

AMERICAN INDIAN FOUNDATIONS:  
PHILANTHROPIC CHANGE AND ADAPTATION

Dagmar Seely

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree  
Master of Arts  
in the Department of Philanthropic Studies  
Indiana University

May 2007

Accepted by the Faculty of Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

---

Dwight Burlingame, Ph.D.,  
Chairman

---

Frances A. Huehls, Ph.D.

Master's Thesis  
Committee

---

William Brescia, Ph.D.

c 2007

Dagmar Seely

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge and extend appreciation for the support of the thesis *American Indian Foundations: Philanthropic Change and Adaptation* to the following: Thesis Committee Members, Dr. Dwight Burlingame, Chair, Dr. Frances Huehls, and Dr. William Brescia. As well I acknowledge the philanthropic studies faculty and staff of the library, special collections, and archives. A special acknowledgement is extended to the Thesis Research Committee of the Center on Philanthropy. Lastly, recognition is given for the support provided by the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, the staff of the philanthropic studies graduate programs, and the University Graduate School.

## ABSTRACT

Dagmar Seely

### AMERICAN INDIAN FOUNDATIONS: PHILANTHROPIC CHANGE AND ADAPTATION

The thesis, *American Indian Foundations: Philanthropic Change and Adaptation*, explores definition of the issues which impelled the development of grantmaking foundations as vehicles for American Indian community development. *American Indian foundations* are grantmaking foundations by and for American Indians. They frequently incorporate technical support, fiscal sponsorship and management of their own programs in ways which are unique to American Indians.

The thesis is based on a case study and analysis of the formation and development of the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development (and its predecessor the Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project), the first American Indian national public grantmaking foundation.

The research design is based on primary source research and a literature review, augmented by a case study, and amplified by in-depth experience in the field of American Indian philanthropy. The literature review encompasses the relevant primary issues of the thesis and also covers an historical philanthropic review of influences on the development and inception of American Indian philanthropy.

Original documents relative to these subjects were located in the manuscript and microfilm collection of the Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison; the Field Foundation Archives of the Center for American History at the University of Texas, Austin; and the Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives, and the Joseph and Matthew Payton Philanthropic Studies Library, both located at Indiana University in Indianapolis.

The thesis is based on a primary research question and framed by six subsidiary questions. The thesis concluded that perhaps American Indian foundations were formulated to better serve their peoples in the absence of philanthropic attention. In addition they were formed to address underserved philanthropic needs in ways unique to American Indians. As well with regard to the case study, the primary reason for the founding of the first American Indian national grantmaking foundation was to apply the theoretical concepts of sovereignty and self-sufficiency into practicality in Indian country.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One	American Indian Philanthropy as a Field of Inquiry.....1
	Introduction.....1
	Methodology.....3
	Definition of Terms.....4
	Sources of Evidence and Authority.....6
	Analytical Technique and Research Design.....7
	American Indian Philanthropy as a Field of Inquiry.....9
	Theoretical Basis for American Indian Philanthropy....16
Chapter Two	Philanthropy and American Indians.....21
	Early Influences.....21
	Conceptual Development of Philanthropy Applied to
	American Indians.....23
	Social Process of Philanthropy.....23
	Foundations Facilitating Reform.....24
	American Indian <i>Self-Help</i> .....27
	Contemporary Conceptual Influences.....32
	Broadening the Spectrum of
	Institutional Philanthropy.....33
	Innovative Foundations to Support
	the Underrepresented.....36

	Diversification of Foundations.....	41
	The Development of Minority Foundations.....	43
Chapter Three	Case Study: The <i>Seventh Generation</i> Fund for Indian Development.....	52
	The Origins.....	57
	Emergence of a Grantmaker.....	67
	Independent Foundation.....	76
Chapter Four	Case Analysis.....	84
	Factors Contributing to Its Inception.....	84
	Challenges.....	87
	Approach.....	91
	Distinctions.....	94
Chapter.Five	Conclusions.....	100
	Further Areas for Research.....	104



Appendix.....	107
Case Study Timeline.....	107
References.....	111
Primary and Secondary Source Collections.....	111
General References.....	113
Curriculum Vitae	

## Introduction

Examined within the philanthropic historical context of that era as well as exploring the influences that contributed to its inception, this thesis explores the reasons for the development of the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development and its role in encouraging the development of American Indian philanthropy.

American Indian foundations have played a tremendous role in American Indian community development over the past two decades, yet little is known about philanthropy and its relevance to American Indians. It is a relatively new field and its overall value has not been documented, its import not fully realized, its stages of development understood; its practices, theories and ethical underpinnings in the broadest sense articulated; and its potential relevance clarified.

American Indian initiated, controlled and directed foundations were among the innovative foundations developed during the years 1960 - 1990 to support the self-help efforts of grassroots Indians.<sup>1</sup> Prior to this time, there was little support for the community-based efforts of the underrepresented by foundations.<sup>2</sup> The primary

---

<sup>1</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, April). Our First Issue. 1(1), 1-2. *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1981, September). 4(3, 4).

<sup>2</sup> Margolis, Richard J. (1973, March/April). White Philanthropy and the Red Man. *Foundations News*, 14(2), 13-22.

emphasis of foundations was on large institutional development and large strategic approaches to problems and their solutions. With the advent of addressing issues of poverty, racism, and rights, and the direct efforts of people to lift themselves up from the situations they were in, a proliferation of new foundations were developed to provide support for these growing efforts.<sup>3</sup>

One of the early foundations formed as part of the *innovative* foundation developments and highlighted as an exemplary model of this new type of foundation was The Youth Project, a Washington, DC based effort founded in 1970 to support community-based efforts through grants, technical assistance, and fundraising assistance.<sup>4</sup> One of the grantmaking programs of The Youth Project was the Tribal Sovereignty Program, an American Indian effort founded by Daniel Bomberry, Cayuga and Salish Indian, in 1977.<sup>5</sup>

Later in 1984, the Tribal Sovereignty Program incorporated as the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development, thereby becoming the first national American Indian public grantmaking foundation.<sup>6</sup> Philanthropic resources

---

<sup>3</sup> Carey, Sarah C. (1975). Philanthropy and the Powerless. In *Research Papers sponsored by the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs* (1977). II, 1109-1164. Washington, DC.

<sup>4</sup> Rabinowitz, Alan (1990). *Social Change Philanthropy in America*. 49. New York: Quorum Books.

<sup>5</sup> The Akbar Fund (1978). *Akbar Fund Report for 1978*. 7-8. Santa Fe: The Akbar Fund.

<sup>6</sup> “The Fund [*Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development] is unique among other foundations in that. . . . it is the only Native American grantmaking foundation.” *Seventh Generation* Fund (1987). ‘*Seventh Generation*’ Fund for American Indian Development *Annual Report* 1986-1987. 5. Reno: The Author. “[The ‘*Seventh Generation*’ Fund for American Indian Development] is the only Native American grantmaking foundation. It is the only national Native American institution which makes grants and which actively assists communities to raise funds.” Thorpe, Dagmar (1989). Looking at Philanthropy through Native American Eyes. 19. In a [Special Issue on Minorities in Fundraising], *The Journal: Contemporary Issues in Fundraising*. “The ‘*Seventh Generation*’ Fund is the first national Indian controlled . . . foundation.” Bomberry, Daniel (1985). *Native Self-Sufficiency*. 3(1). 2. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

were generally unavailable to Native Americans. The philanthropic purpose the Fund was created to fulfill was to provide grants and technical support to community-based Native American nonprofit organizations which wanted to contribute to their communities.

The *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development was the first of its kind, a national Native American public foundation, providing grantmaking and technical assistance to a national constituency of Native American emerging and established nonprofit organizations.<sup>7</sup> The foundation often became the first grantmaker to many Native American community-based projects and the first step into the philanthropic process.

### Methodology

The primary research question which this thesis on *American Indian Philanthropy*, or concepts of philanthropy as they apply to Native Americans, explored was definition of the issues which impelled the development of grantmaking foundations as vehicles for American Indian community development. Existing theories which explained the inception and development of American Indian philanthropy as a field of inquiry were explored. As well, new theories were developed and examined.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Seventh Generation* Fund, 1986-1987, 5; *The Journal*, 1989, 19; *Native Self-Sufficiency*, 1985, 2.

