I hid my Native American identity and that is out of the question. I am proud of the fact that I am a traditional dancer, I know where my grandparents came from, I am proud of that.

I have tried to not be offended or hurt by the mockery the Chief Illiniwek mascot makes of my culture and of all Indian nations, but it is impossible. I have tried to not be offended by people who mock my culture in the same exact fashion that the Chief Illiniwek dances. I have tried to not get hurt by the lack of respect that Native American communities get because of Chief Illiniwek.

Chief Illiniwek mascot degrades, excuse me, I'm sorry, Native Americans as human beings.
Chief Illiniwek mascot perpetuates ignorance of my Native American culture. The Chief Illiniwek mascot breeds low self-esteem in Native American youth. I do not understand why Native American -- why Native Americans are supposed to be honored by some guy dancing at a half-time show. If you can call that dancing.

Who exactly is supposed to be honored by a white guy wearing Lakota clothing and labeled as the Chief of the Illini? Honoring a person, a tribe or a whole race of people means respecting them as human beings and respecting their beliefs. People who are advocates of saving the Chief are not respecting the hurt emotions of Native Americans. Respect is not given to Native Americans by the misrepresentation of the Illini tribe. The half-time dance shows only disrespect for Native American culture.

To those who say Native Americans should feel honored and respected by the Chief Illiniwek mascot, I say to them, tell my heart to not cry when the Chief Illiniwek mascot mocks my people's culture. Tell my heart to not break when the Chief Illiniwek mascot promotes ignorance of my
people's culture.

Native Americans most can hold their tears, but the University of Illinois Illiniwek still hurts right here.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Next speaker.

JULIAN B: My name is Julian B, I am from Oklahoma. I am enrolled in the Muskogee tribe. And I just wanted to say that to all --

MODERATOR GARIPPO: This is not --

VOICE: Let him speak.

JULIAN B: What's up? Okay, I will make it really quick. To all the Illini, you guys want to keep that racist, you know, mascot, it's really simple. You know, you guys use in God we trust on your money, if it was us taking your cross, you know, and using it like the tomahawk chop, it would be a different story. Do you know what I am saying? Then put a Native on that panel today. In you want to honor Native people, we can't go anywhere, because this is our home.

AUDIENCE: This is not democratic.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: The next speaker is Beverly Moser.

MS. BEVERLY MOSER: My name is Beverly
Moser, I am a Menominee Indian and I am director of the Institute for Native American Development, support for Native American students at Truman College in Chicago. The INAD program was established in 1979 out of a need to provide a program to recruit and provide academic support services to Native Americans who seek to enroll into higher ed, GED, vocational training programs and continuing education programs at Truman College. Before INAD existed, it was documented that in 1976, only three Native Americans were enrolled, at that time it was called Amundson Mayfair College, now named Harry S. Truman College.

I am giving this background to make you aware of a perspective of a community that has worked and struggled to offer programs to recruit and keep Native Americans in school. The dropout rate for Native Americans in the Chicago public school system is around 70 percent or higher.

And we are up against institutions of higher education that do not recognize the value of offering a curriculum in Native American history and culture. The lack of inclusion of
Native American history and culture in the public school system and institutions of higher ed is exactly what has contributed in large part to the dropout rate of Native American students, but is also definitely a contributing factor to this continued argument.

I always hear throughout these last ten years of this fight against the Chief Illiniwek mascot that, you know, that Chief Illiniwek honors us as a people, honors and respects who we are. I feel it's an empty statement completely, because the image was born out of an era that proudly boldly produced cartoon images of all ethnic groups. It came out of the era that produced the black Sambo image.

Since that time most, a lot of those images have since been properly classified as racist. It would never be utilized in promotional or commercial campaigns, yet here we are in a ten-year long argument trying to convince students, alumni and the public at large that this mascot is offensive, racist and should be stopped. Why is there a resistance to this argument? With most other ethnic minorities groups it would have been
The idea that Chief Illiniwek honors the Native Americans, again I feel it comes from a lack of knowledge about who we are as Native American people. Again, there are not very many Native American studies programs that are offered in the public school system or institutions of higher ed, at the moment, today we are trying to begin a dialogue at Truman College where we can offer Native American students programs.

But it's always been a continuing struggle for us in Chicago, and across America for us to instill the importance of our inclusion in Native American history and culture.

I cannot stress enough of the importance of the need to incorporate Native American history and culture into the curriculum or public school institutions of higher education nationwide. I believe that the reason we are still arguing on this issue is because nonIndians and the general public's argument is coming from a position of ignorance. Ignorance of who we are except from, you know, from the small blurbs out of history books and more about the knowledge, I think that
more of the knowledge really comes from the point
of reference that come out of the John Ford cowboy
western movies that Hollywood produced.

If you make the right decision to do
away with this mascot, it would be a big step
forward in our fight to do away from other sports
mascots representing collegiate and professional
sports teams. We can also begin a dialogue about
developing and offering a curriculum that includes
Native American history and culture.

And I just as a final statement wanted
to say that I am here representing my community
and I am also representing my own children and I
am hoping that you go in the decision to do away
with it to make our lives a little bit easier and
our struggles to educate our own in the general
public of who we are. Thank you.

MS. IMANI BAZZELL: Good morning, my
name is Imani Bazell, Carol Spindel, and my son
Cofe who is out of school today to get a different
kind of education. We are Latino and Asian, black
and white, marginal and privileged, lesbian and
straight. We are mothers, godmothers and
grandmothers. We are Women Against Racism and we
say the Chief has got to go.

Last year, the Trademark Trial and
Appeal Board, which is composed of three federal
judges, canceled the seven trademarks belonging to
the Washington Redskins football team. In their
ruling, they cited as one of their reasons the
fact that there is an infinite array of possible
names that can be used for the team. They aren't
limited to Redskins. There is no need for them to
maintain the legal right to use the term. In
other words, the judges said there are plenty of
names out there that aren't disparaging. This one
is, so pick something else.

Women Against Racism felt similarly. It
is clear that many people in this community, many
students, staff, faculty and alumni are
embarrassed by Chief Illiniwek and wish that our
teams had a symbol of which they could be proud.
This is why we sponsored a contest, A New Mascot
for a New Millennium. The community responded
enthusiastically and sent 80 suggestions.
Illinois Tornadoes, Rolling Thunder, Rattlesnakes,
Illini Lightening, the Nighthawks, the
Railsplitters, the Storm, the Blue Stems, the
Springtails, the Blades.

Each of these entries was accompanied by a rationale and a graphic design. Some contestants added cheers and half-time activities. The winning entry, chosen by a panel of judges, was Illinois Prairie Fire, submitted by three different contestants, including a team of two fourth graders.

Prairie Fire was chosen because it leaps high, jumps from spot to spot, is powerful and alive and renews and renourishes the prairie when it passes. The logo maintains the Illinois colors, orange and blue.

All of the values that have been symbolized by Chief Illiniwek, bravery, courage, loyalty, school spirit, can be symbolized even better by a new mascot with which everyone can identify.

A new mascot that doesn't demean any ethnic group will be welcomed at the Universities at Iowa, Minnesota and Wisconsin as Chief Illiniwek is not. The professional academic societies that are boycotting our state will once again hold conferences on this campus.
The University of Illinois is the most prestigious institution in our state. And if it would put just a portion of the resources into a new athletic symbol that it has put into promoting and justifying the reverence and the aura that surrounds Chief Illiniwek, the new symbol would surely succeed.

We firmly believe that it is possible to create a community based on equality and mutual respect. We know that the greatest obstacle to this is ignorance and miseducation.

We know this community and this campus. We ask the University to stop teaching our children, whether they are Native American, African-American, Latino, Asian, American, white or any mixture thereof, that stereotyping another group of people is acceptable as long as you do it dramatically and with good graphics. Just because it's a positive stereotype doesn't make it any less a stereotype. Just like the idea that all Asian kids are math whizzes, or all African-American kids are basketball champions, positive stereotypes keep us from seeing real people.
No professor who taught engineering or geography the way it was taught in 1926 would get tenure at this University, they would be laughed at. But the leadership of this University teaches race relations that were practiced in 1926. The 1926 fight song contained the word darkies. And the student theatricals included minstrel shows. The students of 1926 assumed that Indians would soon vanish forever. They also assumed that only white men had the right to leadership positions in government and business.

In the south, white women often used to have and I think continue to have, a mammy doll in their kitchen. They claimed to love that little doll. But that doesn't mean they love or respect African-American women. This means that they feel affection for a romanticized past that never existed, a past where slave women loved their masters and stayed with them after emancipation. It's a fantasy. The affection for Chief Illiniwek is just like the affection for Aunt Gemina.

It seems that one of the greatest stumbling blocks to those who continue to embrace the Chief as an honored symbol is the confusion
over intent versus consequences. They know
themselves to be good people, so how could good
people do bad things? The issue is not about
intentions, as noble as they may be, but about
consequences. The consequences of continuing to
represent Native people in this one dimensional
way is to perpetuate a stereotype, demean Native
people, offend all people of conscience and
restrict the campus community and nation from
moving together into the 21st century.

In the final analysis, it is only the
consequences of our actions that make the
difference. This boils down to a moral issue, not
a popularity contest. If you took a vote today,
the Chief would definitely win. But if you took a
vote on slavery in the south in 1865, guess where
I would be today?

Stereotypes and racism cannot be
reformed. They must be eliminated. Proposing to
reform the Chief is like proposing to reform
slavery. Can we keep them if we promise to only
beat them on Saturdays? Can we keep them if we
promise to let them eat twice a day? The answer
to the question of racism and all forms of
oppression will always be no.

As community women, we have been here on this issue and will remain. We are long distance runners. And we ain't no ways tired. So when it comes to Chief Illiniwek, it ain't over until it's over. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Stephen Kaufman.

MR. STEPHEN KAUFMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Stephen Kaufman. I am a professor in the department of cell biology and I have been on this faculty for 26 years and I represent faculty against the Chief.

More than ten years ago Charlene Teters stood alone before crowds of sports fans with a simple sign that read Indians are people, not mascots. Then and now, that truth is self-evident and it is nonnegotiable, sir. At least I hope it is evident to you, because unfortunately, it has not been as clear to our Board of Trustees.

Since that time, our elected student government, as well as a special campus wide committee convened by the Chancellor to recommend how to make this campus a better place for people of all cultures to study and work, as well as our
elected faculty and Student Senate, all passed resolutions advocating the retirement of Chief Illiniwek. Mountains of testimony have been given.

Sadly, all of these democratic exercises enfranchised by the rules that govern this campus have been disregarded by our administration and Board of Trustees. Moreover, the Board and campus administration refuse to engage in an independent mediated arbitration of this issue. They summarily dismissed without due process grievances charging racial discrimination.

They have refused to include this issue in two self studies, one conducted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the other conducted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools pertaining to academic accreditation. And they have fostered an atmosphere of intimidation in many quarters of this campus.

However, recently, 13 independent senior academics from other institutions that comprised the North Central Accreditation team did review this issue and did meet with both pro and
anti-Chief advocates. Their report is an unprecedented condemnation of the institutional integrity of this campus. It severely criticized the University administration for their failure to deal with the Chief issue in a manner consistent with our Statutes, which prohibit invidious discrimination.

In other words, they pointed out the contradiction between having a Native American mascot and the educational mission and rules of this University.

In response to this condemnation, the Board publicly reiterated its firm commitment to maintaining the mascot and then, quote, reaffirmed its commitment to a dialogue. They reaffirmed their commitment to something they previously refused to discuss. Instead of acting to finally end this form of invidious discrimination, they chose to ask the same old question, hoping that if they controlled the process, they would finally get the answer they sought. And so here we are.

Remarkable as it may seem, in response to censure for lack of institutional integrity, the first response of the Board was allegedly to
break the law by violating the Illinois Open Meetings Act. Since then they have continued to defy that law, all meetings, including the ones selecting you, Judge Garippo, were held unannounced and in secret by persons who have publicly declared their strong position and interest in maintaining the Chief.

Furthermore, this dialogue process per se clearly violates the Statutes of this University and this is not how we resolve educational issues at this institution. What an astonishing way to confront condemnation of institutional integrity, by breaking the law and violating the statutes of the institution.

But here we are, sir. The question at hand is whether this process is anything more than a charade, or a circus to placate the concerns of the North Central Association Accreditation team. Let's have a look at some of the evidence.

One, the process to date has been closely managed in secret and has included only those who have publicly declared their pro-Chief position.

Secondly, tens of thousands of taxpayer
dollars have been spent by the Board to send out messages directed to specific constituencies who might favor keeping the Chief. This includes advertising and personal letters from Mr. Engelbrecht. The source of the letter, Mr. Engelbrecht, has made his position quite clear. And he invited people who feel as deeply as he does to participate in the dialogue.

Moreover, who did not receive this personal invitation from Mr. Engelbrecht is equally important. He did not send it to the Council of Deans, releasing them from the intimidation that they have been under for the past ten years. He did not send it to the University faculty, and he did not send it to Native Americans, either on this campus or anywhere else. Perhaps he isn't interested in knowing how they feel about his honoring them.

Thirdly, although tens of thousands of dollars have been used to target audiences the Board wanted to reach, Mr. Engelbrecht, President Stukel and Provost Herman refused to defray the expenses of Native Americans to come and participate in this intake session today. They
denied support to cover the costs of ads and 
letters to be directed more uniformly. And they 
denied access to the same mailing lists they used. 

And fourthly, perhaps the most egregious 
act by Chancellor Aiken and Mr. Engelbrecht is 
that they have refused to provide you with the 
correspondence they have received prior to the 
initiation of this dialogue. They have set up a 
dialogue but are withholding essential evidence 
from you.

What is this information? There are 
mountains of it, including testimony from dozens 
of individuals and organizations, local as well as 
from around the world, organizations concerned 
with human rights, including Amnesty 
International, the National Organization of Women, 
the NAACP, the Rainbow Coalition, organizations 
that represent Native Americans nationally, the 
Minorities Opportunity Committee of the NCAA and 
all student organizations on this campus that 
represent people of color. In essence, from 
anyone who knows discrimination when they see it. 

They withhold from you the transcript 
and audio tape of our Senate proceedings, anti-
discrimination complaints dismissed without due
process, statements by various campus departments
condemning the use of the Chief, and a host of
additional documents.

Judge Garippo, I respectfully request,
sir, that you advise the Chancellor and Board to
forward these documents and an annotated list of
them to you without further delay and make that
list available to the public. And secondly, that
you advise the Board to write the Chancellor, the
Provost, the Deans and Directors, inviting their
candid input on this issue and guaranteeing them
that there will be absolutely no reprisals of any
sort should they disagree with the perspective of
the Board.

Your Honor, there is intimidation at all
levels of this campus where this issue is of
concern and that is toxic to the mission of this
University and it is wrong. And perhaps, sir, you
can help end this.

Judge Garippo, as a scientist, I must
say that with the sole exception of conversations
with you, there is no data thus far that this
process is anything but a charade. I hope I am
wrong. But it is up to you to convince us otherwise.

I hope that in your deliberations you remember what is self-evident, that Native Americans are people, not mascots. And that there cannot be any compromise of that, it is nonnegotiable.

In support of the position to retire the Chief, I present you with a resolution signed by 793 faculty of this campus. This includes 10 of the 13 prestigious Swanlund chairs, 17 additional named chairs, 11 of 15 Jubilee professors of the College of Arts and Science, 24 department heads and hundreds of plain old faculty like me. Thank you, sir. I will be happy to answer questions.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: I have no questions. I just want to assure the audience that the -- I have assurances from the administration that anything I seek and I request from the administration will be furnished to me. As I stated earlier, I have no interest in having my report come out on one side or another. My interest is just to present each side fully, document it in every way that I can. I have
sought Professor Kaufman's input. I have sought Mr. Wakeland's input, Mr. Haney, Miss Ostrovsky, this is only in the first two weeks that I have been named.

I will continue to seek the input from all sources, this session today is only a fraction of what I will use as the source of my report. And as I stated earlier today before many of you were here, I invite input from anyone, either through the e-mail, the e-mail address which has been published, to the box office, post office box that has been published. Or you could even send it directly to my office. I will fail in my mission if my report comes out slanted one way or another.

Believe me, I will have no opinion, nothing I do, I will have no opinion, nothing I say should be interpreted as having an opinion one way or another on what action the Board shall take. So I just wanted to assure you, and believe me, I will seek your input through the coming weeks and months as I will seek the input of every other person who I see, who I feel can assist me in making this report. We are going to break
now -- we'll have a couple more speeches. Then maybe we can break a little earlier this afternoon. If you will introduce yourself.

MR. JOHN MADIGAN: Good afternoon. My name is John Madigan, I am currently the student who portrays Chief Illiniwek. First of all, I want to thank everybody who has come here today. Thank you. Thank you. First I want to thank everybody who has come here today and to express their views. I would ask that everybody who does have different views, please listen to those who have views who may be different from your own, because I know that's what other people are doing as well.

I have never and will never argue on keeping any tradition solely for the sake of tradition. It is healthy for traditions to be challenged from time to time, because if they are strong and worthwhile, they will be made stronger in the end. That's what I think we are here to do today. I have been told by various people that Chief Illiniwek attempts to mock and dehumanize Native Americans. It makes me very sad to hear people say this and that they would think that
this is what Chief Illiniwek is meant to do.
A lot has changed since Chief Illiniwek's inception in 1926, but one thing that hasn't changed is its original intent and purpose. Lester Leutwiler spoke of his first performance, "The performance took place at a time when Native Americans in the west were installed on reservations and struggling for survival. Many in the areas like Champaign-Urbana had only heard stories about the savage, animal-like characteristics of Indians. I simply wanted to prove that there was another side to the culture that most people were unaware of; the inspirational side, the beautiful side, the meaningful side." Those reasons which Leutwiler said reflects what is happening today.

Many opponents of Chief Illiniwek also say that they have a problem with the authenticity of Chief Illiniwek. Well, what exactly does authenticity mean? The University of Illinois created Chief Illiniwek as an expression, as an art of the Native American heritage that was part of the state, part of the area and the name of the state even. It's an expression in the spirit and
the heritage of the University of Illinois and the
Native Americans who walked these lands before us.
It matters not whether the regalia was given to us
by the Sioux, by the Potawatomi, it is the spirit
with which it is conducted.

It was never meant to authentically
replicate any type of Native American dancing. It
is a celebratory dance. It is based on fancy
dancing.

Fancy dancing is very popular in Native
American circles today. It is largely designed to
show the outside world the beauty of Native
American dance while not limiting the special
religious ceremonies. Today I have seen fancy
dancing competitions held at pow-wows, where prize
money is given to the best competitors. These
best competitors often perform such extravagant
and fancy moves like back flips and somersaults.

It is designed to travel, or Native
American troops have been designed to travel all
over the nation to show people this beauty of
Native American dance and this side of their
culture, never ever to mock or degrade these
people. This is the spirit with which Chief
Illiniwek conducts himself.

I have been told about a hostile learning environment and that just makes me sad, and furthermore, it's just simply not true, because in 1994, the US Department of Civil Rights did a thorough investigation of the University of Illinois and ruled that there was no hostile learning environment created by the presence of Chief Illiniwek. So hopefully we can all together look past that.

I must say that I am very excited about the energy and the passion that I see from all groups of people here today. But once again, I am even more excited because for once, since the ten-year struggle to remove Chief Illiniwek began, I have seen both sides express views to work for a compromise. This is something that has not existed in the past. I, myself, have been trying to work to establish scholarships for Native Americans, working with University officials. I see all this passion and energy that you people are creating as well. Why can't we work together instead of fighting. I challenge you to take this community to use Chief Illiniwek to further this
cause. Thank you for your time.

MODERATOR GARIPOPO: This will be the last speaker before we break for lunch.

MS. PAULA OSTROVSKY: My name is Paula Ostrovsky. I am here as a public relations officer and press officer for the National Coalition on Racism in Sports and Media and also a member of Alumni Against Racist Mascots. That proves that not all alumni are for Chief Illiniwek.

Before I go on, I would like to sort of respond to Mr. Madigan's comments by inviting everybody to go see a real pow-wow on how real Native Americans dance and to really say that what he said is not true. There is a pow-wow at Madison State Park on June 3 and 4 it's near Starved Rock. If you need more information we have people outside who can give it to you.

Before I go on to my prepared comments, I wanted to express my concern, what I see here is that everybody who is speaking for Chief Illiniwek seems to be Caucasian. And people of color and Indian people are the ones objecting. I likewise am objecting to the use of sacred Native American
elements in this fashion.

I think the Board and the University have a huge racial problem here. And it's a big racial divide, it's a ticking bomb and if Chief Illiniwek is not done away with, it might explode. And I hope this is addressed soon.

A statement by Bill Murphy on yesterday's Daily Illini affirmed the common ground for everybody involved in this issue is valuing Native Americans and Native American culture. It is clear that those opposed to the University's Indian symbol, logo and name are Native Americans.

Every major national organization representing Native Americans in this country has formally asked sports teams and educational institutions to stop using Native culture and images for entertainment and profit. Clearly indicating that this practice is not perceived as an honor but a blatant disrespect.

The National Congress of American Indians, this is the oldest and largest organization representing Native peoples in this country, have condemned the University
specifically in the strongest possible terms for this practice. Today we have representatives from Native organizations throughout the country and state and particularly the Chicago area serving a community of 30,000 plus. A community that is being denied equal access to this educational institution, the flagship University of this state.

Their message once again is stop the mockery, stop degrading Native religion and open your doors to the Native community. Even the direct descendents of the Illini as mentioned before have approved resolutions urging the University to drop the Illini mascot and references. These are not small liberal organizations, students groups or dad's groups. They are sovereign nations whose governments have taken the time to discuss this issue and address it. Ignoring them would be most disrespectful and could not be farther from any intentions to honor Native Americans.

If this is truly the intention of the University, the first step that must be taken is to listen to these nations and Native
representatives and ask them how would they like to be honored. I would like to thank Judge Garippo for consulting with the NRSM, which is the organization I am representing, a human rights organization led by prominent labor leaders, when determining the course of action for today.

This is the first time anybody with associated with the University has asked and included Native American input in this controversy. We hope this is just the beginning of a new era of working together to make this institution more inclusive and respectful to Native American and all people of color. I certainly hope that Judge Garippo who was essential in ridding humanity of a monster like John Wayne Gacy, that he will be instrumental in ridding our community of the John Wayne mentality that keeps Native people locked in the past.

Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: We will resume at 1:30. This auditorium will be used as a class. So if you will exit as quickly as possible.

(A recess was taken for lunch, and the intake session continued as follows:)
MR. ENGELBRECHT: Good afternoon, I would like to welcome those of you who were here this morning back to the afternoon session. For those of you here for the first time, I extend my welcome to this dialogue session on a very important issue to all of us. Before we get started, I would like to introduce members of the Board of Trustees who are here, David Cocagne, David, would you raise your hand. Doctor Kenneth Schmidt. Trustee Melissa Neely. Trustee Judith Reese. On my left, Trustee Arun Reddy, Trustee Martha O'Malley and Trustee Roger Plummer. And my name is Bill Engelbrecht, I currently serve as the Board chair.

I now would like to turn it over to Judge Louis Garippo who will conduct the proceedings. Judge Garippo.

MODOERATOR GARIPPO: We will start with the microphone on my right, and John Menees.

MR. JOHN MENEES: That's close enough. My name is John Menees, my qualifications for being here among others, I have been an active alum at the University for 47 years. I am a past president of the Illini Club of Chicago and I
would also say that we recently passed a
resolution supporting the Chief. You haven't
received it yet. You will be receiving it. We
have over 100,000 members in the Chicago area.

I am also a past president of the Dad's
Association, currently a director of the
Mechanical Engineering Alumni Group. And I would
like to start by telling you while my European
ancestors came to North America before the United
States was a country almost three hundred years
ago, my Native American ancestors from the Pohapan
tribe were here hundreds if not thousands of years
before that. And I am proud of both of these
ancestral groups.

Illiniwek -- I haven't been here for all
these talks, so this may have been discussed
before, but as my grandmother used to tell me, it
won't hurt you to hear it again. Illiniwek was a
name of a loose confederation of Algonquin
tribes. Early French explorers changed the
spelling of the word at the end to O-I-S, or else
this would be the State of Illiniwek and this
would be the University of Illiniwek.

With that bit of history, regardless of
what else has been said here today, the Chief is
not only a symbol of this University, but he's
also a symbol of our state. The Chief is a symbol
which by definition is something that represents
something else by association, like our flag is a
symbol of our country, and the lion is a symbol of
courage.

The Chief is also a tradition which is
defined as the passing down elements of a culture
from generation to generation of time honored
practice. Like the world celebrates Christ's
birthday is a tradition, or like we all welcomed
in the new year and the new millennium three and a
half months ago. And, like we celebrate the 4th
of July in this country as the birth of our
nation.

The Chief is not a caricature as he has
been characterized, but a very dignified and
respectful portrayal of the American Indian. The
current regalia that was presented by Chief Frank
Fools Crow, a Sioux elder during half-time at the
Illinois Pitt game on September 25, 1982, and was
the Chief's own personal regalia, and he was
honored and proud that so many people would get to
see it.

In closing, I think I can best sum up by quoting a 1994 letter to the Chicago Tribune by Mr. S. Neiburger, Chairman of the Ethnic Minority Council of America wherein he said: "Chief Illiniwek is a benefit to our diverse society and a strong reminder of our history and should continue as a positive symbol of the Native American heritage that every Illinois citizen shares."

We have ten mascots in the Big 10 and we have one symbol. He is 74 years old, let's keep the Chief.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Belden Fields.

MR. BELDEN FIELDS: I address you as an alumnus of the University of Illinois, 1960, who went on to take a Ph.D. in political science at Yale University and then to return to this University in 1965 to teach political science. I will thus be, I am in my 34th year here. My affiliation with this University crosses five decades.

For the most part, I can take much pride in this institution, in which I have spent so many
years as a student and as a professor. But there
is an area that I find shameful. When I was an
undergraduate here, there was no critical
reflection on the Chief. Whether it was an
accurate portrayal of the Illini Indians or
whether it would be offensive to Indians was just
not an issue at that point in time. Some of us on
this campus were still trying to get barbers in
Campustown to cut the hair of African-American
people. African people were in our midst, too few
as students, but many in the community. We were
just waking up to that.

While we have very few Native Americans
on our campus, most of those who have come as
students, and others they have called in from
outside the University over this issue, have told
us that this portrayal of the sacred dance is
inaccurate and that even if it had been accurate,
it would be offensive to trivialize it in a
sporting event. After all, how would Jewish
people react if we had a rabbi dancing across the
athletic field or a Christian cleric performing
feats with a cross. I think you would agree that
this would be harmful, mentally if not physically,
to Jews and Christians. Why would it be any
different with the sacred rites of Native
Americans.

Indeed, it is even more serious with
Native Americans in this country. This is because
physical genocide has been perpetrated on them. I
say physical, quote, unquote, because the 1951 UN
Convention on Prevention and Punishment of the
Crime of Genocide includes, quote, causing serious
bodily or mental harm to members of the group,
unquote. Article II B. I am going to leave with
you copies of the convention on genocide as well
as my statement.

The use of an ethnic or religious symbol
for fun at a sporting event is always offensive.
But it is doubly wrong and in violation of the UN
Convention when that mental harm is perpetrated
against a group that has also suffered close to
physical annihilation. Moreover, the NCA is quite
right that this is an educational issue, the
denial of some or all of you on the Board
notwithstanding.

I teach and write in the area of human
ingents, am on the Editorial Board Review of the
major human rights journal in this country, "The Human Rights Quarterly" and am an organizer of one of the two panels on human rights at the year 2000 World Congress of the International Political Science Association meetings to be held this August in Quebec.

How in the world am I supposed to explain to other human rights scholars, and even more importantly, to students here that their own University, which makes claims to a universalistic vocation of learning, engages in an act, which under the UN Convention is involved in, quote, complicity in genocide, unquote, Article III B, and refuses to learn and to change when that complicity is called to its attention?

I am asking you to recognize that universalistic respect for other people ought to be the hallmark of any educational institution. And to put an end to the shameful violation of human rights and compromise of its educational mission by the University which calls itself the flagship institution of higher education of this state. To whom should I direct these documents?

MODERATOR GARIPPO: If you just leave
them on the stage. Ralph Trimble.

MR. RALPH TRIMBLE: Your Honor, members of the Board of Trustees, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Ralph Trimble, I am a clinical psychologist and I work with our students as a clinical counselor. I am here to speak in favor of retiring Chief Illiniwek. My sentiment on this has been influenced strongly by my work with many students over the years, since 1973.

My basic mission at the University is to help students develop their abilities to contribute to society and to lead fulfilling lives. I believe that the Board of Trustees subscribes to that same basic mission. Over the years, the Board has made many efforts to make our campus more hospitable and more learning conducive for everybody, including people of color. Unfortunately, these laudable efforts have been consistently undermined by our continuing use of Chief Illiniwek as a mascot for our athletic teams.

Those who support the Chief refer to him as a positive symbol, not a mascot. Unfortunately, whatever he is called, to many
Native Americans and for many other people of color, the Chief symbolizes a white endorsement of continuing racial oppression and cultural disregard. Many within the Native American community have made it clear that for them the Chief represents a strong message of disrespect. The disrespect for one nondominant group carries powerful implications of disrespect for other nondominant groups.

I have been told that not all Native Americans are of one voice, nor all African-Americans, nor all Latinos, nor all Asian Americans, but I have observed that many students of color in each of these groups have felt the negative impact of the Chief.

Recently, with the evaluation of the North Central Association, the relevance of that impact on the educational process, the University's basic mission, has received special emphasis. I truly believe that this development has come as a surprise to the Board of Trustees. That seems reasonable in light of the nature of input people at the Board level are likely to get on a day to day basis.
Most notably, when in nonconfrontational settings, students give input to high officials, especially as it relates to educational difficulties, rarely can that input be free of rank-imposed power differentials. My situation is a more humble one and I am sure I have gotten a different perspective from the students.

Students of color have told me how the Chief’s performance and his logo on all kinds of things all over campus add to an inhibiting environment for them. In the classroom, if you are a student of color, perhaps feeling like the only different one in what seems like a sea of white faces, it can be hard to raise your hand and to ask a question or risk exploring a unique viewpoint. After all, someone may consider you and others of your race as stupid.

Similarly, it can be hard to approach a professor after class to seek clarity or guidance or a paper or an exam.

Of course, these things can be hard for white students too, but at least in their case, they more often come into the situation feeling like they belong here. Through sheer differences
in numbers as well as through well known stereotypes and mythologies, many students of color hear a message that they don't belong here. When they see the Chief's dance at half-time or the Chief logo on someone's sweatshirt, the message they don't belong here gets reinforced.

No entity of our University, even our athletic mascot or symbol, if you will, should be giving any of our students that intimidating, growth-inhibiting message.

I close, hoping this dialogue process will lead to richer perspectives on the Chief and that ultimately the Board will conclude that its overall mission is best served by retiring the Chief. Thank you very much.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Roger Simms.