The thesis then examined some of the challenges facing American Indians in forming a grantmaking foundation during the formative philanthropic years of 1960 - 1990. Also examined were the organizational changes and adaptations of an American Indian foundation throughout its development. In addition, distinctions between American Indian and other foundations were defined. Profiles of key players in foundation development, their motivations and ambitions, and inspiration with regard to the formation of American Indian foundations were developed. The thesis concluded with an analysis of the distant and recent past and how this informs concepts, strategies, methods, and principles of American Indian philanthropy.

The case study utilized for thesis exploration was the formation and development of the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development (and its predecessor the Tribal Sovereignty Program), the first national American Indian public grantmaking foundation.<sup>8</sup>

#### Definition of Terms

*American Indian foundation* is a term used by *Foundations News* May/June 1990.<sup>9</sup>

American Indian foundations are grantmaking foundations by and for American Indians. They frequently incorporate technical support, fiscal sponsorship and

---

<sup>8</sup> “The *Seventh Generation* Fund is the first national Indian controlled . . . foundation.” Bomberry, Daniel (1985). *Native Self-Sufficiency*. 3(1), 2. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>9</sup> Ruffin, David C. (1990, May/June). Not for Survival Alone: Minority Foundations at Work. 54-55. *Foundation News: The Journal of Philanthropy*.

management of their own programs in ways which are unique to American Indians.<sup>10</sup>

*Minority foundations* are institutions of giving by American Indians, Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics as described in *Foundation News* May/June 1990.<sup>11</sup>

*Innovative foundations* refer to a terminology utilized in the paper *Philanthropy and the Powerless*, a research paper commissioned by the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs in 1975. It aptly describes the development of new foundations developed to address the specific needs “of minority groups, the poor, and others.”<sup>12</sup>

*Social process of philanthropy* is a concept alluded to and articulated by Jane Addams in *Democracy and Social Ethics*. It is referred to allegorically. In referencing a young charitable worker, Addams observed that she “socialized her virtues not only through a social aim but by a social process”.<sup>13</sup>

*Social movement philanthropy* is defined in the book *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities* as “foundation grants to social movement

---

<sup>10</sup> Thorpe, Dagmar (1989, December). *Native Americans in Philanthropy: A Paper Developed for the Council on Foundations Pluralism in Philanthropy Project*. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.

<sup>11</sup> Ruffin, David C. (May/June 1990). Not for Survival Alone: Minority Foundations at Work. *Foundation News: The Journal of Philanthropy*. 52-57.

<sup>12</sup> Carey, Sarah C. (1975). *Philanthropy and the Powerless. Research papers sponsored by the Commission on Philanthropy and Public Needs. II*, 1111.

<sup>13</sup> Addams, Jane (1902). *Democracy and Social Ethics*. 69. New York: The Macmillan Co.

projects.” Social movement is defined as “a collective attempt to organize or represent the interests of a previously unorganized or politically excluded group.”

14

### Sources of Evidence and Authority

A research plan of primary and secondary research sources was accomplished which entailed the following: review of relevant research and theory; inventories of records, contacts and availability; and projected time and effort to accomplish research. Research visits to the repositories of primary source documents were included in the timetable and were a significant aspect of the intended research accomplished. A primary source research grant was provided by the Center on Philanthropy for thesis research.

As a result of the primary source research, the thesis has been significantly amplified by identifying and obtaining of documents relevant to preparation of the thesis with original resources from several repositories particularly with regard to the case study. Documents were sought primarily for the years 1960 - 1990 for an American Indian grantmaking program of a sponsoring public foundation, an American Indian foundation, and several diverse philanthropic initiatives.

---

<sup>14</sup> Jenkins, J. Craig and Halci, Abigail (1999). The Development and Impact of Social Movement Philanthropy (1953-1990). In Lageman, Ellen Condliffe Ed. (1999). *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. 230. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Original documents relative to these subjects were located the manuscript and microfilm collection of the Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison;<sup>15</sup> the Field Foundation Archives of the Center for American History at the University of Texas, Austin;<sup>16</sup> and the Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives,<sup>17</sup> and the Joseph and Matthew Payton Philanthropic Studies Library, both located at Indiana University in Indianapolis.<sup>18</sup> A primary source bibliography containing inventories for part of these collections is contained in the reference section of this thesis.

The research plan also entailed a review of relevant research and theory which represents the secondary sources which were utilized. This is fully described in the references.

#### Analytical Technique and Research Design

The research design utilized is based on primary source research and a literature review indicated herein, augmented by a case study, and amplified by in-depth experience in the field of American Indian philanthropy. The literature review encompasses the relevant primary issues of the thesis and also covers an historical philanthropic review of influences on the development and inception of American Indian philanthropy.

---

<sup>15</sup> The Youth Project Collection 1971-1992, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, Wisconsin. (For an inventory of materials relevant to this thesis, please see Primary Source Bibliography of the reference section.)

<sup>16</sup> Field Foundation Archives, 1940-1990, Center for American History, The University of Texas. (For an inventory of materials relevant to this thesis, please see Primary Source Bibliography.)

<sup>17</sup> Philanthropy Collection, Ruth Lilly Special Collection and Archives, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, University Library, Indianapolis, Indiana.

<sup>18</sup> Joseph and Mathew Payton Philanthropic Studies Library, Indiana University-Purdue University, University Library, Indianapolis, Indiana.



The research is framed by the following primary research question and six subsidiary research questions which are:

What were the issues which impelled the development of grantmaking foundations as a vehicle for American Indian community development?

- What are the theories which explain the inception and development of American Indian grantmaking foundations as a field for inquiry?
- What were the challenges facing Native Americans and how does this compare with the challenges facing Native American foundations today?
- What were the organizational changes and adaptations of American Indian foundations throughout their development during this time period?
- What distinguishes a Native American foundation from other foundations?
- Who were the key players in foundation development, their motivations and ambitions, and inspirations with regard to American Indian philanthropy?
- Given the history of the distant and recent past, what are the concepts, strategies, methods, and principles American Indian philanthropy could incorporate in its foundation and organizational development?

Another research method employed was a case study analysis of the *Seventh Generation* Fund for Indian Development, an American Indian public foundation, and its predecessor the Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project, a Native American grantmaking program of a social change public foundation. Case study is ‘a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence’.<sup>19</sup> The elements of inquiry of the thesis and incorporated case study are: theoretical development, foundation development, philanthropic changes and adaptations, and contributions to American Indian communities.

#### American Indian Philanthropy as a Field of Inquiry

American Indian philanthropy as a field of inquiry has been established in the literature by at least two prestigious scholars, Merle Curti and Wilcomb Washburn. The writing of these two authors was explored, in addition to others.

Following a research planning conference conducted at Princeton University on the topic of American philanthropy in 1956, Merle Curti, generally recognized as a leader in the early development of American philanthropy as a field of research, wrote a paper, *The History of American Philanthropy as a Field of Research*,

---

<sup>19</sup> Robson, Colin (1993). *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers*. 147. Cambridge: Blackwell.

focused on his hypothesis that “philanthropy is one of the major aspects and keys to American social and cultural development.”<sup>20</sup>

“In the literature of American social history, one finds certain large themes or areas receiving special attention. . . . The time has come to ask whether there are less obvious but possibly almost as important segments of our culture which have received less attention at the hands of social historians than their importance warrants. To be specific, is philanthropy, in all of its ramifications, one of these major culture segments? In other words, how important has relatively disinterested benevolence been in giving expression to, and in promoting at home and abroad, a major American value—human welfare? All one can say at the present time, I think, is that the literature of the subject warrants the hypothetical statement, to be tested by investigation, that philanthropy has been one of the major aspects and keys to American social and cultural development.”<sup>21</sup>

In addition to this timely hypothesis, among Merle Curti’s recommendations for philanthropic study in referencing the impacts of philanthropy and government are the extent to which “voluntary philanthropic organizations call attention” to new problems, arouse public opinion, and serve as pressure groups. . . . He asks, “How was this trend illustrated in the matter of . . . the Indian?”<sup>22</sup>

A decade later Wilcomb Washburn, head of the Smithsonian Institute, in presenting his paper, *Philanthropy and the American Indian: The Need for a Model*, before the Annual Meeting of the American Society for Ethnohistory, suggested “an attempt be essayed at more sophisticated categorization and analysis of philanthropic

---

<sup>20</sup> Curti, Merle (1957, January). The History of American Philanthropy as a Field of Research. *The American Historical Review*. 62(2.), 352.