MR. ROGER SIMMS: Good afternoon. My name is Roger Simms, I live out at Sidney, I should have left the corridor and walked in from where I parked. I thank you all for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Chief. Both my wife and myself and three of our four children attended here. And I might say that they paid their own way. I am a 1951 graduate, we are
strong supporters of Chief Illiniwek and at the same time, we have great respect for the Native American tradition.

When our older daughter was a pom-pom girl here, I was fortunate enough to be in the first group of dads to perform with their daughters at half-time on the football field. Let me tell you that back then in those days the Chief and the band were about the only thing there were to cheer for. The feeling of pride and respect that I feel continues today when the Chief appears.

My wife and I are close friends with the Victor Coochury family, Second Mesa, Arizona. Victor last told me, he's a top silversmith and whose name was inducted as a living treasure in Arizona in 1995, we were fortunate to be asked to attend that.

He is a Purple Heart World War II vet and was with Merrill's Marauders in Burma. We have attended dances, his medicine bear pow-wow and were privileged to be the only whites in attendance at the bean dance one February morning when the Kachinas come up out of the Kiva.
We also were invited to the pow-wow after Desert Storm. What truly great loyal Americans, I guess they should be, they were here first. Victor's son Ben is in charge of the White Mountain Apache reservation and was offered the top job in Washington, DC, with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Our home is full of Native American art, from Victor's jewelry to original paintings by Robert Redbird, Kiowa, Rance Hood, Comanche, Paladye royé, Ponca, sculptures by Cheyenne Arapaho Charlie Pratt, Bobby Creeping Bear and many others. One of our latest prize possessions is a prayer feather that Victor made special when my wife had surgery a year ago.

I have sent seed to Victor for 20 years and just this week, we mailed six varieties of beans for him to plant. We were honored and thrilled to have Victor and his Ben and Ricky in our home in November, 1998, as they came to speak to the pro-Chief group. They also attended a football game, the Indiana game. We won that one.

One time when we were in the restaurant at the Hopi Culture Center, I was wearing an
orange U of I shirt with a Chief logo on it.

Someone in all seriousness asked what tribe is that you're from? Someone yelled across the room, that's Chief Illiniwek, you dummy.

As one of the veterans in the South Pacific in World War II, we have made it possible for people to express their opinions and beliefs. I don't understand Kachinas, Kivas and some of the Native American beliefs, however, I respect their beliefs and traditions. All I ask is the same understanding and respect for our tradition, the honored Chief. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Linda Duke.

MS. LINDA DUKE: I am Linda Duke, I am a long time staff member at Krannert Art Museum. And I also hold two degrees from this University. I would like to begin by reading just a couple of short selections out of a book by Theodora Kroeber called "Ishi in Two Worlds." It's her account of the fate of a California Native American who actually finished his life living as a Yahi in California.

She begins the book by talking about the systematic annihilation of Native peoples in
California in the years right after the California gold rush and after the Civil War. This passage is from a chapter called Episodes in Extermination. "In 1853 occurred one of the first of the mass murders of the Yahi. This one under France's leadership. It was triggered by the stealing of one of several cows. Federal men gave chase and before they were through, 25 or more Indians were dead, some shot, some hanged. A second party led by Chance Tater the same year went out in response to an alleged rape along the north fork of the Feather River. They netted 50 or 60 scalps this trip.

"By 1859, the white settlers were not relying on reservations or military assistance. From their own number, they collected $3,000 as a beginning fund to be used to fight the Mill Creeks."

These accounts go on and I don't want to use all of my time reading them. Some of them are first person, all of them are entered into official state records. In other words, these records of Indian massacres were turned in to the military and to the civil government as official
As an example of one of the final descriptions -- I will skip that one. Let me just finish by saying, once a dominant society employing its legitimate government, attempts to exterminate a minority people and its culture, nothing is the same again. The wounds caused by acts this horrible on a scale this huge lasts for generations.

It is the work of millions of descendents of both exterminators and survivors to move towards healing themselves and each other.

One of the things that will never be okay is for the descendents of the exterminators to appropriate, flaunt and use the image of the victimized people. If a public university in Germany were to adopt a respectful image of a traditional Jew, the situation would be similar to the one we discuss today.

No amount of protestation that the revered symbol's prayer shawl was made by real Jewish weavers or that a rabbi taught the performer how to wear his forelocks, would make such a symbol appropriate. The horrible fact that
the German state methodically worked to
exterminate the Jewish people renders this
scenario outrageous for all time.

As a mother, a teacher, a community
member, a U of I staff member and alum, and as a
human being, I demand that you immediately
discontinue the use of Chief Illiniwek. And I ask
that you take every opportunity to explain why you
have discontinued the Chief, what happened when
Euro-American culture met Native American culture
must never happen again. That means that we
collectively must never forget.

This is a teaching opportunity of great
magnitude. I demand that the University of
Illinois rise to this task and teach peace,
compassion, humility and the value of diversity.
It is the best hope for the human race. Thank
you.

MS. BRENDA FARNELL: Brenda Farnell, I
am a faculty member in anthropology and a
specialist in American Indian studies. While I
fully understand the good intentions and nostalgia
of those committed to retaining the Chief, as
educators we must take into account the unintended
consequences of this commitment.

I therefore wish to document here some
of the ways in which the Chief seriously
compromises my own research and teaching and
actively prevents the development of American
Indian studies on this campus.

Since accepting the position at UIUC
four years ago, my scholarly reputation among
Native communities has been severely compromised.
My professional ethics have been repeated
questioned and my future research plans are placed
in jeopardy. When I travel out west to do
research nowadays, I am wary of driving around
with Illinois license plates since on more than
one occasion I have been asked if I come from,
quote, that University with the racist mascot,
unquote.

When I took a group of freshmen to the
annual pow-wow at the University of Iowa last year
as part of their discovery class, they were
confronted with similar questions, and reported
how confused and deeply ashamed they felt of their
school and its so-called honored tradition.

In the classroom, I find that the
dancing mascot mis-educates by creating and
supporting oversimplified and inaccurate views of
indigenous peoples and their cultures by confining
them to a romanticized past. As such, it
contributes to the development of cultural biases
and prejudices, rather than educating against
them, unintended consequences indeed.

This is why this is an important
educational issue and why seven national academic
associations and the NCA all voice strong
opposition to this practice. If the Board doesn't
understand this, then they have the solemn
responsibility to set aside personal feelings and
nostalgia and defer to the expertise of those who
are educators. Nothing less than the future
national and international reputation of this
institution are now at stake.

The presence of the Chief makes it
difficult if not impossible for us to recruit
Native American students, because rightly or
wrongly, this campus is perceived as racist and
hostile to Native peoples. All the talk about
honoring Indians rings hollow when we have never
offered even basic academic and cultural support
services for Native students.

The development of an American Indian
program is compromised because the Native American
faculty upon whom the success and viability of
such program will depend will not come to this
campus.

Since it appears that both sides of this
debate are interested in such developments, I
suggest that a viable middle ground could be
found, if the dancing Indian and the logo were
replaced with an Illini American Indian Studies
Program whose charter would include an annual
Illini festival of Native American music, dance
and other performing arts in honor of the Illini
peoples past and present.

This issue is about diversity, whether
this institution unintentionally educates the
young people of this state in ways that perpetuate
ignorance and intolerance for cultural differences
or equips them to participate fully in a multi-
ethnic nation and global work place of the future.
Times and moral sensibilities have changed
radically since Illiniwek was invented, and
history teaches us that American traditions work
best when they change with the times. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: J. Michael O'Byrne.

MR. MICHAEL O'BYRNE: Mr. Garippo,

members of the Board of Trustees, I am a life-long
resident of Champaign-Urbana, graduate of the
University of Illinois, law of 1949. I have two
brothers and three sisters, all six of them, all
six of us graduated from the University of
Illinois. I have watched Chief Illiniwek perform
since 1934 when I was eight or nine years old at
Red Grange's homecoming. I can still remember
that.

But more importantly, I have observed
Chief Illiniwek each year, several times each
year, because I have attended all the football and
basketball games since 1946 when I was in school.
And I have lived here ever since. I take pride in
the University of Illinois. As one of the ten
greatest universities in our country, it is an
institution of learning that crosses a broad
spectrum of agriculture to veterinary medicine.
Its students, its athletics, its alumni who
marshaled support for a one billion dollar
campaign just a few years ago in support of the
I do support the Chief, because the Chief is a part of the pride that I have in the University. He's a symbol of that pride. He's not a Hawkeye and he's not a Buckeye, he's not a Wildcat, he's not a Badger, they are mascots. The Chief is a symbol of the pride of the people of Illinois in our Native American heritage. The concept of Chief Illiniwek comes from Native American heritage when the Illini were part of a confederation of Indian tribes whose name was incorporated in the name of our state of Illinois.

The Chief is authentic in his presentation, as you have heard before, he wears regalia that is taken from Indian lore. He studies to learn the Indian dance and it is an honored position on the campus. I was present when the present regalia was presented to the University in 1982.

It's interesting to note that perhaps the Chief has performed to over 21 million people in the last 50 years if you count the football games and the basketball games. Presently in the season of football and in the season of
basketball, he will perform before 250,000 people this coming year.

I have never in all of my times that I have attended these functions heard any moment of disrespect for Chief Illiniwek. It has all been support until today perhaps.

I would like to suggest that I believe that the people who have been talking about retiring the Chief are mistaken. I realize they are sincere in their belief, but I believe they are mistaken. It seems to me that we have a situation where perhaps the University curriculum should be expanded. I am not personally acquainted with that. But from the complaints that I have just heard, it could very well be that our American heritage should be a more common part of our curriculum here at the University of Illinois.

To me it's an opportunity for all of us, everyone in this room to get together, because the Chief has the support, I feel certain of 90 percent of the alumni of this University. We could get together behind the Chief, not as an entity but as a symbol of the pride that all of us
have in the University of Illinois.

The Chief is not why we take pride, but he's a representative of it, a symbol of it in which all of us University students, faculty and alumni unite. Thank you very much.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Jay Rosenstein.

MR. JAY ROSENSTEIN: My name is Jay Rosenstein. My qualifications for being here are that I am an alumnus of the University of Illinois. I have a bachelor's degree from 1982. I have master's degree from 1996. And unlike probably most of the other speakers, I actually have a Chief Illiniwek in my family. My wife's great uncle, William Hug was Chief Illiniwek in 1951 and '52.

What I want to do right now is not start at the beginning, but start at the end and let's sort of cut to the chase here. Members of the Board of Trustees, how do you think this is going to end? What do you envision? How do you think this thing is going to be solved? There's a letter to the editor in the local paper just recently, very interesting, the writer, a Chief supporter, said the Chief will be an issue until
the University of Illinois officials put their foot down and say the Chief stays, end of discussion.

Well, I was there in 1990 when you did just that. In fact, I have video tape footage of that meeting. Now I want to ask you in all sincerity, in those ten years has this problem gotten better or gotten worse?

Earlier today I heard a speaker talk about Chief Illiniwek and about the unifying spirit of Chief Illiniwek. Does this look like unity to you? In all honesty, a symbol of the University is supposed to bring people together. Chief Illiniwek is the most divisive symbol I believe in all American colleges and universities. If you don't believe that, look around you. Is that what you want for a great University like the University of Illinois? It's not what I want for my school.

Now, I know what you are going to say. You are going to say you can't please everyone with your symbol, right? People are going to complain no matter what. And that might be true. But I don't know of any college that has a symbol
that is so disliked than the University of Illinois. Look at what we are doing here today.
They are not doing this at the University of Michigan, they are not doing it at Wisconsin, they are not doing it at Minnesota, they have other problems there. They are not doing it at Indiana, not at Northwestern, only here. Only the University of Illinois has a problem with their symbol.

I want to say one more thing. Speakers here today have repeatedly said that Chief Illiniwek honors Native Americans. So where are those people that feel honored? Where are they? How can you feel good about a symbol that hurts and disturbs so many people. That is what I don't understand. I have something very strongly in common with the members of the Board of Trustees, I love the University of Illinois. I have chosen to live here, I have chosen to work here and it is a great honor for me to have the privilege to teach here. But there is one thing that embarrasses me to no end and that is Chief Illiniwek. I understand that people love this symbol. But I just don't understand how you can
continue to want to hold onto a symbol that is so disliked and so divisive. Please do something about that. Thank you.

MS. NEENA HEMMADY: Good afternoon. My name is Neena Hemmady. I am alumnus of the University of Illinois and also a lesbian South Asian Indian woman. I feel very, very strongly that the Chief must be removed as a mascot and symbol of the University of Illinois. Why? Simply put, Native people are saying it should be so. This alone should be reason enough. But since there is always backlash when oppressed people try to define for themselves what is right, we come to this now, a divisive, racially charged and painful fight.

So I ask again, why should the Chief be removed? How dare we, we as a people standing on soil that is stolen, the University of Illinois as a university that is predominantly white with no Native American studies department, say that the Chief honors Native people. How can anyone say this as we look at the history of rape, forced sterilization, genocide and a stripping away of basic human rights like self-determination? How
can anyone say that this is an honor if Native
people themselves are saying that the Chief does
not honor, that it is wrong.

People clinging onto this tradition have
benefited so much from this oppression, that they
are blinded into thinking that they are doing
good. It is white privilege, entitlement and
racism that is blinding people. If this is really
about respect, isn't respect about listening?
Shouldn't we listen to the Native people who are
saying that the Chief should be gone?

What if? What if the University of
Illinois mascot was the Pope. What if the Pope
was doing an acrobatic half-time dance for
entertainment to an audience of non-Catholics?
What if this revered figure was being reduced to
being half-time entertainment and turned into a
commodity so that this figure could show up on
shirts and toilet paper?

What if this figure was totally
dehumanized? What if people were protesting,
saying that this felt degrading, that this felt
hurtful and wrong? How hard would we fight to
keep the Pope as our mascot then.
To me, there are parallels to draw between the respect that we give these figures. Most people have a context to understand that the Pope is not an inappropriate mascot. We grow up here with that context because the Pope has power. Because of the invisibility of Native history, most people don't have the context to understand how a white man dancing in Native costume is wrong.

I experienced something related being from a Hindu family. It is somehow okay to appropriate Hindu and Indian symbols and take them on as people's own thing, things like yoga, mehndhi, I see people wearing pants with Hindu gods and goddesses on their seats. Is this about respect? I see night lights and lunch boxes with gods on them, not made by Indians and certainly not benefiting them. Is this about respect? This is not respect, this is painful. This does not acknowledge a history of colonialism that ravages India and other nations to this day.

I want to end with this, this is not a game. This is not a fight to take up because we don't have enough to do with our lives. This is
about real people. This is about real pain and
real anger. What do the pro-Chief people have to
lose if the Chief is no longer the mascot at you
of UIUC? How will it really change their lives?

On the other side, what do Native and
other oppressed people have to lose if the Chief
stays? The struggle for Native people is real and
about lives. Let there be a new tradition. Let
it really be about respect. And let me close with
this. We keep hearing that alumni oppose removing
the Chief. Well, here I am, I am an alumni and I
strongly support removing the Chief. Thank you.

MR. MICHAEL MONDELLI: Good afternoon
Board of Trustees members and Judge Garippo, thank
you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of
Chief Illiniwek. My name is Michael Mondelli and
I am a junior here at the University of Illinois.
For the past two years I have served the
University of Illinois as assistant Chief
Illiniwek. If you are unfamiliar with the
assistant Chief, this means that I am responsible
for performing as the Chief at the last home
football game and women's basketball. Over the
past few years, I have also been fortunate enough
to perform at the Big 10 and NCAA women's basketball tournaments. I have traveled to Indianapolis, Clemson, South Carolina, and Ames, Iowa.

At these events, the performance of Chief Illiniwek was well received by the fans in attendance. At Iowa State this past March, I performed to a sell out crowd of 14,000 Cyclone fans. Although there were less than 100 Illini fans there, I walked off the court to a round of applause. At the Big 10 tournament in Indianapolis also this past March, I had encounters with two Big 10 mascots, the first was the Michigan State Spartan, and second the Penn State Nittany Lion. Both stood by the court, while I saluted both their fans and ours as Chief Illiniwek. The students underneath the Nittany Lion costume even told me before the game that he was really excited to see the Chief for the first time, because he had heard all about it.

As you can see, other mascots in the Big 10 do not view Chief Illiniwek as a mascot. It is a symbol. They do not pick fights with us at half-time or engage in any activity with the
Chief. While I regard the performance of Chief Illiniwek as dignified and respectful, I have a hard time believing that both sides can't reach a compromise in this issue. You have a tough task ahead of you, because once you reach a decision, one side will remain upset. There are many strong feelings on both sides.

Let me leave with the words of a former Chief, Mike Gonzalez, who in 1976 said, "When I visit alumni groups and other organizations, almost always the first question someone asks is what does it feel to be the team's mascot? I tried to explain to them that I am not a mascot, but rather a symbol of the spirit of the Fighting Illini."

My job at half-time is to transmit that type of spirit to the fans. I believe that Chief Illiniwek does transmit the spirit of the Fighting Illini. And inspires spirit, pride and loyalty to this great University in the most exciting formats in all of college athletics, the incomparable Three-In-One and Chief Illiniwek. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPOPO: Wayne Crue.

MR. WAYNE CRUE: Hello. My name is Gwa
Ha Duse. I am also known as Wayne Crue. I am Shoshone-Bannock from the Fort Hall Reservation in Idaho. I am 12 years old and I am in sixth grade at Edison Middle School here in Champaign.

I am here to tell you that Chief Illiniwek is painful and dehumanizing to my people. It hurts to see Illinois sports fans all over the community desecrate my religion by wearing turkey feathers that mock my sacred eagle feathers. The University band mocks our sacred drum with a Hollywood imitation of our music while band members wave horns up and down like a tomahawk chop while the opposing teams yell racial slurs about my people. It hurts to see fans paint their faces in mockery of my sacred ceremonies.

Eagle feathers and paint are spiritual items I must earn and take care of in a prayerful way. You don’t just buy them, you don’t just decide to wear them, you must earn them. My regalia is sacred. I don’t wear it down the street or to a sporting event. I only wear my regalia in a circle that has been blessed by a medicine man. The Illinois symbol wears the Lakota regalia, but to him it's like a costume,
like Halloween. He has no right to wear this regalia at all. Only a very respected plains Chief would wear such a headdress. Chiefs are religious and spiritual leaders who we honor. We do not use their images as entertainment.

I am here to tell you it hurts. Because of the University of Illinois, I must sit in school and see my friends wear clothing with inaccurate images of my people. It takes me -- it makes me feel sick inside. Chief Illiniwek is all the kids at school know about my people. They don't understand what a real Indian is. They don't know what the significance of our religion. His image spreads misinformation about my people.

It is often all of the teacher's knowledge. I had a teacher that told me that Chief Illiniwek was more famous and a better role model than Jim Thorpe. That was like a slap in the face. You say I should be honored because you admire me, but what responsibility for the welfare of my people, do you take, for the welfare of Native children.

Is it an honor to put my culture and spiritual images on floor mats, seat cushions,
underwear, port-a-potties, toilet paper, meat
packing, beer mugs or shot glasses. When you use
my religious and cultural items for fun, it's like
I don't exist. I am here to tell you that Native
people are still here. We are athletes,
businessmen and women, doctors, lawyers and
members of the community.

I demand the same respect for my
religion and culture that you have for yours. To
adore mythical images of us or to ridicule us is
the same. If you honor us, if you care about us,
let our image go. Remove Illiniwek for the sake
of the children, for the sake of my people.
"Oos." And if Chief Illiniwek wants to be a clown,
he should join the circus.

MS. CYD CRUE: I am Cyd Crue and a very
proud mother. I am here to testify about the very
real human cost of using Chief Illiniwek as a
symbol. I am an academic as well. And I
agree with what Brenda Farnell had to say about
how it impacts my professional career. However, I
am here today to speak as a mother. To facilitate
understanding, perhaps you should imagine that you
have a Native child, or some member of your family
that lives here in this community. But somebody you love deeply.

My family moved here four years for me to complete a doctorate. It never occurred to me what it would be like for my son to live in this community that is saturated with inaccurate and stereotypical Native iconography, where a college student dresses up for half-time entertainment as a Native spiritual leader, where most people have never met a Native person and know nothing about the languages and cultures of the first people of this land.

I thought it would be exciting to take Wayne to Big 10 sporting events. But I realized soon after a glimpse of tailgate parties where intoxicated individuals paint their faces and don turkey feathers, that Illinois sporting events are not proper viewing for my son, nor for any children, for that matter. The University's use of Wayne's religious and cultural items for half-time entertainment denies him a sense of pride and respect for his cultural heritage and his religion.

If Chief Illiniwek is truly about
honoring Native Americans, surely after all these
decades, school children, Wayne's peers, would be
knowledgeable about and respectful of Native
Americans, at the very least, they would recognize
one in their midst. But they don't, because Chief
Illiniwek freezes Native peoples in the past.

Shortly after beginning third grade in
Champaign, Wayne was in a fight one day because
kids were calling him gay boy and Barbie. After
patiently explaining to children that Wayne is
Shoshone-Bannock and the significance of his long
hair, then he began hearing "woo woo" and other
racial slurs. I was forced to remove Wayne from
school and home taught him in fourth grade.

In fifth grade, a fellow student called
him a stupid Indian savage. In sixth grade, he
has been removed from a teaching team because the
teacher cannot understand why it is racist to tell
Wayne he is not a good representative of his
people, or humiliate him with his heritage.

The institutionalized use of Native
imagery in this community has made it difficult
for teachers and students alike to recognize
discriminatory and racist practices for what they
are. The University has engendered and fostered
an environment where children learn Indians are
used for half-time entertainment and that it is
okay to treat them in a disrespectful manner. It
is okay to be a fake Indian on the football field
but not a real Indian in the classroom.

No one seems to notice that this symbol
teaches non-Native children disrespect. That it
is okay to use other cultures and religions for
fun. But children are not born racist. They
learn racism from parents, peers, teachers and the
institutions around them. It is not okay and not
consistent with the University's mission to create
a hostile climate that excludes American Indians
both at school and within their communities.

A direct correlation between the use of
Indians as mascots and symbols and the violence
directed against them has been confirmed by
research. According to the United States
Department of Justice, American Indians are two
and a half times as likely to be victims of
violent crime than any other group of Americans.
Further, statistics show that the violence against
Native Americans is committed by non-Natives.
Suicide rates for American Indian youth are also several times greater. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: If you have any further statements that you wish to submit, please leave them up on the stage.

When I received my acceptance from the University.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Identify yourself, please.

MS. LEANNE REETZ: My name is Leanne Reetz and I am a senior. When I received my acceptance from the University of Illinois four years ago, it was one of the most emotional moments of my life. The University of Illinois was the only university that I had applied to. The letter said, "On behalf of the faculty and staff, I congratulate you on your admission to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign."

I can quote this with great accuracy, as I carry this letter from me to and from school every year, it is a great source of pride for me. It has been the best four years of my life.

That's why I take so much pride in this University and its official symbol, Chief
Illiniwek. I believe that the Chief is a revered symbol to this University and its students. To take him away would be a grave mistake. The Chief gives something to this University that cannot be replaced by anything or anyone else. This thing that the Chief gives us is not something easily put into words. It is that thing you feel when you are at an Illini football game and the Chief comes out on the field at half-time. It is a feeling of pride, awe and excitement. Chief Illiniwek is not mocked but revered. He is treated with the utmost respect.

The first time I saw the Chief I was a bit confused. I didn't understand what the low hum was I heard in the stadium. It was quickly explained to me, anyone who has seen the Chief at any games knows what I am talking about. It is not a chant or a cheer of any type. It is a low roar while the students, faculty, staff, alumni, join together to pay their respect to Chief Illiniwek. This is one of the things future students will lose by taking away Chief Illiniwek. One day I hope to be able to take my children to a game so they can experience what I have been so
fortunate to.

Yesterday in the Daily Illini, I was shocked to see an article on the front page entitled "English Department Announces Opposition to Chief." For the first time in four years, I felt like I didn't matter, that I was just a number at the University. An English and rhetoric student, I consider myself to be part of the English department. However, I was never consulted or asked my opinion on this subject by my department. Thus I can only conclude that the English Department doesn't feel that my opinion on the matter is worth their time.

Well, I feel differently. This University could not exist without its student. The purpose of this University is to further the education of its students, so I ask you to take into consideration what I feel as a student.

Professor Robert Parker said in the article that there has been some trouble in recruiting graduate students and faculty to the University because of Chief Illiniwek and the publicity which surrounds this issue. While I question the validity of this statement, I also
think this questions the English Department's
motivation.

If the department motivation for taking
an anti-Chief stand is a recruiting strategy, the
article also stated Chief Illiniwek is an
inappropriate symbol or mascot. Once again, I
would like to reiterate that Chief Illiniwek is
not a mascot. He is a symbol. If you do not know
the difference between these, then you do not know
enough about the subject to be speaking.

Before I came to the University, my
knowledge of Native Americans was limited to what
I learned in grade school. My knowledge of the
Illiniwek tribe was even less. I didn't know the
last remaining descendents were in Oklahoma, not
in Illinois. I only knew the name Illinois came
from an Indian tribe. Now after being at the
University for four years, I can say my knowledge
of the Illiniwek is much greater. Of course it
can be improved. And an education department at
the University surrounding this would be helpful.

But how many other symbols can you think
of that promotes learning? One argument that I
will not accept from the anti-Chief supporters is
that I am racist for supporting the Chief. How can admiration and respect and reverence be racism. I would never support something I thought was racist and would bring pain to anyone. The Chief is a positive symbol.

I will be graduating on May 14 from the University with a degree in English and rhetoric. However, this will not end my career here at the University. Just as I did four years ago, this past January I received an envelope from the University of Illinois. Luckily, the first word I read was congratulations, so once again, I will be returning in the fall.

I look forward with great anticipation to the first football game where I can again show my respect and support for Chief Illiniwek. Thank you.

MR. FREDERICK HOXIE: Good afternoon, Your Honor, I can Frederick Hoxie, I am holder of one of the Swanlund endowed chairs here at the University, professor of history in the History Department. I will dispense with other identification, it's in the CV that I will give you along with some other resolutions and
material.

I am here to, in the time allowed, to make four points. And I think what Jay said earlier is very important. This is the time for candor and a time for honesty. No. 1, Native Americans find the University's insistence on maintaining its mascot or symbol in the face of their protests humiliating. American Indian students, educators and community leaders have made their feelings clear. The University has responded with assurances of good intentions. Native Americans have watched white people justify their actions for five centuries. The history of those five centuries teaches us that good intentions do not excuse hurtful behavior, whether it be in a government boarding school or in modern athletic entertainment.

The obstinacy of the University in the face of protests has a corrosive effect on the few Native American students who chose to remain here. During each of the last two semesters, I have had students come to me in private to request that I not disclose their American Native heritage to the class. They do not want to hear lectures from
white people about their good intentions, and they
do not want to receive the hate mail that ensues
when they speak up. Great universities respect
all their students. Great universities provide an
environment where people can be themselves. This
University does not.

The context surrounding Chief
Illiniwek's performance, my second point, has
changed dramatically over the last 75 years.
Seventy-five years ago there were 300,000 American
Indian in the United States. Seventy-five years
ago white performers appeared in black face.
Congress had banned immigration into this country
from China, Japan and most of the countries of
southern and eastern Europe.

The 2000 census will report more than
two million American Indians live in the United
States as citizens. Tens of thousands of them in
this state of Illinois, paying taxes. Racial
discrimination and segregation are now prohibited.
Immigrants now come to this country and to this
University from every corner of the globe. We no
longer celebrate white supremacy in public
rituals. We no longer speak of Native Americans
as a noble people of the past. We have come to see ethnic and racial diversity as the glory of our democracy. Great universities embrace adversity and build healthy, multicultural communities. This University does not.

No. 3, scholars in American Indian studies universally condemn Chief Illiniwek. Last week I chaired a meeting of a new organization, an American Indian studies consortium made up of faculty members who teach in this field at all 11 of the Big 10 Universities and University of Chicago. At that meeting, 25 faculty representatives who appeared at this conference, we passed a resolution unanimously calling for the immediate retirement of Chief Illiniwek.

A few weeks earlier I noticed on a list-serve sponsored by the Michigan State University reaching more than 800 researchers requesting comment on Chief Illiniwek elicited dozens of responses, all of them negative. All calling for the retirement of the Chief. I have copies of them here to give you.

My final point. The Board of Trustees' response to the North Central Association report
released earlier this year demonstrates a lack of commitment to equity and diversity. North Central has asked the University, the NCA has challenged the Board of Trustees to act on its stated principles.

Further resistance to change will only continue the negative effects of this controversy. Student alienation, faculty anger and minority staff and student disgust will surely grow. Efforts to retire the Chief will continue. Some day those efforts will be successful. Where will the Board of Trustees be on that day? Great universities live up to their principles. Great universities act with confidence and courage rather than fear. This University so far has not.

MR. DAVID FRIED: Hi, Judge Garippo, members of the Board, I am a graduate student. My name is David Fried. I have been at the University, this is my third year. I finished my undergrad here. I came here because this is a great University. It's a great University which excels in things like engineering, farming, trade and business.

Those same sorts of things at which the
Indians excelled. They were the premiere city builders, traders and farmers in North America. Now they are not living here in Illinois anymore. And sadly, most of them were wiped out, but I think it's a great thing that this University chooses to associate itself with those people, because they stand for many of the ideals or they had many of the qualities that we seek to have today as students and alumni of the University of Illinois.

Now, I don't have anything prepared because I think everything that could be said on this issue has been said today. There's been a lot of very emotional debate on either side. But one thing I want to say is that I do support the Chief, but I do believe that 80 years is a long time to have something, a cultural icon and not change it.

Now, I want to say a few things that may upset both sides, I don't know. But my personal opinion is that if education is an issue, if stereotyping is an issue, if the idea that the only exposure that students in the Champaign area or in Illinois for that matter get to Native
Americans and Native American culture is through Chief Illiniwek, then we have a problem that goes far deeper than the Chief.

I think that if you have people war whooping and painting their faces and teasing Native American students, then that is disrespect that goes far deeper than the Chief and it's not something that getting rid of the Chief is going to help, because if that is their only exposure to Native American culture, where are we going to get the exposure? Spaghetti westerns on A and E.

We need to look at what are we doing, what are we putting out there on the field. Is this something that we can be proud of, is this something that a Native American can look at and not see a mockery of his people. Or can we do something. You have a captive audience at half-time, can we do something that celebrates the heritage of this state, celebrates the Illini people and at the same time is accurate in its portrayal, is not inappropriate in that respect.

I think in refusing to compromise, I am sorry, members of the Board have dropped the ball. In not talking with Native Americans, without
listening to their complaints and trying to look
at something to compromise, I know that everyone
hates compromise, because no one gets what they
want. You dropped the ball. I think that there
really, really, needs to be some communication
between the sides, maybe presentation of authentic
fancy dancing instead of what we have now. I
would love that.

I am a member of the band, I would love
to play something more accurate. I would love to
go out there and have a dance presented that
actually displays Native American culture. I
would love if people who had that, or a person who
portrayed that, did what they used to do, and
teach kids, who apparently aren't getting it in
their curriculum about Native American culture.