<sup>21</sup> Curti, 1957, 352.

<sup>22</sup> Curti, Merle (1957, Jan). The History of American Philanthropy as a Field of Research. *The American Historical Review*. 62(2), 352-363. See also Curti, Merle (1962). Creative Giving: Slogan or Reality. *Foundation News*. 8-9.

attitudes and actions involving the American Indian, against the backdrop of a more formal model.”

He recommended an in depth analysis which would make measurable philanthropic attitudes and actions towards American Indians, “The first step in the creation of a model for the study of philanthropic attitudes toward the American Indian is a separation of segments of the picture by time, by place, by cultural background, by power relationship, by functional role, and by a host of other logically separable aspects of the picture which are distinguishable and – at least in an impressionistic sense – measurable”.<sup>23</sup>

Theoretical development with regard to American Indian foundations is a relatively new phenomena. Firstly, the foundation in America was not established until 1862 with the founding of the Peabody Foundation<sup>24</sup> discussed below, interest in philanthropic contributions to Native Americans were expressed by Frances Goodale in 1893 in her book the *Literature of Philanthropy*<sup>25</sup>, a foundation devoting its grantmaking to Native Americans occurred with the Phelps-Stokes Fund in 1911<sup>26</sup>, and lastly, it was not until 1977 that the beginnings of a national

---

<sup>23</sup> Washburn, Wilcomb E. (Winter, 1968). Philanthropy and the American Indian: The Need for a Model. *Ethnohistory*. 15(1), 43-56.

<sup>24</sup> Bremner, Robert H. (1960). *American Philanthropy*. 191. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

<sup>25</sup> Goodale, Frances A. (Ed.) (1893). *The Literature of Philanthropy*. 1, 5. New York: Harper and Brothers.

<sup>26</sup> Phelps-Stokes Fund (1994). *Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund 1992-1994*. Washington, DC: The Author.

Native American grantmaking foundation were formulated with the development of the Tribal Sovereignty Program.<sup>27</sup>

Thus, theories regarding Native American foundation development are a contemporary academic challenge. The Native American foundation is an even newer innovation, not initiated by American Indians until the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Theories regarding their formation have not been contemplated until the present. As stated much later in the important work, *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*, Ellen Condliffe Lageman concluded generally with regard to American foundations that,

“Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, philanthropic foundations have played a variety of crucial roles in U.S. society. . . . Despite that, until relatively recently, their history was known only in superficial, general outline. The reasons for this are several. First, until recently there were few, if any, social theories that helped direct scholarly attention to foundations. This was because the great social theorists whose ideas provided the baseline for most social research in our era lived at a time when ‘the foundation’ had not been invented as a means for channeling funds and directing social energies.”<sup>28</sup>

American Indian foundations apply common philanthropic concepts, skills and knowledge from philanthropy and other foundations. The development of the American Indian foundation combines philanthropic traditions of American Indians and others working in the sector. As is evidenced by this case study, elements of mainstream foundations incorporated by American Indians include their corporate

---

<sup>27</sup> The Youth Project (1978, March). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1977*. 45-47. Washington, DC: The Author; Daniel Bomberly (1983, March 3). Letter and American Indian Foundation Idea Paper to Executive Director, the Youth Project. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program; and *Seventh Generation Fund* (formerly the Tribal Sovereignty Program) (1982-1984). *Biennial Report 1982-1984*. Forestville: *Seventh Generation Fund*.

<sup>28</sup> Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe Ed. (1999). *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. ix. Bloomington: Indiana University.

structure, grantmaking processes, reporting procedures, and development strategies albeit adapted by them culturally, ethically, and programmatically to fit American Indian foundations.

Philanthropy “loving mankind” may be expressed in several ways as defined in *Webster’s 3<sup>rd</sup> New International Dictionary*: (1) Goodwill towards fellowmen especially as expressed through active efforts to promote human welfare; (2) An act or instance of generosity; and (3) An organization distributing funds for humanitarian purposes.<sup>29</sup>

Merle Curti in referencing voluntary associations as characteristically American also noted, in his paper *Tradition and Innovation in American Philanthropy*, “The philanthropic foundation, which similarly derives from Europe, has also become so widely used, especially in the twentieth century, as to constitute an American innovation.”<sup>30</sup>

In 1956, F. Emerson Andrews defined foundations in the book *Philanthropic Foundations* as “an instrument for contributing private wealth to public purpose.”<sup>31</sup> In addition he explained, “A foundation may be defined as a nongovernmental, nonprofit organization having a principal fund of its own, managed by its own

---

<sup>29</sup> *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (2002). Springfield: Merriam-Webster.

<sup>30</sup> Curti, Merle (1961, April 21). Tradition and Innovation in American Philanthropy. In *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. 105(2), 149.

<sup>31</sup> Andrews, F. Emerson (1956). *Philanthropic Foundations*. 11, 13. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

trustees or directors, and established to maintain or aid social, educational, charitable, religious, or other activities serving the common welfare.” Predecessors to contemporary foundations were characterized as “limited endowments for limited purposes, existed from earliest history . . . . but the special ingredient which distinguishes the foundation in the American understanding of the name is ‘wide freedom of action’.”<sup>32</sup>

The grantmaking foundations Emerson described which came into existence from the early 1900s through the 1950s included: special purpose foundations generally the earliest and most prevalent foundation often restricted to a single purpose, general research foundations which were often informed by their grantmaking, family or personal foundations which served as a vehicle for giving by a donor or family, corporation foundations which were nonprofit foundations established for corporate giving, community trusts primarily concerned with social welfare generally in a city or locality, and governmental foundations.<sup>33</sup>

An important innovation concerning foundations included the efforts of Jane Addams to equalize the relationship between benefactors and beneficiaries. A principle theory which she developed regarding philanthropic change and adaptation can be found in the writing of Jane Addams concerning the social process of philanthropy.<sup>34</sup> This provides a theoretical framework regarding

---

<sup>32</sup> Andrews, F. Emerson (1956). *Philanthropic Foundations*. 11, 13. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

<sup>33</sup> Emerson, 1956, 21-37.

<sup>34</sup> Addams, Jane (1902). *Democracy and Social Ethics*. 69. New York: The Macmillan Co.

equitable philanthropic relationships between the benefactor and beneficiary which was the bridge from the “undeveloped stage of our philanthropy” characterized as the “old charitable attitude”.<sup>35</sup> This concept has had a far-reaching influence in the development of a philanthropic ethic which is inclusive of the constituency and its institutions including foundations.

The concept of public foundations as focused upon herein is a relatively new phenomena of the 1960s onward when new public foundations began to form to “broaden the spectrum of institutional philanthropy”<sup>36</sup> through addressing the self-help efforts of minorities and other underrepresented peoples. They are considered nonprofit tax-exempt organizations. As described by Boris in 1992 in *Philanthropic Foundations in the United States* public charities are required to have broad public support, and some public foundations including minority foundations, receive contributions from other foundations and donors for the purpose of grantmaking to their constituencies.<sup>37</sup>

A closely related theory to the social process of philanthropy alluded to by Jane Addams is that set forth by Ostrander and Schervish in *Giving and Getting as Social Relation* in Van Til’s *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy*;

---

<sup>35</sup> Addams, 1902, 67. See also generally, for a discussion of the “old charitable attitude”, Addams, Jane, et. al. (1970). *Philanthropy and Social Progress: Seven Essays*. Montclair: Patterson Smith. This was originally published in 1893. The essays were presented before The School of Applied Ethics, Plymouth, Massachusetts during the session of 1892.

<sup>36</sup> Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (1975). *Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector, Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs*. 1, 170-171. Washington, DC: The Author.

<sup>37</sup> Boris, Elizabeth (1992). *Philanthropic Foundations in the United States*. 5-7. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.