The problem is, what we have now is two
sides fighting, one wants the easy answer and one
wants the easy answer. Get rid of the Chief, keep
the Chief the way it is. What I am saying as
educated people, as sensible people, as people who
are dedicated to a cultural society where everyone
can get along, don't we have an obligation to do
something. Thank you.
MODERATOR GARIPPO: Well, you are correct. Your comments weren't warmly received by either side. That might show the reasonableness of it.

MS. ALMA GOTTLIEB: My name is Alma Gottlieb. I have taught in the Department of Anthropology here at the U of I for 17 years. As a culture anthropologist who specializes in what is sometimes called symbolic anthropology, my job is to study cultural symbolism. So I have been keenly interested in and increasingly perturbed by the continued use of Chief Illiniwek as an icon for our University, and the growing controversy surrounding that potent image.

What makes a good symbol? According to the late Victor Turner, one of the great analysts of symbolic thinking of the 20th century, the successful symbol is what he called multivocal, by which he meant that: It speaks in different, but richly evocative and satisfying ways to multiple constituencies; it speaks to multiple ideas and ideologies; and it speaks to events that are either historically verifiable, or that are seen as existing in mythical time outside of
historically verifiable time.

The great enduring symbols of human history have had just these properties. For example, the cross speaks effectively to multiple groups of Christian all over the world precisely because it visually summarizes a broad range of ideas that are accepted widely as ideologically relevant, spiritually true and, at least in part, historically accurate, to members of Christian communities around the world.

By contrast, symbols fail when they do not meet any or even all of these criteria and they divide people rather than unite them. The Confederate flag and the swastika both come to mind. It is the same with the Chief.

Like other failed symbols, our school mascot is actively turning off more and more of its observers, not only in our school community, but increasingly beyond our campus and beyond Illinois. Like other failed symbols, the Chief speaks to a narrowly restricted ideology, the vision of Native peoples as a source of entertainment to sports fans. And like other failed symbols, the Chief speaks to a historically
and ethnographically inaccurate portrait of the
wrong group of Native peoples set in the wrong
place and in the wrong time.

Given this triple failure, my own
responsibilities as an educator are sorely
becoming challenged. When I instruct my students
in the properties of symbolism and am asked to put
Chief Illiniwek in this conceptual hierarchy, I am
obliged to classify it as a failed symbol along
with the others, such as the two that I have
mentioned.

But I love my University, and it pains
me to have to subject its icon to such a bitter
analysis. Moreover, as an anthropologist whose
prime mission as I see it is to teach responsible
understanding of diverse cultural practices across
time and space, I find it increasingly difficult
to defend my own employment at a university whose
Chief symbol presents an image of one cultural
group that is ethnographically and historically
inaccurate, psychologically offensive and
politically divisive. In short, my job in the
classroom is being tested by the growing
controversy generated by the Chief.
As an educator, I believe my colleagues and I have a moral responsibility to share our scholarly expertise when such expertise is called on. I am honored to have this opportunity as a cultural anthropologist to speak to this troubling issue. You, our Trustees, are charged with the sacred trust of providing not only financial, but also moral leadership in selecting a responsible symbol for our times. I urge you to support the retiring of the Chief as a failed symbol that is an inappropriate, inaccurate and offensive representation of our diverse University community, and to support the search for a new symbol that can far more effectively unite us with another visual image that can convey true pride in our complex history, our changing aspirations and our multiple identities. Thank you.

MR. ROBERT MORGAN: Hello, my name is Bob Morgan. I am a sophomore at the University of Illinois. I am a member of the Illinois Student Government Assembly and I am president of the Hillel Student Board, which is the Jewish Foundation on campus. I am speaking today on behalf of myself.
The question that I wish to raise to you today is who are we to judge, who am I or you to decide what is or isn't offensive to a tribe of Native Americans. We have a symbol of a Native American representing the University of Illinois. More importantly, we have a man dressed in a uniform, dancing around, hopping and prancing around while thousands around chant "Chief" to represent Native Americans.

I have heard people say over and over again that Chief Illiniwek is a symbol of pride. The University of Illinois and the United States have nothing to be proud of regarding the treatment and respect towards Native Americans in the past. Since Europeans invaded North America and pushed Native Americans off their land, the Native American population has dropped from twelve million to two million.

I am sure all of you adults are aware that textbooks and movies were the only experience with Indians that most adults grew up with. All they knew about Indians is that they were bad guys and scalped the poor white man.

In reality, they were abused, mistreated
and killed by the white men and delegated to live on reservations. I also heard that Chief Illiniwek is an honor to the Illini tribe and that it maintains the memory and good name of the tribe. However, if so many Native Americans seem to be offended and enraged by it, how much honor can there really be?

People have told me it's not harming anyone, so why change the symbol of the Chief. I say it is harming people. It is harming the understanding and appreciation that the people of this nation have toward Native Americans. Cultural education is a top priority. Teachers in elementary schools in Chicago asked their students what they know about American Indians, and the students giggle and dance around the room chanting "Chief."

The implication of having a Native American as a symbol of this public university is far reaching and must be considered. We are responsible for those implications. So what can be done? Some history classes about Native Americans would be a start at the University of Illinois. We need to ask for the forgiveness and
advice of the remaining Native Americans in this
country. Then, we need to follow this advice.

I am Jewish and if the New York Yankees
suddenly decide to change their team name to the
New York Rabbis who danced the horah to the song
Havah Negilah, I would be offended. And if Jews
collectively would speak up and say they too were
offended, the mascot and the symbol would be
changed. So why don't we give Native Americans
the same respect. I think it's about time that we
did.

The choice is simple. The University
can upset people, upset people by retiring the
Chief. Or they can offend Native Americans with
the symbol. With all of my heart I say to you it
is time to remove the Chief as a symbol of this
great University. Thank you.

MS. REBECCA CRUMMEY: My name is Rebecca
Crummey. I am an alumni of this University and
currently the program director at the University
of Illinois YMCA. I am here today to share with
you the University YMCA's 1991 decision to take a
stand against Chief Illiniwek.

Some points of the Y's history are
important to note. One, at the beginning part of
this century, we supported the education from
elementary school through a degree from the
University of Illinois and medical school at
Northwestern University of Carlos Montezuma, who
was of Apache origin.

Early publications and facilities
reflect an interest and fascination with Native
American culture, including the YUs Indian, the
newsletter from 1920 to 1989 and the wigwam room
remained the Kaezer Room in 1952 after a major
donor and uncle of the first Chief Illiniwek,
Lester Leutwiler, whose life-size portrait dressed
as the Chief hung in the YMCA for 40 years.

However, in response to requests from
the University YWCA, and the belief that Chief
Illiniwek, whatever the original intent, functions
as a symbol harmful to Native Americans in their
quest for justice and equality, the YMCA Board of
Governors agreed to address their own history and
involvement with Chief Illiniwek. Several persons
reported the pain and embarrassment of finding the
need to change long held positions.

Points of concern to the Board were very
similar to the concerns expressed in this
dialogue, the Y's mission, to be an open forum,
its financial support, image, tradition, and doing
the right thing. It was determined that to take
no stand was actually to condone or support acts
seen by some as racist, or at least as a
misrepresentation of a group of people.

It seems that the representation by the
Chief does not encourage people who have witnessed
the dance to learn more about Native Americans or
help them gain justice, rather, it is seen mainly
as a form of entertainment.

After extensive and sensitive
discussion, the Board acted. The result was the
following resolution adopted by the University

Mindful of this Association's past of
Native American symbolism, of recent YMCA
programming concerning Native American issues, and
of grievous disadvantages experienced by Native
 Americans residing in the United States of
America; supportive of the purposes of the
Coalition for a new tradition, of which the
University YMCA is a member; and, believing that
Chief Illiniwek as a symbol associated with the University of Illinois athletic teams, though not intended to be disrespectful, is an inappropriate representation of American Indian Native, and head logos as well as the practice of designating a person to wear the Chief Illiniwek costume, perform the dance and otherwise perpetuate the tradition.

The Board of Governors commits the YMCA's recourses to continue and strengthen programming and to provide information and open discussions on issues affecting Native Americans and extend services to the Native American community.

The portrait of Lester Leutwiler posing as Chief Illiniwek has been removed from the KAESER ROOM AT THE YMCA. It has been gone for ten years. Relations with the Leutwiler extended family remained positive and they remained major donors until their deaths in the late 1990s. The University YMCA did lose some contributors, but the financial health of the institution has thrived in the last ten years, and just in the last six months, we received word of a gift worth
half a million dollars from a 1937 alumnus.

The University YMCA has not merely made this resolution and let it drop. Rather, it has continued to work for the elimination of this inappropriate symbol and for increased awareness of real Native Americans. Thank you.

MR. ADAM CHADDOCK: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen of the Board of Trustees, I know you have had a long day and I thank you for your appearance here today.

My name is Adam Chaddock, I am a second year law student at the University of Illinois and I am a 1998 graduate of the history department here. I am also currently an elected member of the ISG General Assembly. However, I speak for only myself here today to support the continued use of Chief Illiniwek by the University of Illinois.

In my brief time here today, I would like to address three main points. However, two of them have been beat to death, first Chief Illiniwek is not a mascot. Rather, the Chief is the symbol of a great University. A mascot runs around the playing field dancing with the
cheerleaders, fighting with the opposing mascot, leading the crowd in cheers.

The actions of the Chief are much more dignified than those antics. The Chief puts on a respectful and ceremonious performance that brings pride to our great University. Make no mistake about it, the Chief is a proud symbol, not a foolish mascot.

Second, the use of Chief Illiniwek is a historical tie to the State of Illinois. In a recent article about the issue, Joe Cappo stated that a college that adopts the name of a tribe indigenous to its area is not deriding or insulting that tribe. It is showing respect and admiration, not to mention a link to the area's history.

If we are not to use the names and words of Native Americans, we will have to rename the cities of Peoria and Milwaukee, rename the Mississippi River, the State of Illinois. The list goes on and on. Are we to abolish all signs of Native Americans from the culture of the United States? Is the only place we are to hear of Native American in our history books? I think
not. Chief Illiniwek is a constant and respectful reminder and tribute to the history and tradition of the previous inhabitants of this state. I believe that the Board of Trustees should make their decision not on threats, not on financial considerations, but what they think is right.

Now, having said this, I hesitate to make my third point. Mr. Haney earlier in his comments said that he and his supporters would continue to fight on until the Chief has left this University. Well, I am here to tell you that those of us who support Chief Illiniwek will be here supporting the Chief for as long to come as that.

Banning the Chief will not end the division. When Miss Teters and Mr. Haney pack up their sound gear out there and go home to their respective places throughout the country, what do we have left here at the University? We have the silent majority.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: We have gone all day long and the mood of the dialogue has been done in a fairly decorous manner. Let's not at this stage
of the proceedings let it deteriorate. Each
speaker has a right to state that speaker's
opinion. And interruptions will only delay us and
detract from the civility of this presentation.

MR. CHADDOCK: Thank you, Your Honor.
So what we have left when these people return to
their homes throughout the country is the silent
but powerful majority of students and alumni that
support Chief Illiniwek. This silent majority is
complacent and silent because they believe that
the Board of Trustees will never abandon the Chief
in its time of need.

However, with the vocal and evidently
overly sensitive minority touting political
correctness as their banner issue to come out to
oppose the Chief, I decided to come out today and
show you, the Board of Trustees, that there is an
overwhelming amount of support for the Chief
throughout the students and alumni.

If the Board ever was to retire the
Chief as a symbol, the protest, boycotts and
picketing that would befall this University would
make the current anti-Chief movement look very
small indeed. If this University bows to the
protest of this small group of protesters, or any
other supposedly offended protestors, I will be
the first of thousands upon thousands of alumni
and students who give up my season football
tickets, to give up my season basketball tickets
and pick up a picket sign to show how I feel about
the Chief. Ladies and gentlemen of the Board, I
would not stand alone.

In conclusion, I am here to ask you
today to do the right thing and support Chief
Illiniwek. Thank you for your time.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: After this speaker,
there will be a 15 minute recess.

MR. PAUL HIXSON: Good afternoon, my
name is Paul Hixson, I come before you today in a
number of capacities. I am an alum, as well as a
current staff member who has worked here for more
than 30 years. Other members of my immediate
family are also proud alum of this great
University. I am also a loyal, long-time season
ticket holder for major athletic events, and one
last major connection I would like to establish
for me is that I am a long time member of McKinley
Presbyterian Church, which was the first campus-
based church on a public campus. And one of the McKinley's major focuses is on serving the needs of students, faculty and staff of this particular campus.

I mention all of these things so that you will see that I have lots of very strong ties to this institution. And in many cases, I am very proud of this great University. However, regretfully, there is one area where I cannot say that that is true. And that's the continued use of Chief Illiniwek as the symbol of this campus. At a personal level, I am deeply embarrassed and offended by the misuse of Native American customs and spiritual practices, all carried out in the name of maintaining a 74-year-old half-time skit and promoting school spirit.

As a non-Native person, I have had the true privilege of visiting and working in a number of indigenous communities over the past 33 years, in areas stretching from rural Alaska to southern New Mexico. And out of that experience, I have developed a profound respect for various Native cultures and religions and all that they have the potential to teach each of us about the human
condition.

As a non-Native person, I would like to speak about the matter of how one really honors the spiritual customs of another culture. This fall -- I mentioned that I am a Presbyterian, this fall I was very proud of my denomination when they passed a resolution at their national 211st General Assembly taking a strong stand on this issue. Resolution called in part for "Universities and colleges that use Native American imagery or symbols to develop a process to choose a new name, logo or mascot."

The reasoning was simple empathy. Quote, "The abuse of Christian symbols, such as the cross or chalice, for entertainment or profit would be insulting, insensitive, and an affront to Christian spirituality, it is therefore unacceptable."

"Similarly, the abuse of Native American symbols such as a headdress, feathers or sacred pipe for entertainment or profit would be insulting, insensitive and an affront to Native American spirituality. It's therefore equally unacceptable."
This really is a case where it's truly that simple, folks. Which one of you would like to have your entire cultural heritage supposedly summed up in a half-time ceremony? Particularly if you knew that your people had been the victims of past oppression in this very same area. Regardless of the stated good intentions by the proponents for the Chief, if the people who are supposed to be honored by this symbol are instead outraged and offended by the practice, then face it, the U of I is not honoring, we are offending.

Finally, I am proud to announce that last night at the regularly scheduled meeting of this McKinley Church's Session, the ruling elders of that congregation unanimously passed a resolution calling on the Board of Trustees and the administration of this campus to retire the Chief as a symbol for this campus. It's time for the Chief to go. Now.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: We will adjourn for 15 minutes.

(A break was taken, and the intake session continued as follows:)

MODERATOR GARIPPO: If people will take
their seats. We may begin. Dennis Payne.

MR. PAYNE: The last time that I had a chance to speak to a Judge, I was ready to be sentenced.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: That won't happen today.

MR. PAYNE: I have had a chance to be on the campus only four or five hours. And I have had a chance to walk around and talk to a couple of students and we had lunch with a very young charming girl named Alicia. So my remarks will be confined to what I believe is not only a personal issue, but a national issue. First of all, I had asked if there was any, a Native American cultural house on campus and there is none.

That kind of confused me, because earlier I sat in here and I heard all these allocation of all these honors and gifts and stuff like that was happening to this school because of the mascot, but there has been no honor for Native people in that area. We have a black house, black cultural house, which is certainly needed, Latino house, which are needed. But no effort to even learn about the Native people.
I heard this morning about a compromise.