*Strengthening Theory and Practice*<sup>38</sup>. One point made is that donors and recipients shape the context in which philanthropy functions, “Donors and recipients, then, are both constrained and facilitated by the structure of philanthropy. . . .”<sup>39</sup> A relational approach to philanthropy they suggest brings “the recipient into the theory, research and practice in the field”, which helps to balance the relationship between the donor and recipient.<sup>40</sup>

### Theoretical Basis for American Indian Philanthropy

There is a dearth of published academic work regarding American Indian philanthropy as a subject of inquiry. Research regarding the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development as the first national Native American public grantmaking foundation<sup>41</sup> can provide an important resource regarding the value of the contributions of American Indian foundations to American Indian communities, origination of Native American foundations, their development within a specific historical framework, the philanthropic process of change and adaptation, and the relationship with other foundations formed for the public good.

As noted above in *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*, the history of American philanthropic foundations are not known well and there are

---

<sup>38</sup> Ostrander, Susan A. and Schervish, Paul G. (1990). Giving and Getting: Philanthropy as Social Relation. In Van Til, John. *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

<sup>39</sup> Ostrander and Schervish in Van Til, 1990, 71.

<sup>40</sup> Ostrander and Schervish in Van Til, 1990, 68.

<sup>41</sup> Seventh Generation Fund (1987). *Seventh Generation Fund for American Indian Development Annual Report 1986-1987*. 5. Forestville: The Author.

few theories that direct scholarly inquiry towards them.<sup>42</sup> This is particularly true of American Indian grantmaking foundations which only began to be founded in the 1970s.

Theory is defined by Thomas, cited in *Lenses on Reading; An Introduction to Theories and Models*, thusly:

“Theory is an explanation of how the facts fit together. More precisely, theorizing about [a topic] means the act of proposing (1) which facts are most important for understanding [that topic] and (2) what sorts of relationships among the facts are most significant for producing an understanding. Theory is what makes sense out of facts. Theory gives facts their meaning. Without theory, facts remain a clutter of disorganized specks on the canvas. . . .”<sup>43</sup>

Theories regarding the formation of American Indian foundations may be stated or formulated. Although Native American initiated and led nonprofits have been prevalent since the early 1900s, it was not until the 1970s that the beginnings of an American Indian national public foundation began to take shape. What theories can explain the inspiration and formation of an American Indian foundation at that moment in time?

Potential theories which arise from the case study are that American Indian foundations arose:

---

<sup>42</sup> Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe Ed. (1999). *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. ix. Bloomington: Indiana University.

<sup>43</sup> Tracey, Diane H. and Mandel Morrow, Lesley (2006). *Lenses on Reading: An Introduction to Theories and Models*. 3. New York: The Guilford Press. Citing Thomas, R.M. (1996). *Comparing theories of child development* 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. 4. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.

- As a way to build the theoretical concepts of sovereignty and self-sufficiency into practicality in Indian country.
- American Indian foundations were formulated not only to address unmet philanthropic needs but also to meet them in ways unique to American Indians. This uniqueness arises from the cultures and lengthy history of diverse American Indian tribes in America as distinguished from other ethnicities.
- The development of American Indian philanthropic foundations and institutions of grantmaking arose to better serve their peoples in the absence of philanthropic attention to Native American communities.
- Additionally American Indian foundations which are founded, directed and managed by Indians may have arisen because they provide the best mix of grants, technical support, and other services for American Indians.

## References Chapter One

Addams, Jane (1902). *Democracy and Social Ethics*. New York: The McMillan Co.

The Akbar Fund (1978). *Akbar Fund Report for 1978*. Santa Fe: The Author.

Andrews, F. Emerson (1956). *Philanthropic Foundations*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Boris, Elizabeth (1992). *Philanthropic Foundations in the United States*. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.

Carey, Sarah C. (1975). Philanthropy and the Powerless, contains a status report on Philanthropy and American Indians.1128-1132. In *Research Papers sponsored by the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs* (1977). Washington, DC: The Author. II, 1109-1164.

Curti, Merle (1957, January). The History of American Philanthropy as a Field of Research. *The American Historical Review*. 62(2), 352-363.

Curti, Merle (1961, April). Tradition and Innovation in American Philanthropy. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. 105(2).149.

Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (1975). *Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector: Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs*. Washington, DC: The Author.

Jenkins, J. Craig and Halci, Abigail (1999). The Development and Impact of Social Movement Philanthropy (1953-1990). In Lageman, Ellen Condliffe Ed. *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Margolis, Richard J. (March/April 1973). White Philanthropy and the Red Man. *Foundation News*. 14(2), 13-22.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, April). Our First Issue. 1(1). Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (1981, September). 4(3, 4). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (1985). 3(1). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project.

Ostrander, Susan A. and Schervish, Paul G. (1990). Giving and Getting as Social Relation. In Van Til, John (1990). *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rabinowitz, Alan (1990). *Social Change Philanthropy in America*. New York: Quorum Books.

Robson, Colin (1993). *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Ruffin, David C. (May/June 1990). Not for Survival Alone: Minority Foundations at Work. *Foundation News: The Journal of Philanthropy*. 52-57.

Seventh Generation Fund (1987). *Seventh Generation Fund for American Indian Development Annual Report 1986-1987*. Forestville: The Author.

Thorpe, Dagmar (Autumn, 1989). Looking at Philanthropy through Native American Eyes. [Special Issue Minorities in Fundraising]. *The Journal: Contemporary Issues in Fundraising*.

Thorpe, Dagmar (1989, December). *Native Americans in Philanthropy*. A Paper Developed for the Council on Foundations Pluralism in Philanthropy Project, Washington, DC.

Tracey, Diane H. and Mandel Morrow, Lesley (2006). *Lenses on Reading: An Introduction to Theories and Models*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Washburn, Wilcomb E. (1968, Winter). Philanthropy and the American Indian: The Need for a Model. *Ethnohistory*, 15(1). 43-56.

## Early Influences

In order to develop foundations, American Indians had to overcome early attitudes which still persisted toward Native Americans as portrayed for example by French author, Alexis de Tocqueville (1805 - 1859) who is considered an authority and observer of the formative development of the philanthropic sector during his travels through America in 1830s. He is frequently quoted for his observations regarding voluntary associations in the Americas during this era, “Nothing in my view, more deserves attention than the intellectual and moral associations in America. . . .”<sup>44</sup>

de Tocqueville’s observations of the American Indian in his oft quoted *Democracy in America* are informative of attitudes during that era that American Indians have had to overcome.

“Living in freedom in the forest, the North American Indian was wretched but felt himself inferior to no man; as soon as he wants to penetrate the social hierarchy of the white men, he can only occupy the lowest rank therein, for he comes as a poor and ignorant man into a society where knowledge and wealth prevail. Having led an adventurous life, full of afflictions and dangers but also full of proud emotions, he must submit to a monotonous, obscure, and degraded existence. In his eyes the only result of this vaulted civilization is that he must earn his bread by hard and ignoble labor. . . . Isolated within their own country, the Indians have come to form a little colony of unwelcome foreigners in the midst of a numerous and dominating people”.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Tocqueville, Alexis de (1988). 517, 514. *Democracy in America*. New York: Harper and Row.

<sup>45</sup> Tocqueville, 1988, 331-332, 334.

He did not foresee Native Americans forming benevolent or voluntary associations in his observations. Perhaps over time, de Tocqueville would have incorporated his concept of the connection between associations and equality to include Native Americans. As he observed, “Thus the most democratic country in the world now is that in which men have in our time carried to the highest perfection the art of pursuing in common the objects of common desires and have applied this technique to the greatest number of purposes. Is that just an accident, or is there really some necessary connection between associations and equality?”<sup>46</sup>

Sixty years later in 1893, in the book the *Literature of Philanthropy*, Frances A. Goodale approached the subject of American Indians differently. She incorporated American Indians in her recommendations regarding areas her readers may concentrate their philanthropy, “the written record of philanthropic movements, individual or collective, crude or systematic, is its unit of value in guiding or in warning fresh philanthropic impulses and new undertakings. . . The accompanying papers in this volume present a brief summing-up of work already done, change effected, ends not yet encompassed, and further help needed. . .” Included in the book among the papers dealing with criminal reform, tenement neighborhoods, the Red Cross, antislavery, and education of the blind were the papers *The Indian*, first paper, by Mrs. Amelia Stone Quinton; and *The Indian – a Woman among the Indians*, second paper, by Mrs. Elaine Goodale Eastman.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Tocqueville, 1988, 514.

<sup>47</sup> Goodale, Frances A. (Ed.) (1893). *The Literature of Philanthropy*. 1, 5. New York: Harper and Brothers.

## Conceptual Development of Philanthropy as it Applies to American Indians

In summary other later influences include mainstream philanthropic trends of the late 1800s including the concept of the social process of philanthropy suggested by Jane Addams<sup>48</sup> and the social reform efforts of some foundations including for example the Russell Sage Foundation. An important influence was the development of the first national united Indian nonprofit organization discussed later, the Society of American Indians founded in 1911 which focused on the importance of the “self-help” efforts of Native Americans.

### Social Process of Philanthropy

An important conceptual influence occurred through the work of the settlement house movement in America which was founded by Jane Addams among others. She established the Hull House in 1889. Jane Addams sets forth a major challenge to philanthropy in that era as she writes in 1902 in *Democracy and Social Ethics* regarding charitable effort, “Probably there is no relation in life which our democracy is changing more rapidly than the charitable relation – that relation which obtains between benefactor and beneficiary; at the same time there is no point of contact in our modern experience which reveals so clearly the lack of equality which democracy implies.”<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Addams, Jane (1902) *Democracy and Social Ethics*. 69. New York: The MacMillan Co.

<sup>49</sup> Addams, 1902, 13-14.



Addams broadened the concept of helping others by incorporating the concept of the social process of philanthropy. For example through allegory in referencing a young charitable worker Addams observed that she “socialized her virtues not only through a social aim but by a social process”.<sup>50</sup> This aptly describes the tenor of Jane Addams philanthropic work. Settlement house workers advocating on behalf of underrepresented populations began to work directly with and develop programs for addressing the issues of concern of their constituencies. Intermediaries, like the staff of settlement houses, helped to develop principles of conduct with regard to the relationship between benefactors and beneficiaries, more equitable relationships were encouraged to better serve the people they were intended to serve, and a theory of a social process of philanthropy was begun.<sup>51</sup>

### Foundations Facilitating Reform

Several early private foundations embarked on a form of philanthropy which sought to understand and develop programs for the underlying issues regarding social problems of that era. They sought to overcome prevalent issues with substantial and wide-sweeping grantmaking which focused on problem resolution.

With regard to American Indians during that era, the Phelps-Stokes Fund was established in 1911 by its donor, Caroline Phelps-Stokes. This early endowed private foundation, founded to support “education for Native Americans” among

---

<sup>50</sup>Addams, 1902, 69.

<sup>51</sup> Addams, Jane (1932). *Twenty Years at Hull House with Autobiographical Notes*. New York: The MacMillan Co.

other goals, helped to produce the *Meriam Report*, the first investigative report of the condition of American Indians published in 1928.<sup>52</sup> The *Meriam Report* contains sections on the following: a general policy for Indian affairs which sets forth the conditions of Indian health, education, general economic conditions; family, community life and activities of women; migrated Indians, legal aspects of the Indian problem, and missionary activities among the Indians. The three year study, considered “the most significant inquiry into Indian conditions in the twentieth century”<sup>53</sup> concluded:

“An overwhelming majority of the Indians are poor, even extremely poor, and they are not adjusted to the economic and social system of the dominant white civilization. The poverty of the Indians and their lack of adjustment to the dominant economic and social systems produce the vicious circle ordinarily found among any people under such circumstances. Because of interrelationships, causes cannot be differentiated from effects. The only course is to state briefly the conditions found that are part of this vicious circle of poverty and maladjustment”.<sup>54</sup>

In 1862, the first generally accepted “modern foundation” was created by George Peabody.<sup>55</sup> The Peabody Education Fund set forth principles “which became the standard by which future large funds operated.”<sup>56</sup> His bequest endowing the Fund specified that the interest thereof be applied by their discretion “for the promotion and encouragement of intellectual, moral, or industrial education among the young

---

<sup>52</sup> Phelps-Stokes Fund (1994). *Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund 1992-1994*. Washington, DC: The Author.

<sup>53</sup> Nies, Judith (1996). *Native American History: A Chronology of a Culture's Vast Achievements and Their Links to World Events*. 330. New York: Ballantine Books.

<sup>54</sup> Institute for Government Research (1928). *The Problem of Indian Administration; Summary and Findings and Recommendations* (The Meriam Report). 3. Washington, DC: The Author.

<sup>55</sup> Bremner, Robert H. (1960). *American Philanthropy*. 191. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

<sup>56</sup> Burlingame, Dwight F. (2004). *Philanthropy in America: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia*. Vol. 3, 633. Santa Barbara: ABC CLIO.

of the more destitute portions of the Southern and Southwestern States of our Union; my purpose being that the benefits intended shall be distributed among the entire population, without other distinction than their needs and the opportunities of usefulness to them.”<sup>57</sup>

Another example is the Russell Sage Foundation founded in 1907,<sup>58</sup> when “foundations were still a novelty in America. There were only eight in existence in 1907 - only two with a capital fund equal to that of the Russell Sage Foundation, and none was active in its field.”<sup>59</sup> Peter Dobkin Hall noted that the programs of the Russell Sage Foundation “signaled a shift towards a genuinely scientific philanthropy directed to identifying and solving the root causes of social problems rather than treating their symptoms.”<sup>60</sup>

The Russell Sage Foundation was established for “improvement of social and living conditions in the United States of America . . . . including research publication, education, and the establishment and maintenance of charitable or benevolent activities, agencies, and institutions, and the aid of any such activities, agencies, or institutions already established.”<sup>61</sup> The foundation was considered one of the first genuinely *open-ended foundations*. . . . The Foundation “intended to

---

<sup>57</sup> Curry, J.L.M. (1898). *A Brief Sketch of George Peabody, and a History of the Peabody Education Fund through 30 Years*. 20. New York: Negro University Press.

<sup>58</sup> Bremmer, Robert H. (1960). *American Philanthropy*. 193. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

<sup>59</sup> Glenn, John M., Brandt, Lillian, and Andrews, F. Emerson (1947). *Russell Sage Foundation 1907-1946*. New York: The Author.

<sup>60</sup> Hall, Peter Dobkin (Undated). *A Historical Overview of Philanthropy, Voluntary Associations, and Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1600-2000*. 34. Retrieved from website. Cambridge: Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations, John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

<sup>61</sup> Glenn, Brandt, Andrews, 1960, 11.

fund worthy objects and also to formulate and facilitate the reform of social, economic, and political life.”<sup>62</sup>

### American Indian Self-Help

For American Indians, a process of social reform was initiated with a series of conferences conducted at Lake Mohonk from 1883-1916. In the beginning of the conferences Native Americans were not evidenced as presenters. As implicit in Burgess’s thesis *Lake Mohonk Conferences on the Indian*, in about 1891 this changed and a Native American presence was recorded.<sup>63</sup>

Some of the American Indian attendees of the Lake Mohonk Conferences participated in the founding conference of the Society of American Indians, reportedly the first national organization of Native Americans, on October 12, 1911 in Columbus, Ohio.<sup>64</sup> The Society provided the opportunity for Native Americans to discuss the issues of the day and to develop solutions to address them. The Society of American Indians adopted a constitution and by-laws which set forth these objectives: “To promote and cooperate with all efforts looking to the

---

<sup>62</sup> Hall, Peter Dobkin (1987). A Historical Overview of the Private Nonprofit Sector. In Powell, Walter W. Ed. (1987) *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. 12. New Haven: Yale University Press.

<sup>63</sup> Burgess, Larry E. (1972). The Lake Mohonk Conferences of the Indian (1883-1916). 102-104. *Dissertation*. Claremont Graduate School. Microfilm.