But I want to say, judge, that there cannot be a compromise on this issue. There cannot be a compromise. And I heard all these young people, white people talking about how good the Chief had been to them and then hearing of the noneffort by the school to help Native people, I would think that the, that this Chief issue is part of the school's affirmative action program, because they believe that they are doing good.

But they are not honoring Native people. They are hurting Native people. And this Board of Regents, I think that, understand very clearly that the American Indian movement whom I speak for has a great deal of contacts around this area. And we know what sports and the athletic programs that means big money, we know that. They know that.

But I also want to leave this word, that the American Indian movement will campaign very heavily to the affirmative or to the accrediting agency and ask them to deny accreditation to this school until the Chief is gone. The songs that you have been hearing outside, good songs by
Native singers. I want you to know that the death song for the Chief has started. And I said I would never come here, but when I heard that this was an issue today, I decided then to come. So I hope that you make a good decision today. I know they won't make it today, but we will campaign.

Is there any dialogue?

AUDIENCE: There hasn't been.

MR. PAYNE: Is there any dialogue from anybody?

MODERATOR GARIPPO: The session is labeled as a dialogue and the dialogue has consisted in this, pretty much alternating expression of views.

MS. LAURA SCHMITT: My name is Laura Schmitt and I am an alumna of the U of I. I received a BA in English and an MS in journalism. My late father was an alumnus too. My family and I proudly sponsor an undergraduate scholarship in his name in the Department of Civil Engineering. I am here today to speak on my behalf as well as my family's behalf. I would like to thank the Board of Trustees for giving me the opportunity to express my opinion.
Like many of the people here today, I feel very passionately about the Chief issue. When I sat down to write this statement, I had to admit that I was surprised the Chief was still an issue. But on further reflection, I realized that he had become just another target. Sadly this PC tidal wave is drowning free speech and thought at not only this University but institutions of higher learning nationwide. Those who embrace PC use inflammatory words and accusations to get everyone to bow to their opinions.

In the Chief debate, their position is clear. The Chief is racist and he must go. There are many people in this community who do not believe that. They admire and respect the Chief and what he stands for. However, they fear expressing that opinion because then they will be branded a racist or they fear that others will think of them to be less than enlightened. I reject this PC movement completely because it is intolerant and intellectually dishonest.

I urge the anti-Chief activists to listen to what supporters of the Chief are saying.
The Chief is not a mascot. The Chief is much different than that. I like thousands of others respect him and take pride in all that he represents. I say this to those who oppose the Chief. If it's the dance you object to, then let's modify it. If it's the use of the Chief's likeness that you don't like it, then let's work with the Board of Trustees to license his image very judiciously.

Rather than cave into PC pressure, I suggest that the Board accept any positive, constructive suggestions and make the Chief into an even better tool to educate people in the proud history and tradition of the Illini tribe from which our University and our state take their names.

If the Board takes a strong stand and puts this issue to rest once and for all, then everyone, including the anti-Chief activists and those for the Chief, will be able to devote their energy to tackling real instances, real issues and instances of injustice. I urge the Board to take that stand in favor of the Chief. Thank you.

MS. LYNDA LONG-FAINTER: Judge Garippo
and members of the Board of Trustees, I am Lynda Long-Fainter and I am a representative of the Western Band of Cherokees in Oklahoma but I also live in Illinois. And I also represent, I am one of the Board members of the American Indian Council of Illinois which was established in 1996 to address issues facing Indian people in Illinois that are not being faced or addressed.

I want to bring to your attention things that people have forgotten, and this has to do with veterans and recently you will see veterans in Wal-Mart stores fund raising for a memorial on the mall in Washington, DC, to my knowledge there has never been a memorial to veterans. What you are not aware of is that in world war II, the 82nd Airborne out of Fayetteville, North Carolina, which my dad is one of the handful of survivors along with four Native American Dakota Sioux Indian men in Minnesota.

I want to read what is a veteran by Father Denis Edward O'Brien with the US Marine Corps. "You can't tell a vet just by looking. It is the soldier, not the reporter, who has given us freedom of the press. It is the soldier, not the
poet, who has given us freedom of speech. It is
the soldier, not the campus organizer, who has
given us freedom to demonstrate."

That right is our right through the US
Constitution and the supreme law of the land,
First Amendment rights, freedom of speech which is
denied to some people.

When Indian people decide to take on an
issue like Charlene Teters or Michael Haney, if
somebody doesn't want to hear what they want to
say, then we want to teach them a lesson and throw
them in jail, which happens to a lot of Native
Americans. Charlene was in jail for 24 hours,
which she was invoking her First Amendment rights.
And I think that's very wrong.

That's why I wanted to remind you of
this from the 82nd Airborne because these people
are the ones who gave you your freedom to sit on
this Board at the University of Illinois.

But that freedom does not always exist
for Native American in employment or religious
freedom. We express ourselves in dance and music
which Chief Illiniwek does not portray. It is a
mockery for the University to retain Chief
Illiniwek. It is yet another incident of power and greed at the expense of the American Indian culture.

Where are your values? Is money your God? Because I hear threats today about taking money back, donating money if you don't, if you don't retire Chief Illiniwek. I get tired of things coming down to the almighty dollar.

One other thing that I want to remind you of the 82nd Airborne, these men are in the honor guard at the club in Minnesota, the Indian Club. They are in the honor guard and most people are not aware of when I give presentations to grade school children in the fourth grade that under the Lincoln administration, the largest mass execution occurred in Minnesota. They hung 38 Indian leaders for retaliating because the government failed to follow through with their obligations and they were starving their families, their men, women and children, their elders. And the parents say to me, well, we don't know about that. I said that's right, because you are not going to find it in a textbook. That's why I am here to tell you this. This is the most spiritual
group of people I have ever met in my entire life.

If you were to view the documentary "In Whose Honor," your trustees Gravenhorst and I think his name is Lamont say, well, maybe American Indians don't understand. Maybe they should attend a game at the stadium. Excuse me, but we understand, we are highly mentally intelligent and what we understand is that we have tried to be diplomatic in asking that you retire Chief Illiniwek as taxpayers in Illinois. And on this video -- I ran out of time. In this video, there's a man who thinks we are foreigners in our own country who don't pay taxes. Wrong.

MS. ELAINE GEHRMANN: My name is Elaine Gehrmann and I am co-pastor of the Unitarian and Universalist Church of Urbana-Champaign.

I understand the powerful positive feelings that many people associate with Chief Illiniwek. I think it speaks to a deep and profound longing in us for connections to the past to ancestral traditions, to spirituality, for deeper connections to one another and to the larger creation. Many of us long for a symbol to unite us and transform us, to stir our emotions
and uplift our spirits.

But, we do both the indigenous peoples of this land and ourselves a great disservice by trying to appropriate their connections to the past, their ancestral traditions, their spirituality. These symbols and sacred objects are not ours to do with as we wish.

In this country of religious pluralism and diversity, we rely upon one another to show respect for our various religious beliefs and practices. Many of us would be deeply shocked and offended if someone were to incorporate a cross or a Bible into a half-time entertainment show, especially if it clearly showed that that person had no understanding or respect for the very sacred meaning of those items for us.

We cannot always know the meaning of a sacred object or symbol based upon our own knowledge or experience. We often need to look to the particular religious group in order to discover the meaning and significance of a religious item or ritual.

As the dominant culture in a country of many subcultures, we need to be very careful about
our responsibility to avoid cultural
misappropriation, which is basically taking what
does not belong to us. Unfortunately, we have a
long and not very honorable tradition in this
country of taking what does not belong to us,
especially from Native Americans. We have
inherited this history, but we have an opportunity
to stop this dishonorable tradition here and now
at this University.

As a clergy person in this community, I
find the lack of respect and desecration of
another religion's sacred symbols and rituals to
be not only offensive, but dangerous to the
climate of religious freedom and tolerance that is
to central to our campus, our community and our
country.

I find it to be a tragic and painful
irony that we, many of us descendents of those who
came to this country to flee religious intolerance
and persecution in Europe, have continued to
perpetuate a form of religious persecution and
oppression similar to that which our ancestors
sought to escape. And I do not believe that we
would tolerate any other religion's sacred objects
and rituals to be so misunderstood, misused and mocked.

We can't do anything about the thefts and lies that our American forebears perpetrated on the indigenous people that they encountered. But I am convinced that we can and must do something about the cultural theft and religious misappropriation that continues today. All religious persons of conscience have an obligation to protest the desecration and abuse of Native Americans sacred symbols and rituals. Thank you.

MS. JANNA Mc Gregor: Good afternoon. My name is Janna McGregor, I am a senior in sociology here at the University of Illinois. I also work with the Progressive Resource/Action Cooperative, a group that has delivered numerous anti-Chief speeches to the Board over the last ten years.

The following is a composite of several of these speeches. In October of 1946, Julius Streicher was convicted at Nuremberg of Crimes Against Humanity. His crime: Authoring anti-Semitic articles, editorials, cartoons and images. These images depicted Jewish people in such a derogatory manner so as to dehumanize them
and help make possible the termination of six
million Jewish people by the Third Reich. The
tribunal found him complicit in genocide and
deserving of death by hanging.

Fifty-four years later, our Chief
Illiniwek carries on as a Julius Streicher’s
tradition of racism. The Chief, in many Native’s
societies, holds the revered role of a political
and spiritual leader. To take that role and to
turn it into a vehicle of entertainment at a
half-time show is an insult. It would be akin to
having a mascot of the Pope celebrating communion
in the middle of a football field.

Such distorted caricatures of a people
make possible their dehumanization. The United
Nations 1948 Convention on Punishment and
Prevention of the Crime of Genocide makes it a
crime against humanity to foster those conditions
which promote the eradication of an identifiable
human group. Thus stating in no uncertain terms
the causal relationship between racist propaganda
and the implementation of racist social policy.

Non-Native people since 1492 have
claimed by force the right to own, sell and mock
Native American culture; to misrepresent,
commodify and desecrate Native American religion,
to humiliate, defame and invalidate the voices of
Native American students, elders and spiritual
leaders.

Over five hundred years later,
subordination is real, only the instrument of
oppression today is a prancing Chief Illiniwek.
Joe Gone, a former student at UIUC stated: "The
Chief is not created randomly or out of thin air,
it follows in well worn trajectories in the
American historical tradition of how we represent
Indian people, and that qualifies as a racial
stereotype." End quote.

The place and time for honor and
reparation is not at a half-time minstrel show.
If the UI administration wanted to honor Native
history and culture, it would have established a
Native American studies program and cultural
center. If the administration were interested in
serving its Native American students, it would
have hired a dean of Native American students.
Instead, our administration has lied to and
treated the campus community.
In 1997 Board member Susan Gravenhorst stated, quote, "I just want to make sure that everyone understands that the University has a very strong commitment to the Native American students," end quote. A few years ago, Gravenhorst demonstrated this commitment by promising Native American students a dean. They were strung along in the selection process for almost a year only to be told that funding for this position had magically disappeared.

That's not really what I would call commitment. It sounds more like something I once read of former US President Andrew Jackson. In an 1830 statement to Congress he said, "Toward the aborigines of this country, no one can indulge a more friendly feeling than myself." End quote.

Now this is coming from a man who spent the greater portion of his life implementing such racist policies as the Indian Removal Act which resulted in the infamous Trail of Tears.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate: The existence of racist propaganda facilitates the implementation of racist, social policy. An indispensable step in making the U of
I more inclusive of all persons is the elimination of Chief Illiniwek. Thank you.

MODERATOR GARIPOPO: Those who have prepared remarks, if you would leave a copy of your prepared remarks, it would be helpful to the court reporter. Go ahead.

MR. HENRY EMERLE: Good afternoon. My name is Henry Emerle and I am a senior in cell and structural biology and psychology. I have been involved for the last three years with the Progressive Resource/Action Cooperative in the movement to retire the Chief.

The Chief is wrong in the same way that any racist stereotype is, namely it serves to marginalize, trivialize and disrespect those it portends to represent, regardless of the claimed intent.

The argument has been made today that without the Chief, University of Illinois students would not be able to know anything about Native American and specifically Illini culture. But how can I learn about the true Native history from a fictitious and mythological character?

Why is it that in my five years on this
campus that I haven't taken a class in the
department of Native American studies? Possibly
because there is no such department. Why isn't
there a Native American culture house, why aren't
there Native American faculty, why there are so
few students? The Chief has created such a
hostile campus climate that Native students don't
want to come here. It's tragic that the
University has chosen racist and demeaning
half-time entertainment to educate its students on
the history of Native American. The Chief is a
gross misrepresentation that negatively affects
all people.

In light of what Native Americans and
community members have said today and have been
saying over the years, I request that the Board
reconsider statements that they have made in the
past such as, a quote from Gerald W. Shae, quoted
in the News-Gazette, March 5, 1999, "I just think
it's a good thing. I have not seen any Native
American groups raising any big outcry." Susan
Gravenhorst in 1997, "I still feel that if I were
a Native American person, I would be complimented.
We have taken a particular person from a
particular group and edified him and everyone
thinks so highly of him. And I think that this
would be a source of pleasure to you."

These statements not only show the
Board's complete disregard for the real impact of
the issue, but also violate the University's own
policies. Here I quote from page 1 of the Code on
Campus Affairs.

"The University of Illinois claims
commitment to foster programs within the law which
will ameliorate or eliminate, where possible, the
effects of historic societal discrimination; to
comply fully in all University activities and
programs with applicable federal and state laws
relating to nondiscrimination and equal
opportunity."

It is clear from the testimony of Native
Americans and community members today that the
Chief is both a historic and continuing societal
discrimination and honors no one. It's obvious
that the Board has ignored their commitment to the
University and the community for the last 74
years. The fact that the Chief still exists is an
insult to what the University claims to stand for.
Thank you.

MS. LISA JOHNSON: My name is Lisa Johnson and I am representing the Social Justice Committee of the School of Social Work here at UIUC. We are here to voice our opposition to the use of Chief Illiniwek as a symbol of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. If we accept the pro-Chief argument that Chief Illiniwek should remain as the symbol of UIUC because it is a great tradition of the University, are we then accepting that slavery, which was also a great tradition of the US, should have remained? Are we saying that civil rights for minorities should have been denied? Are we saying that restricting women from voting should have continued? Was the use of black faces in theatrical presentations a tradition that should not have ceased?

Today few would claim that slavery, denying minorities their civil rights, women's restriction from voting, or the use of black faces in entertainment are great traditions of our past. Society has taken great strides to eliminate the seemingly great traditions. Why should these efforts end with Native Americans. In 50 years,
will people be wondering why there was a need to
have this discussion today? Indeed it simply
should not be an issue.

We know that great tradition does not
mean that it is right to ignore the negative
impacts it has on the minority group that has been
and continues to be oppressed by the majority.
Thus, we want to demonstrate that merely because
something is or was a tradition, it does not speak
at all to the righteousness of the effect and
impact of such traditions.

Supporters of Chief Illiniwek have
proudly claimed that the real issue here is
intent. That they mean no harm in maintaining the
Chief. Rather they claim that the Chief is meant
to honor and respect Native Americans. The
problem is that intentions are not what determines
the degree to which something is acceptable.
Regardless of what they hope will be the effect of
their actions, the reality of the situation is
quite different. For as we understand the Chief
does not honor, it is not respectful, it is
derogatory. It plainly does not achieve what it
is intended to do.
Keeping the Chief would set a harmful precedent which would explain to the world that it does not matter how an institution's actions affect a group of people. It would say that intent is sufficient to justify these actions.

We conclude by quoting from the University's nondiscrimination statement which states, "The commitment of the University to the most fundamental principles of academic freedom, equality of opportunity and human dignity requires that decisions involving students and employees be based on individual merit and be free from invidious discrimination in all its forms."

Retaining the Chief as a mascot of the U of I is in direct violation of this statement. Thus, we call for the immediate and unconditional removal of Chief Illiniwek from the U of I. Doing so would be to take a step towards closing the gap between words and actions. Thank you.

MR. ANDY ERICKSON: My name is Andy Erickson, I am a student at the University. And sometimes I am not very proud to be a student at this University. Because of this, not the forum, but the reason we have to have this forum. If I
knew what I knew now about racism at this University, I probably would have taken my money elsewhere. I guess it got a little heated right before we took the lunch break, I saw a tour group with perspective students, I think that's who they were. I told them not to bring their kids here because the Board doesn't care about the Native American community.

You have shown time and time again that you don't care. There's why there was a Native American crying here. She said she couldn't come to this University, because she had felt that it was too racist. It wasn't honor that made her cry. It was racism. And I am not saying it's blatant racism, I am not saying that you are directly telling her that she is subhuman or that her people are inferior or anything like that. But that's what you imply every time you let the Chief prance around on the football field and every time you tell Native American organizations that you don't want to hear what they have to say.

I know that the Chief isn't supposed to be offensive. But it is. I know that the Chief supporters don't see anything wrong with it, but
they are not the ones being mocked every time the
Chief prances. Every major Native American
organization has denounced our mascot. Doesn't
that bother you? I know it bothers them. It
bothers them that they are -- that this University
is so unwilling to discontinue this mockery of
their culture. It makes them cry. Is this honor?
The University of Illinois which claims to be so
advanced is behind the times. There is no reason
why it is more important to keep this mascot than
it is to end the humiliation they are causing
people.

I know that the University has
continually denied that the Chief is racist in any
way. They can deny it as much as you want. But
the University mascot is still causing pain to the
Native American community and it's real pain and
it's the pain of racism.

And the pain of racism is a lot more
piercing than the pain that will be felt from
losing the Chief. I understand the supporter's
positions, though it may not seem like it. My
father went to school here, my grandfather went to
school here. They all loved the Chief. I am sure
if my grandfather would hear what I have to say
now, he would be very upset. But I know that his
pain would go away.

The pain of racism does not go away. It
never goes away. The mascot is racist because the
Native American community feels it. They know
it's racist and other people do too. And you need
to do the right thing. I know that you have heard
that a bunch. But I think you know what it is.
So we are going to keep coming back until either
you do the right thing or someone sitting in those
chairs who has enough compassion to understand
that there is no place for racism at the
University of Illinois.

So, I just want to say one more time, I
challenge you to find one good reason why it's
more important to keep this mascot than it is to
end the real humiliation, not honor, that we are
causing an entire race of people. Thank you.

MR. JOE PERALEZ: My name is Joe
Peralez. I am a Comanche Indian, member of the
American Indian movement. Founder of the AICI
Association, Chicago Native American retreat, I am
employed as a prosthetist and orthotist at a
What I want to say is the issue of this Chief is this, it's not an issue of political correctness, it's racism is what it is. So subtle, so subtle people are blinded from hearing the truth. The truth comes down the street and everybody wants to run. Nobody wants to hear it. The issue is this is it.

On a Comanche Indian reservation, children were being inoculated by the FDA with experimental drugs and they were told to the parents, don't worry about it, we are just going to see what this drug does. The parents were not aware what is going on. That diminished Indian human life. And that has -- I grew up in a time in this country in this century that I saw that as a youth, as a young boy. And as times changed, we have to change, so does the University and its perspectives.

If is money, you have to look at these alumni people who may have intended to have the Chief as an honorable thing in the beginning, but now it is he is skewed, just like our government, the founding fathers of this government had a
great idea. The country is still standing, but now things are going awry to some degree. We question our government. So we question the Chief, the same thing. So we look at this and we say to ourselves what is this?

I saw this person five years ago dancing, that was not a dance. It was very offensive. As a Native person I danced, but I did not dance a dance that I would like to dance because I can no longer physically do that.

In order for me to do what I have to do as a Native person, I have to attain rights to do that when this so-called Chief can do this blatantly, that is subtle racism without consideration to the people who it affects.

Napoleon was right, the victor gets to write history. This is what is perpetuated. The Chief perpetuates the domination of this functional European process. It is not the way Native men are taking care of their families and their children and their wives. This is not a Chief. The Chief is a father, he is a son, he is a brother, he is an uncle. He is a caretaker, he is a giver.
This Chief is nothing other than a clown. And clowns are respected in Native communities because they are taught to be clowns. They are supposed to take what is serious in our lives and give people a different perspective to really look at what they are seeing or how they are acting. This clown does not do that either.

So in closing, I say this: Your alumni, the old alumni who like to keep the chief, they are going to die soon, just like me and you. Our time is limited. You have to look forward to new money coming in. When my son finishes his tour with the United States Marine Corps, he wants to go to the University. I have to tell him, you have to think about this one and really consider it. You will lose money in the future. If money is the issue. Thank you for your time.

MS. ROXIE GRIGNON: Thank you, Indian brother. My name is Roxie Grignon, I am a Menominee from Menominee Nation, Wisconsin, and I work in Chicago. I am the executive director for the Native American Foster Parents Association and the Indian Child Welfare Agency. I am the mother of four, grandmother to 12 and the foster mother
to over 30 Native American children. And I am here on behalf of my children.

I pray every day and I teach my children to pray, and I have asked them to pray for the decision that you know as Board of Trustees you need to make on this issue here of the mascot.

My children as my brother Joe had said, are the future, are the ones that will be sitting at this table or attending this school. And they won't have to look at no Chief Illiniwek. I know that the decision that you will be making and I have prayed about this, is going to be positive towards our people, the Native people in this country. It's going to be a right decision. I know you will be losing some money. But you should be feeling good in your hearts, because you know that that's the right thing to do. I pray every day and I will continue to pray every day and I ask all of my brothers and sisters, Native and non-Native, to pray and help you with the strength to make this decision that you need to make today, or in the future. Thank you.

MR. TODD ISLER: My name is Todd Isler, I am a Champaign resident. I would like to begin
with a quote. "Instead of asking how much damage
will the work in question bring about, why not ask
how much good, how much joy?" Henry Miller. The
Air Conditioned Nightmare.

Those protesting the Chief seem
unwilling to even think of asking how much good,
how much joy as far as this symbol is concerned.

In other words, they refuse to see the
possibilities of good in any point of view other
than their own. And that is what I find so
disheartening. That those who constantly scream
for respect are now showing no respect for any
viewpoint other than their own narrow one, and
that the same ones who are calling for tolerance,
are showing no tolerance for anyone else's
opinion.

This is especially distressing, and
bitterly ironic, in the case of the English
Department's recent call to end the Chief's reign.
One would think one of the very first to step
forward in defending a form of expression under
attack would be the English department of a
university. Instead, this one has sadly chosen to
join in the fray.
There was something which caused a similar controversy back in 1928 when the American Hebrew and Jewish Tribune demanded that a certain corporation pull from its inventory an item stating that, quote, "We charge them with an attempt to cash in on the misery and catastrophe of an important section of the human family," unquote.

Does that sound similar to a few of the anti-Chief arguments that the University is cashing in by participating in the humiliation of a defeated people? The corporation in question was Houghton Mifflin, and the item was "Mein Kampf," a work that can definitely be said to contain stereotypes.

Another similar incident was when the black community demanded the removal of a certain thing from a public school, because they claimed it advocated institutionalized racism and was harmful to the integration process. Was the thing in question a mascot? No, it was the book by Harper Lee, "To Kill a Mocking Bird." What of "The Grapes of Wrath," which has been attacked by the public for its portrayal of women? Or "The
Adventures of Tom Sawyer" and "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn," both decried as racist by members from the public and both removed from schools?

What am I trying to establish? That the groups who want the Chief censored are themselves censors? No. But more than simply the bitter irony of this University's English department calling for the head of Chief Illiniwek. I am trying to establish the idea that there lies a connection between those who demanded the removal of those books and those who now demand the removal of the Chief.

If you still doubt, consider that the NCAA, which has called for the removal of Chief Illiniwek, has also in the past stood as one of the foremost groups demanding the removal of Mark Twain's "The Adventures of Tom Sawyer" from the shelves of school libraries, as well as "To Kill a Mocking Bird."

I am trying to make you see that Chief Illiniwek is a form of expression, just as the books I have mentioned are also a form of expression, and those who are demanding the
immediate removal, are the same sort who would
demand the removal of those books from this
University's library.

To touch upon their argument that his
presence dehumanizes Native Americans in the eyes
of others, this idea that allowing people to be
exposed to certain forms of expression, may compel
them to act in a certain way and therefore the
solution is to ban said form of expression, is to
take the blame off the shoulders where it belongs:
The listener, not the speaker. For I strongly
believe that, whatever we may be exposed to, we as
individuals are ultimately responsible for
digesting that information, and whatever actions
we choose to take based upon said digestion.

If a certain idea can be seen as having
a dehumanizing effect, I still insist the best
solution is to counter with humanizing speech.
Also, for obviously if they say that speech --
talk about negative speech, whatever, speech can
have a negative effect, obviously the counter-
speech should have a positive effect. Instead of
just calling for the removal, how about calling
for positive speech.
In 1995, the Federal Department of Education Civil Rights Office ruled, after an investigation on this issue, that the Chief does not create a hostile environment.

I would like to conclude with a quote. It's from John Stuart Mill "On Liberty," "The peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is that it is robbing the human race; posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth; if wrong, they lose, which is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its conclusion with error." Thank you.

REVEREND JAKE CRAMER-HEUERMAN: I am the Reverend Jake Cramer-Heuerman. I am born and raised person from the State of Illinois. I am a graduate of this University. I am an alumnus. I have a degree from this University in philosophy and history. I am a donor to this University. I am a member and officer in one of the booster clubs. I am a season ticket holder for the
women's volleyball and I believe that it's time to retire Chief Illiniwek.

I grew up in a county that was 100 percent European American. I attended a high school whose identity was the Red Ravens. I played sports in a conference that had a team named the Pekin Chinks.

And I found this University to be a very important place for me where I grew in my understanding of cultural diversity and passivity. Many people have talked about Chief Illiniwek as an honored and revered symbol, or an honored and sacred symbol. As a person whose profession is in the religious community, I think I know something about such symbols.

And I have listened carefully to my Native American brothers and sisters who are part of the United Methodist Church and other faith communities. And they have reminded me about honor and revered symbols and about honor and sacred symbols in terms of their authenticity, how and where the symbol is displayed and the unity and pride that it represents as a way to recognize those that are truly honored and revered or
honored and sacred symbols.

Questions have been brought up all day long that remind us to really consider the authenticity of Chief Illiniwek. From the music that is used, from the dance steps that are used, to the costume that is a part of it. That symbol raises some serious questions about its authenticity. How that symbol is displayed, I have seen it on lamp shades, I have seen it on posters, I have seen it on schedules of sporting events. I know various places where that symbol is displayed. And sometimes it does not say much in terms of being honored and revered.

And many today have addressed the questions of whether or not this symbol brings unity and pride to this community. As to the issue of political correctness, sometimes we have to overcome our tendency to exclude, our prejudice and our racism, not based on a set of votes, but because it is simply the right and just and wise choice.

In the county where I was raised, it was not considered offensive to not have any other ethnic groups as a part of the population of that
county. It was acceptable to have a high school
with a team named the Pekin Chinks and nobody saw
anything wrong with that. But it was not the just
and right and fair thing to do. Many of you are
familiar with Rotary, are involved in Rotary. And
I want to remind us of the Rotary four way test as
I conclude these remarks.

    The Rotary four way test says is it the
truth? Is it fair to all concerned? Will it
build good will and friendship? Will it be
beneficial to all concerned?

    I ask you as you consider the
possibility of retiring this honored and revered
symbol, Chief Illiniwek, what is the truth of
this, what would be fair to all concerned? What
builds good will and better friendships and what
is the benefit that could come out for our Native
American brothers and sisters. Thank you.

    MR. BRUCE TWO EAGLES: Good afternoon,
Your Honor, and Board. My name is Bruce Two
Eagles. And the importance of this coming here, I
have cancer of the spine. And I drove eleven and
a half hours to be here for four minutes. That's
how important this is.
When I was in the 7th grade, I was called into school, I am an urban Indian, I was brought up off the reservation. And I was called into the school guidance with my mother. And the guidance counselor told my mother, Bruce is very intelligent for an Indian. He should do well in the trades.

About 25 years prior to that is when the Chief was picked as the mascot here. And I am sure cultural sensitivity was not part of the picking of the Chief. I talk to you today about moral decline of your school, the morality, the things that you have done in the last year and a half to keep your Chief. One of those being a letter writing campaign offering the people on the Lac Courte reservation a thousand dollars for the best leather depicting their enthusiasm about the Chief. They threw you off the reservation.

You last year you sent students to the Peoria tribe to get their input. And they lied to the tribal council and were asked to leave the meeting. That's what caused the Peoria tribe to write the resolution you got this morning, saying remove the Chief. He's offensive. Your offering
of a bounty to the Eastern Band Cherokee graduate students, high school students to come to the University of Illinois because they have the contracts to supply tomahawks and headdresses to the Atlanta Braves, they are trained mascots. You have gone there and offered a bounty for their students. Where is your moral decline? It's right here. And it's live and in color and it's in front of you.

I can tell you about how dishonored I am, but you have heard it from a thousand people. How many minority people have to tell you they are offended before you are going to say this is racism? This is the high school -- or the school yard bully that we are dealing with. You have got a little power, you have got the control, and it doesn't matter what the minority thinks. You are the powerful majority.

You want entertainment at half-time? Have your good alums go out at half-time and wave their check books in the air, that's what you are interested in is the money. You want entertainment with your mascot? Get a puppy. You want political correctness? Yes, you do. Because
you are white. You live in my shoes, you live in a minority's shoes and there is no such thing as too much political correctness. We ask to be human beings.

Don't parade my spirituality at on your campuses. In front of you, I handed out symbols of racism today. You have a copy of it in front of you. Also you have a report by Doctor Jace Weaver which is now accepted by the US Department of Justice of what constitute religious items that are Native American in the school system. Read it. It's nine pages. Thank you.

TRUSTEE SCHMIDT: If someone would tell Mr. Two Eagles that he did not leave nine pages. He left, I mean if there are more, we would like to have them.

MR. TWO EAGLES: The web site is on there. It's obtainable on our web site. Also, you can contact Lawrence Parker at US government.Org.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: But it's on the web site? Thank you very much.

MS. MONICA GARRETON: Good afternoon.

My name is Monica Garreton and I am a sophomore in
political science here at the University. When I
first came to U of I in the fall of 1998 I was
pretty much apathetic about Chief Illiniwek. I
had heard the pro-Chief side's argument but
something didn't sit right with me. I had also
heard of Jay Rosenstein's, "In Whose Honor" and it
sounded like a good way to hear the other side's
opinion on the issue.

So I made it out to the Progressive
Resource/Action Cooperative's teach-in this past
semester and watched the film I had heard so much
about. As soon as it ended, all that was running
through my mind was Native American activist
Charlene Teters' voice describing the horrified
looks on the faces of her children when they saw
Chief Illiniwek for the first time at a U of I
basketball game.

The heartache I felt for those children
soon turned to anger. I knew that I couldn't just
sit quietly for the rest of my educational career
while Native people were stereotyped and made a
mockery of at every sporting event and on every
piece of University merchandise.

I decided to turn my anger into
involvement. I joined the PRC and have been organizing ever since. Instead of quelling my anger, it only increased when I realized our efforts, while gaining campus, national and international support, were following on deaf ears of the people who should have been listening the hardest.