<sup>64</sup> See also Potin, Armand S. Ed. (1987). *Native American Voluntary Organizations*. New York: Greenwood Press.

advancement of the Indian in enlightenment which leaves him free, as a man, to develop according to the natural laws of social evolution.”<sup>65</sup>

One of the reasons for the call to conference was that “the time has come when the Indian should be encouraged to develop self-help.” Another spoke to the “century of dishonor” and “if in any degree he [the white man] can convince himself and his red brother that he is willing to do what he can for the race whose lands he has occupied, a new step toward social justice will have been taken.”<sup>66</sup>

Overtime, the early work of the Society of American Indians and other efforts initiated by American Indians has resulted, as Armand La Potin points out in his important work *Native American Voluntary Organizations*, in numerous voluntary efforts, associations, and nonprofit organizations to address their needs.

“In assessing the development of Native American voluntary associations within the context of American history, it is apparent that native peoples have increasingly utilized organizational mechanisms inherent in group structure. The roles and functions of these bodies have altered as America has changed from a nation that venerated a belief in a common unified tradition to one that acknowledges the importance of cultural diversity. . . . Native peoples have increasingly organized in non-tribal groups as a means of defining their uniqueness in a culturally pluralistic society. . . .

---

<sup>65</sup> Hertzberg, Hazel (1971). *The Search for an American Indian Identity*. 59, 80. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press. The book contains an extensive account of the early development of the Society of American Indians whose founding conference was conducted on October 12, 1911 in Columbus, Ohio. The society was reportedly the first national organization of Native Americans. This book contains an excellent biographical essay on published works about this era.

<sup>66</sup>.Hertzberg, 1971, 37.

The proliferation of self-created native associations serving a multitude of functions is a testimony to the vitality of American Indian communities in the United States today.”<sup>67</sup>

Later during the early to mid-1970s, two major influences on American Indian philanthropy which helped to set the stage for the development of an American Indian foundation were: efforts by Native Americans to inform foundations about their issues; and the flourishing of Native American nonprofits, as a part of the strong and vital recognition of the nonprofit sector in the main.

One of these major accomplishments affecting Native American and philanthropy were efforts by Native Americans to inform foundations about their issues. Led by David Gipp, Executive Director of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Native Americans sought to educate funders through convenings, site visits, and published works about American Indians.<sup>68</sup> Much of this data is provided by the Directory of American Indian Private Funding Sources published in 1975.<sup>69</sup>

Commenting on the challenge before American Indians of that generation and the opportunity for foundations to provide assistance, Gipp commented:

“From an Indian point of view, it is a cruel dilemma, because federal recognition does confer three important rights – privilege of tribal citizenship, protection of tribal identity, and perpetuation of tribal

---

<sup>67</sup> La Potin, Armand S. (1987). *Native American Voluntary Organizations*. 9. Westport: Greenwood Press. This book contains descriptions of Native American voluntary organizations existent since 1756. It also contains organizations classified by major functions; and a chronological list of organizations accompanied by key historical facts.

<sup>68</sup> Gipp, David (1975.) *Directory of American Indian Private Funding Sources*. Denver: American Indian Higher Education Consortium.

<sup>69</sup> Gipp, 1975.

organization as a form of local government in this country. On the other hand, the reservation Indian must endure the poverty and paternalism which has characterized the federal government's role as a trustee over the years. It is precisely because of the failures of federal trusteeship that foundation involvement in Indian affairs is so drastically needed. In fact, private funding – if directed at giving Indian people a chance to initiate reforms in the federal/Indian system, thereby making that system more responsive to their needs- can act as a catalyst for change.”<sup>70</sup>

The Council on Foundations Annual Conference, St. Paul, Minnesota held in May 1973 included a broad cross section of Native Americans. The Council on Foundations conference resulted in three philanthropic convenings held throughout 1974. *Foundations and Indians: A Partnership in Indian Health Concerns*, was held on September 18, 1974, sponsored by the Indian Health Board, and supported by the William H. Donner Foundation.

As well a *Conference on Indian Higher Education*, conducted at the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation on October 29-31, 1974, was sponsored by the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, assisted by the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and supported by Carnegie Corporation, Ford Foundation and Johnson Foundation.

In addition *A Working Conference on Tribal Government*, was held on May 14 - 15, 1974 by the American Indian Lawyer Training Program in Albuquerque, and partially sponsored by the Akbar Fund. As a result, two ad hoc foundation groups

---

<sup>70</sup> Gipp, 1975, vi.

were started “to inform themselves about Indian programs”, one in the northeast numbering 30 foundations and the other in the Midwest of 15 foundations.<sup>71</sup>

In 1975, probably the first *Directory of American Indian Private Funding Sources* was published by the American Indian Higher Education Consortium in partnership with the Taft Group and the Phelps-Stokes Fund. Based on the results of a survey research project of 100 foundations and resulting paper by Twila Martin and Paige Baker, Masters students at Pennsylvania State University, *A Comparative Study of the Relationship between Native Americans and Private Foundations*<sup>72</sup>, the Directory provided “a review of philanthropists perceptions of American Indians and visa versa, and discuss some of the recent steps philanthropists have taken to attempt to be more responsive to Indian needs. The Directory also includes a summary of 61 private funding sources”.<sup>73</sup>

Comparing Native American staff and board involvement in grantmaking among foundations, religious organizations and corporations, the Directory stated, “There are no full-time permanent American Indian staff members and only one trustee on a major, grantmaking foundation in the United States. . . .” The report concluded that American Indian board and staff “abound” with church related grantmakers including the Campaign for Human Development, National Committee for Self-

---

<sup>71</sup> Gipp, 1975, vii.

<sup>72</sup> Martin, Twila and Baker, Paige (1974, July 19). *A Comparative Study of the Relationship between Native Americans and Private Foundations. Joint Master's Paper.* Pennsylvania State University.

<sup>73</sup> Gipp, David (1975). *Directory of American Indian Private Funding Sources.* v. Denver: American Indian Higher Education Consortium.



Development of People, and National Indian Lutheran Board. In addition with regard to corporations, there are “few Indian grant officers and board members with companies”.<sup>74</sup>

As well another effort during that era was the American Indian Program of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, led by Rose Robinson and developed and staffed by Native Americans, which provided philanthropic information and assistance to American Indians and to foundations to support Native American communities.<sup>75</sup> The Phelps-Stokes Fund as indicated above was founded to provide support for the education of American Indians.

### Contemporary Influences

Another influential development occurred when several foundations began social movement philanthropy. Authors J. Craig Jenkins and Abigail Halci chronicled the development of social movement philanthropy, defined as “a collective attempt to organize or represent the interests of a previously unorganized or politically excluded group”,<sup>76</sup> from the early 1950s through 1990. In the early 1950s they reported there were only three social movement funders: the Field Foundation of New York, Wieboldt, and Emil Schwarzhaupt foundations which made four grants

---

<sup>74</sup> Gipp, 1975, xii.

<sup>75</sup> Phelps Stokes Fund (1977-1978). *Phelps-Stokes Fund Report, 1977-1978*. New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund.

<sup>76</sup> Jenkins, J. Craig and Halci, Abigail (1999). The Development and Impact of Social Movement Philanthropy (1953-1990). In Lageman, Ellen Condliffe Ed. (1999). *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

totaling \$85,700. By 1970, a total of 65 foundations contributed \$11 million to social development projects.<sup>77</sup>

*White Philanthropy and the Red Man* by Richard Margolis, an early contemporary major philanthropic article published in *Foundation News* on grantmaking to Native Americans, reported in 1972 that “At least 40 foundations are now grappling with Indian survival, supporting a variety of programs which last year cost the foundations about \$15 million. That is not very much; but it is considerably more than foundations have been accustomed to spend on Indians and it bespeaks a trend that has been inching upward since the mid 1960s. . . .” The article reported also that grantmaking trends for Native Americans concentrated on infrastructure development of health and legal systems, education, and community control and self-determination. As well he concluded, “there was a good deal of floundering by foundations interested in launching Indian programs.”<sup>78</sup>

### Broadening the Spectrum of Institutional Philanthropy

Later influences include the “innovative” foundation developments of the 1960s and 1970s which were established to support the underrepresented including the development of minority foundations. The “innovative and creative” foundations developed during that era included American Indian foundations, which is the

---

<sup>77</sup>Jenkins in Lageman, 1999, 230.

<sup>78</sup> Margolis, Richard J. (March/April 1973). *White Philanthropy and the Red Man*. *Foundation News*. 13-22.

subject of this paper.<sup>79</sup> The Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs was established in September 1973 to develop information, explore the ramifications, and report findings regarding philanthropy and its contributions to the voluntary sector.<sup>80</sup>

The Commission created to improve the philanthropic practices of foundation and donor contributions had an immense effect on recognition of the nonprofit sector in American life. A briefing paper written as a retrospective twenty years later concluded in reference to the nonprofit sector, “Thereafter, philanthropists, professionals and scholars involved with philanthropic giving and volunteerism discovered that they were concerned about a concept that had a name – and therefore an identity”.<sup>81</sup>

In 1975 the *Report of the Commission of Private Philanthropy and Public Needs* recommended under the category of accessibility, that, “tax exempt organizations, particularly funding organizations, recognize an obligation to be responsive to changing viewpoints and emerging needs and that they take steps such as broadening their boards and staffs to insure that they are responsive.” The Commission also encouraged the establishment of “new organizations and new organizational structures that broaden the spectrum of institutional philanthropy in

---

<sup>79</sup> Margolis, March/April 1973, 230.

<sup>80</sup> Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (1975). *Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector*. 1. Washington, DC: Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs.

<sup>81</sup> Brilliant, Eleanor (1995). Looking Backward to Look Forward: The Filer Commission in Perspective. In *Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector: The Filer Commission and the State of Philanthropy* (1995). 28. Indianapolis: Center on Philanthropy.

general.”<sup>82</sup> This view was supported by a commission sponsored research paper *Philanthropy and the Powerless* written by Sarah C. Carey.<sup>83</sup>

Among the new foundations “broadening the spectrum of institutional philanthropy” were myriad public foundations. In addition to predominantly private foundation support for the unrepresented such as the Phelps-Stokes Fund, new public foundations began to form to address the efforts of minorities and other underrepresented peoples to develop projects to address their own issues. Many of the innovative foundations which were established during this era were public foundations.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> *Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector, Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs* (1975). 1, 170-171. Washington, DC: Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs. This Commission was established in 1973 as a *privately initiated and privately funded citizen’s panel* charged with two broad objectives: (1) *To study the role of both philanthropic giving in the United States and that area through which giving is principally channeled, the voluntary ‘third sector’ of American society*; and (2) *To make recommendations to the voluntary sector, to Congress and to the American public at large concerning ways in which the sector and the practice of private giving can be strengthened and made more effective*. 1. The report contains findings and recommendations of the Commission. Native Americans are cited in the section of findings entitled *Philanthropy and the Powerless*. 67-68. In addition, under the recommendations with regard to the category of accessibility, it was recommended that *tax exempt organizations, particularly funding organizations, recognize an obligation to be responsive to changing viewpoints and emerging needs and that they take steps such as broadening their boards and staffs to insure that they are responsive*. The Commission also encouraged the establishment of *new organizations and new organizational structures that broaden the spectrum of institutional philanthropy in general*. 170-171.

<sup>83</sup> Carey, Sarah C. (1975). *Philanthropy and the Powerless*. In *Research Papers sponsored by the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs* (1977). II, 1109-1164, esp. 1128-1133. Washington, DC: The Author. This seminal work included philanthropy and Native Americans in its coverage of *Philanthropy and the Powerless*. This paper contains a status report on philanthropy and American Indians. It describes the emergence of a new initiative with regard to Native Americans and philanthropy. This initiative is comprised of developing grantmaking programs which are based on the needs of Native Americans as they are articulated to the foundation; and the involvement of Native Americans as Board and staff members.

<sup>84</sup> Boris, Elizabeth (1992). *Philanthropic Foundations in the United States*. 5-7. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.

An interesting note is that a group called the Network of Change-Oriented Foundations, a precedent group to the National Network of Grantmakers, was formed in part, after “several publicly supported foundations were denied participation” in a national philanthropic conference.<sup>85</sup> Public foundations were not permitted full membership in the Council on Foundations, a publicly supported nonprofit organization, until 1984.<sup>86</sup>

The commissioned paper *Philanthropy and the Powerless* by Sarah C. Carey in 1975 reviewed the status of foundations developed to assist the underrepresented and unrepresented and summarized the important foundation developments which she characterized as innovative foundations. The paper was based on a survey of a select group of foundations and grantees. The author defines the powerless as “suggestive of minority groups, the poor, and others”.<sup>87</sup> At the time, the author concluded that it was not possible to accurately measure the amount of support given to the unrepresented because these figures were not documented.

### Innovative Foundations to Support the Underrepresented

Carey then posited that the development of some innovative practices of some new foundations and donors may help to encourage greater contributions to the

---

<sup>85</sup> National Network of Grantmakers (Website retrieved March, 23, 2006 [www.nng.org](http://www.nng.org)).

<sup>86</sup> History of the Council on Foundations, (Retrieved from Council on Foundations Website [www.cof.org](http://www.cof.org). on November 26, 2006).

<sup>87</sup> Carey, Sarah C. (1975). *Philanthropy and the Powerless*. *Research papers Sponsored by the Commission on Philanthropy and Public Needs*, II, 1109. Washington, DC: Commission on Philanthropy and Public Needs.

“powerless” in the future. The author summarized some characteristics of these new foundations and provided also an in depth profile of The Youth Project, a national public foundation.<sup>88</sup>

The new foundations created to provide support for the underrepresented were summarized as follows: some experimental foundations of limited duration, growing interest of foundations to stand by an issue or a place, “minority foundations which give only to their own constituencies”, channeling of funds through philanthropic grantmaking intermediaries and networks, and helping large foundations and donors identify community-development efforts.

These new foundations were characterized in part by direct support to the underrepresented to organize themselves and develop and manage their own programs, support for organizations with the presence of leadership among the powerless and real constituencies, incorporation of planning and technical assistance in addition to grantmaking, and long term commitment to ensure the success of their grantees.<sup>89</sup>

One model of an innovative foundation developed during this era was The Youth Project, a public foundation described above as an “organizational prototype”<sup>90</sup> which provided seed grants, technical support, and fundraising assistance to primarily grassroots projects working on a broad range of issues. From 1970 to

---

<sup>88</sup> Carey, 1975, 1151-1153.

<sup>89</sup> Carey, 1975 1111-1114.

<sup>90</sup> Carey, 1975, 1151.

1975, the Youth Project funded 143 projects. In addition, the Youth Project staff made numerous referrals and recommendations of grants to these and other social change projects.<sup>91</sup>

“During the 1960s with the growth of the peace movement and the discovery of young people as a powerless group in society, a number of the more activist foundations became interested in funding projects administered by and/or addressed to the needs of young people. . . . One of the more successful of these has been the Washington-based Youth Project which. . . . should be considered as an organizational prototype. . . . by philanthropic donors. . . .”<sup>92</sup>

In a submission of a proposal in the spring of 1970 from the Center for Community Change, a Washington, DC based nonprofit organization founded in 1968 to help “establish and develop community organizations”.<sup>93</sup>, the formation of the Youth Project, was noted as the “result of nearly a year’s discussion and planning by a cadre of young people.”<sup>94</sup> A governing board of young people was established for the Youth Project.

The Center for Community Change served as fiscal sponsor until August 31, 1970 when the Youth Project received tax exemption as a nonprofit organization.<sup>95</sup> By 1971, the Youth Project described itself as a “resource center which supports a wide range of youth initiated social change efforts. The Project is wholly governed and staffed by young people, and functions to identify, fund, and provide assistance

---

<sup>91</sup> Carey, 1975, 1151.

<sup>92</sup> Carey, 1975, 1151.

<sup>93</sup> Center for Community Change (Retrieved from Website [www.communitychange.org](http://www.communitychange.org). August 8, 2006.) Washington, DC: Center for Community Change.

<sup>94</sup> Letter and proposal to Executive Director, the Field Foundation from the Center for Community Change dated April 22, 1970; and Field Foundation Docket Write-Up on Center for Community Change, 2<sup>nd</sup> Spring 1970.