So that's why I am here today, because maybe today you will understand what you haven't understood for the last ten years.

For over ten years, UIUC students have asked you nicely, pleaded with you to retire your Chief. Throughout these years, we have also screamed about you, the Board of Trustees and President of one of the most prestigious universities in the world. We screamed about how we, your students, desire a Native American studies program. And we scream about how you have failed to admit that as long as you have your chief, we will never have the reputable American Indian faculty and students necessary for such a program.

We scream about how demeaning it is for the chair of this board to embarrasses UIUC on
national television by claiming that the Chief is
culture as far as UIUC is concerned. We scream
about the thousands of hours we invest in creating
authentic, diverse cultural programming on this
campus, and still, not only do you not praise us
on national television, you do not attend our
events or support us as much as you do your Chief.

We scream because the rest of the world
must think we are all like you, more attached to
honoring the culture of those people that you make
little effort to retain at UIUC, than creating an
environment in which all students can thrive,
learn, develop and graduate with pride, not
embarrassment.

In his book, "Lies My Teacher Told Me,"
James Loewen, a recent visitor to this campus,
remarks that, "Native Americans are not and must
not be props in a sort of theme park of the past,
where we go to have a good time and see exotic
cultures."

As we have been in the past and will
continue to in the future as alumni, we now scream
about how you fail to listen to the voices of your
American Indian students when they tell you how
much your Chief hurts them. Maybe if we
non-Native students scream with them you will
hear?

We scream because when you defend your
Chief, you sound like racists, colonizers, a
Columbus. We scream because Columbus is not our
hero. We scream because your chief is not our
mascot, symbol or mythological being. We are
angry because we do not want reputable faculty and
gifted students to reject teaching or attending
UIUC because we are known as racists here.

We scream because although you have no
obligation to educate UIUC's alumni, you are more
congruent about making this campus an environment
more conducive to their enjoyment of football
games than conducive to our education.

We scream because you do have an
obligation to honor the people, Native, Asian,
African, Latino, Middle Eastern and Caucasian
American or of mixed heritage on this campus. We
scream because you have an obligation to us and
you are not being honorable by not listening or
responding in our demands that you retire Chief
Illiniwek. Thank you.
MODERATOR GARIPPO: Again, if you will leave the statement on the stage. We would appreciate it.

MR. NORMAN DENZIN: My name is Norman Denzin, I am a professor of communications and sociology. I am honored to be part of these proceedings. And I wish to thank all the involved parties who have made this participation possible. I believe it's possible to hold contradictory attitudes towards one's institution. I have been privileged to teach at this great University for over 30 years. I stand in awe of many of my colleagues and their intellectual accomplishments. I gaze in wonder across the marvelous landscape that frames this beautiful land campus. I daily benefit from the actions and policies of our administrators. My chest swells with pride when our athletic teams soar to victory overcoming insurmountable odds. At the same time, I cringe when I see the image of Chief Illiniwek appear on the television screen or on the pages of the daily newspaper or on packages of meat sold by agricultural sales. I find the framed image of the Chief offensive.
I have listened to my learned colleagues in anthropology and English and other fields. I have listened to the testimony of Native Americans and the best judgment of these people is this mascot is contentious, detrimental and offensive.

I believe that the use of the Chief as a mascot has serious educational consequences for this campus. It compromises the intellectual mission of this great University. The Chief works against the building of cultural understanding and mutual respect among racial and ethnic groups on this campus. It's clear that this mascot exists at the center of competing discourses. Its meanings are controversial and political. But the times have changed and the meanings of the symbol have changed.

I further believe that it's not appropriate for one group to say that another group is just wrong, to assert that they misunderstood what the symbol means. We cannot shout each other down. We cannot legislate the meanings of this symbol. Calling each other names will not advance the conversation or the dialogue.

So I am now at a crossroads. I seek a
principle that will guide my actions. There must
be a way to show us how to do the right thing. To
act with compassion and love, without rancor or
bitterness. How can I love an institution that
engages in offensive practices.

This conflict could not be resolved in
terms of a majority vote. We must seek recourse
in a higher moral principle. There is ample
precedent for the operation of such a principle.
Major civil rights issues in the United States
history have been resolved, not by a popularity
contest, or by a vote of the majority, but in
terms of what was morally correct. African-
Americans and women were denied the right to vote
by a majority of the population.

In the present case the moral principle
is clear, it is not appropriate for one racial
group to use the imagery of another racial group
for political, cultural or entertainment purposes.
Accordingly, a new school symbol must be selected.
Thank you.

MR. FRED CASH: Good afternoon, Your
Honor, distinguished members of the Board of
Directors, University of Illinois, my fellow
Americans and my fellow Illini. My name is Fred Cash, I am one of nine members of my family by blood or marriage that graduated from this fine institution. I also was the 17th Chief for the University of Illinois.

I want to start with one quote, "Of all areas of study that a student can select, history provides the student with the best opportunity to profit from his studies," so sayeth Malcolm X.

I think we have to look back at history, Illinois, you see the name on the flag, Illini. Nine tribes, Kaskaskia, Tamaroa, Tapouaro, Michigamea, Moingwena, Peoria, Cahokia, Chepoussa, Coiracoentanon, Illinois.

It's amazing every Indian tribe that I have heard mentioned today was in fact an enemy of the Illini. The Illini at one time numbered about 18,000, when they finally sold this land that we stand on, there was maybe 240.

Your Honor, if this were a court of law, you might be challenging some of the opposition as to their standing before this court. What we are talking about is the Illini, five specific tribes, an amalgamation formed the tribe the Illini. What
we have here is, in fact, now you know what the
Illini felt like being hit from every single
different direction. The Ojibwe and Kickapoo from
the north, the Sioux and Missouri from the west,
the Chickasaw, the Quapaw, the Cherokee from the
south and I just heard the Seneca and Iroquois
from the east.

They could not hold this land anymore
and they sold it. If you look at history at West
Point, you will find that the Illini were in fact
the most loyal to the French. In fact, in the
battle of DuQuoin with Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania,
current Washington, surrendered to the French and
the Illini in the beginning of the French and
Indian War.

Your Honor, also, some Indians retain
sovereign rights, which they should have. Today
they have casinos. You noticed before anybody,
any Native American receives any remuneration from
those casinos, they must prove that they belong to
that tribe, at least 1/32, 1/16, sometimes one
quarter.

And yet we are talking about Native
Americans. The Illini were a first nation, first
nation. Chief Chicago, maybe that name rings a bell to you, seven years before George Washington was born, Chief Chicago was in France basically with Louis the 15th, 18 years before Thomas Jefferson, 48 years before William Henry Harrison and 112 years before one of the finest generals from this country, Sitting Bull was even born. The Illini were already consulting with the world leaders.

Mr. Kaufman talked about, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, I have here a letter from Thomas Jefferson to Tonti, Chief of the Kaskaskia, where he was thanking him for help in the revolutionary war, and here is quickly what Thomas Jefferson said. As soon as the war is over --

MODERATOR GARIPPO: If you have any further remarks, you can leave them on the stage.

MR. DINO POLLOCK: Good afternoon, my name is Dino Pollock, I am a graduate student. I address you today as a present day student and an alumnus of this University and a former Division I student athlete playing football from 1986 to 1990. I address you today as someone who is
extremely devoted to racial justice. As a man --
as a conscience man of African descent, I find the
continued use of the Chief at this University
absolutely reprehensible, repulsive, extremely
racist and for you to sit up there and continue to
condone the use of this symbol severely
compromises your moral authority to discuss
anything on this campus relating to anybody's
behavior.

I have found through my study as a
conscience African man in this country that
ethical and moral appeals to white institutions
and white people are in vain. They do not work.
Emotional appeals do not work for you. Logical
appeals today, people who are far more scholarly
and informed than I am have come before you today
to offer you logical reasons why this ridiculous
mascot should be eliminated. So logic doesn't
work.

It seems like the only thing that white
institutions and white people understand is either
litigation or violence. And that is when pressure
is placed and that is when you throw out a few
bones, to put the people back to sleep so that
they will not rise up and continue to fight for justice. Because the issue you have is, as Martin Luther King said, injustice inflicted anywhere is inflicted justice everywhere. We exist in a state of war on this campus, in terms of the war between justice and injustice.

And right now, we are losing that battle as a university. You as the Board of Trustees, contrary to popular opinion, are not the final authority on this issue. We do not come to you to ask you for anything. The final authority on this issue is going to be a power much higher than you. And if all of us profess to be the good Christians and Muslims or Jews, or people that practice traditional religion and we know that there is a higher power, you know that you are going to have to answer for your vote on this issue.

This campus was founded in 1867, the next year 77 white men enrolled, 77 white men. How many white women on this campus when it was begun? As a person who is the descendent of people who have had to have five constitutional amendments just to bring us within the purview of the laws of this country, I find it absolutely
disgusting that I have to come before you again today and say the same thing over and over and over and over again.

If litigation or violence is what you want, you will continue this Chief. And I am not threatening violence, I am not threatening litigation. I am saying that those are the only two things that seem to have got people of color any type of remuneration in this country in terms of justice.

Doctor John Clark said that the art of civilization is about the art of being civil. What I suggest today is that you take the step, the one baby step in the journey of a thousand miles and be civil to indigenous peoples and eliminate and kill swiftly this Chief Illiniwek. The U of I should become a member of the civilized world of the 21st century and dismiss Chief Illiniwek. We are not here to be toilet paper to be wiped upon.

MRS. AGNES SIMMS: I am Agnes Simms, and I am pro-Chief and I am know how it feels just in the last hour to be in the minority. I also believe that having been here since 8:00 that I
think there is also the saying and the last shall be first.

It is fitting that Chief Illiniwek is the honored symbol of the University of Illinois. By means of this symbol a tribute is paid to those Native Americans who once lived here on this land we call Illinois. By this honored and respected symbol, we are saying we remember them.

The Chief is not a mascot, as about 100 people have said today. The costume that the Chief wears and the dance that he does reminds me of the costumes and the dance that my husband and I saw on Second Mesa, Arizona, when they had their pow-wow. It is almost exactly the same.

We were there --

MODERATOR GARIPOPO: Please.

MRS. SIMMS: Many considered him to be a dignified reminder of an Indian past. I do not understand why Native American activists want to get rid of Chief Illiniwek. If I were, if I were one of them, would I not want to have as many symbols as I could to remind everyone of the tribe that was here first?

Our Hopi Indian friends spend much time
in private events working to keep the customs and
beliefs of their tribe reserved for their children
and grandchildren and their children. This is an
important part of their history and it is not
written down. So they are extra busy keeping,
preserving all of these customs and beliefs
verbally. It worries elders that these young
people seem not overly concerned about preserving
their culture.

If Chief Illiniwek truly offends even
one person, could that not be in the eye of the
beholder? One person may say what a beautiful day
and another says the sun is too bright. Is the
glass half full or half empty.

Jerry Klein, a columnist with the
Journal Star, Peoria, Illinois, entitled an
article, "Illiniwek Celebrates Our Rich History."
He asks, "Why is it that Native American activists
you most hear from seem determined to erase any
memory, any celebration, any sign that they once
were the only civilization this country possessed.
And how, indeed, can we celebrate this heritage
without offending someone?"

He remarked that we have to be careful
so as we do not offend groups. His article continues, quote, "So we have Chief Illiniwek being called a race-based mascot, which sounds like one of those tired cliches that comes right out of the political correctness handbook. And for the moment, the main spokesperson seems to be Charlene Teters who was once a student at the University of Illinois."

Well, so did I, and I will tell you that Chief Illiniwek is part of my heritage too. These are our Indians, these Braves, these Kickapoos, they are part of our glorious past and to sacrifice our rich, historical traditions because they might offend somebody or because they are perceived by some to be politically incorrect is unthinkable.

Let's celebrate this rich past of ours with more Indian dances and Irish ones and Jewish ones.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: Thank you.

MS. CAROL SPINDEL: My name is Carol Spindel. I am an adjunct faculty member in the Department of English. I have taught here since 1989. I am also an alumna. I teach nonfiction
writing and for the past four years I have researched and written a book about the controversy over American Indian sports mascots entitled "Dancing at Half-Time," it is forthcoming in August from New York University Press.

When I started the book, I was not convinced either way. But after years of research and interviews, and after following Native American activists and educators around as they speak to state legislators, school boards and sports fans, I have made up my mind on this issue. Since you have not seen this for yourself, I want to tell you that I have been shocked at how these Indian people are received. Again and again, I observed as they stated their genuine concerns about the effects of stereotyping on their children and young people. Again and again, I watched and listened as they said they were offended. They were ignored, discounted and angrily attacked for speaking up.

How can this be when sports fans, school boards and university trustees all claim to honor and respect American Indians? This contradiction, between the admiration fans genuinely feel for
this fictional character, and the way they treat living, breathing American Indian people is at the very dark heart of this debate.

What has been lacking in this debate for ten years is historical context. Unfortunately, I can't give you that in four minutes. I would just like to say quickly that Americans have divided Indians into two categories, and here I speak of nonIndian Americans. The real and the imaginary.

Historically, we have shown little interest in real Indian people. When they speak up, we are quick to dismiss them, not full-blooded, not traditional, given up their Indian ways, belonged to the wrong tribe. We have created laws forcing them to give up their cultures and religions and then refused to recognize them as real Indians when their cultures change, as all human cultures do constantly. This ambivalence of ours has put Indian people in a real bind.

Chief Illiniwek is an imaginary Indian, the kind we have been interested in. Where did he come from? I hear Pine Ridge, home of the Oglala Sioux. That is where we purchased his costume.
But his performance cannot be traced to any tribal tradition. It comes to us straight from Buffalo Bill and the Wild West show. Wild West shows were part of the American circus tradition. They traveled to small towns all over the country between 1900 and 1920, putting on one or two shows under a big top and then moving on.

Buffalo Bill and other circus owners employed Indians, mostly from the Sioux nation, as actors. And another parallel with the University of Illinois, Buffalo Bill claimed his sketches were historically accurate, educational and morally uplifting. Three forms of entertainment still exist today: The western, the rodeo and the half-time performance.

In 1926 while Boy Scouts here were pretending to be Indians and dancing publicly, American Indians were forbidden by law to dance themselves. They did not stop dancing, of course, but they had to do so surreptitiously or else risk punishment. It was not until 1934 and the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act that American Indians could perform their own dances on their own reservations without risking punishment.
Buffalo Bill promoted the idea that his show was historical to make a buck. He was all showman and he knew what business he was in. Show business. We are here at a public university. Buffalo Bill died in 1917. You are here in 2000. Please have the courage and let's end this Wild West show.

MODERATOR GARIPPO: I hate to do this, but I have scheduled two more speakers than we have time to hear. I am sorry. We have Kevin Baldwin and William McCray. I understand we have to vacate the auditorium for another event. And it's unfortunate we didn't hear everybody. It's my fault that I scheduled too many. And we went a little slower this afternoon than I thought we were going to.

So, I wish to thank all of you who have participated. The remarks were eloquent on both sides. We have heard a lot. And I believe the, together with what we heard today and the input that we can receive through the e-mails and correspondence, I am sure that I am going to be able to put together a report that adequately states the position of all sides.
I would like to be reminded that Tuesday there is still an opportunity to video tape your remarks on the second floor lobby. And those video taped remarks will be considered along with the remarks of today. So, that's finished. They are off now. I'm sorry. If you could submit those in writing to us. I would appreciate it. I hate to do this, I know you probably all waited very long. I wish to thank you.

I wish to thank the staff for volunteering the time and maintaining the atmosphere of, today. It was truly an inspiring set of speeches that we heard today on both sides of the issue. And I thank you all. If you all just please exit this auditorium as quickly as possible.
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