<sup>95</sup> Internal Revenue Service (1971, August 31). Tax Exempt Letter to the Youth Project. Washington, DC: The Author.

to youth groups formed around a commitment to work on specific and local issues and problems.”<sup>96</sup>

By September of 1972, the Youth Project laid out its grantmaking, technical and fundraising support approach, priorities and criteria which made it unique among foundations. Project field staff sought out potential projects, assisted in their planning and development, provided seed grants, and linked people to appropriate resource people and groups, compiled and transmitted research materials unavailable to local groups, developed and marketed proposals for funding, and provided other support to help projects reach their objectives.

In the first annual report of the Youth Project for 1972, criteria for project support was prioritized for groups and projects which are “committed to realizable social change.” Criteria for consideration included: “Dedicated to careful and thorough investigation and analysis of the issues and institutions under consideration, thoughtful consideration to development of strategies for change, willing to build alliances with other organizations working toward similar objectives at local, regional, and national levels, and be unlikely to receive support and assistance without help from the Project.”<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> The Youth Project (1971, August). *Annual Report and Proposal. Introduction*. Unnumbered. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

<sup>97</sup> The Youth Project (1972, September). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project*. 8. The Youth Project: Washington, DC.



By 1975, the Youth Project staff had grown to eleven including six field representatives located in 3 offices and had provided support to over 100 projects during the previous fiscal year.<sup>98</sup> From September 1971 through December 1974, the Youth Project allocated \$784,614.95 to 143 projects from more than 50 foundations and churches. In addition additional supplemental funds were leveraged which went directly to organizations which had their own tax-exempt status.<sup>99</sup>

One of the constituencies served by the Youth Project were American Indians. The Youth Project is described in 1977 in the book *Robin Hood was Right: A Guide to Giving Your Money for Social Change* published by the Vanguard Foundation of San Francisco, one of the early books about giving to social change and references its role with American Indians. “An excellent example is the Youth Project, which gives technical assistance and money to grassroots projects throughout the country. Concentrating on organizing efforts, the Youth Project identifies organizations striving for self-determination in communities which are traditionally dominated by unresponsive forces. Much of its work has been done in Native American . . . . communities.”<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> The Youth Project (1975, January). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project*. vi. The Youth Project, Washington, DC.

<sup>99</sup> *The Annual Report of the Youth Project*, 1975, x.

<sup>100</sup> Vanguard Public Foundation (1977). *Robin Hood was Right: A Guide to Giving Your Money for Social Change*. 57. San Francisco: Vanguard Public Foundation. Later descriptions of the Youth Project are contained in Shellow, Jill R. (1981). *Grantseeker's Guide A Directory for Social and Economic Justice Projects*. Chicago: Illinois; and Shellow, Jill R. (1985). *Grantseeker's Guide: Funding Resourcebook Revised and Expanded*. Mt. Kisco: Moyer Bell Limited.

## Diversification of Foundations

As well, foundations have become increasingly diversified with regard to their grantmaking. Daniel R. Faber and Deborah Mc Carthy observe in *Foundations for Social Change: Critical Perspectives on Philanthropy and Popular Movements* the opportunities for foundation diverse grantmaking for social change which included the following summary of potential areas to support:

“(1) grassroots democracy and inclusiveness of people from all walks of life in the decision-making processes of business, government, and other social institutions that regulate their lives, as well as the civil organizations and social movements that represent their interests; (2) social and economic justice, where the central obligation is the meeting of all basic needs and ensuring fundamental human and civil rights for all members of society; and (3) sustainability and environmental protection, whereby the integrity of nature is preserved for all present and future members of society.<sup>101</sup>

In addition to increased opportunities for grantmaking, another influence has been the increasing diversification of mainstream foundations. Many foundations have diversified their boards of directors, grantmaking boards and committees. For example, Susan A. Ostrander’s case study of the Haymarket People’s Fund as described in *Money for Change: Social Movement Philanthropy at Haymarket People’s Fund*.<sup>102</sup> A later article by Ostrander which elaborates on this subject includes *When Grantees Become Grantors; Accountability, Democracy, and Social*

---

<sup>101</sup> Faber, Daniel R. and Mc Carthy, Deborah (2005). *Foundations for Social Change: Critical Perspectives on Philanthropy and Popular Movements*. 9. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

<sup>102</sup> Ostrander, Susan A. (1995). *Money for Change: Social Movement Philanthropy at Haymarket Peoples Fund*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

*Movement Philanthropy* in Lageman's *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*.<sup>103</sup>

As well Ostrander and Schervish in *Giving and Getting as Social Relation* in Van Til's *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy; Strengthening Theory and Practice*<sup>104</sup> explore the concept of the range of roles on the donor and the recipient sides and also discuss some philanthropic entities which are both donors and recipients. One excellent point made is that donors and recipients shape the context in which philanthropy functions, "Donors and recipients, then, are both constrained and facilitated by the structure of philanthropy. . . ." <sup>105</sup> A relational approach to philanthropy they suggest brings "the recipient into the theory, research and practice in the field", which helps to balance the relationship between the donor and recipient.<sup>106</sup>

Susan A. Ostrander explores the dimensions of grantors becoming grantees and the impact on accountability and social movement philanthropy. She examines several examples of this growing trend of involving the grantee in decision-making with primary emphases on the Haymarket Fund, the Julius Rosenwald Fund, and the Stern Fund. She explores the range of dynamics from grantees speaking about their

---

<sup>103</sup> Ostrander, Susan A. (1999). When Grantees Become Grantors; Accountability, Democracy, and Social Movement Philanthropy. In Lageman, Ellen Condliff Ed. (1999). *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

<sup>104</sup> Ostrander, Susan A. and Schervish, Paul G. (1990). *Giving and Getting: Philanthropy as Social Relation*. In Van Til, John. *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

<sup>105</sup> Ostrander and Schervish, 1990, 71.

<sup>106</sup> Ostrander and Schervish, 1990, 68.

projects and issues at board meetings to developing grantee committees which make funding decisions about potential grants.<sup>107</sup>

In the book *Money for Social Change* she contextualizes this concept in the case study of the Haymarket People's Fund, a public foundation in New England. Haymarket has established grantmaking boards which make all grants, derived from the types of organizations which the Fund provides support. Staff and board members do not make grants.

“In the widest sense, both in the larger community and through its own internal structure and process, Haymarket uses its money to support and to practice active democratic citizenship among people of different races, classes, genders, and sexual orientations. Haymarket grantmaking democratizes philanthropy. It makes philanthropy a participatory process by involving the groups who are, in more traditional kinds of philanthropy, recipients and beneficiaries, not participants.”<sup>108</sup>

### The Development of Minority Foundations

Another important philanthropic effort demonstrating philanthropic change and adaptation was the development of minority foundations by minorities for grantmaking to their own constituencies.<sup>109</sup> “Minority foundations which give only to their own constituencies” were noted in the paper *Philanthropy and the Powerless* written in 1975 as among the innovative foundations developing in that

---

<sup>107</sup> Ostrander, Susan A. (1999). When Grantees become Grantors; Accountability, Democracy, and Social Movement Philanthropy. In Lageman, Ellen Condliffe Ed. (1999). *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

<sup>108</sup> Ostrander, Susan A. (1995). *Money for Change: Social Movement Philanthropy at Haymarket People's Fund*. 164. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

<sup>109</sup> Ruffin, David C. (May/June 1990). Not for Survival Alone: Minority Foundations at Work. *Foundation News*. 52-57.

era.<sup>110</sup> The first American Indian grantmaking program was begun several years later in 1977 as the Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project; succeeded by the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development, the first American Indian grantmaking foundation in 1985.

Minority foundations may be defined as institutions of giving by American Indians, Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics as described in *Foundation News* May/June 1990.<sup>111</sup> Firstly, these philanthropies derive from the giving traditions of their own peoples which inform contemporary practices; and thence also draw from other elements and theories of philanthropy.

Jim Joseph, in his seminal book, *Remaking America: How the Benevolent Traditions of Many Cultures are Transforming Our National Life*, explores some concepts which might have broader implications and concludes, “Pluralism rightly understood and practiced is a benefit, not a burden.”<sup>112</sup> He summarizes the benevolent traditions and contributions of four major diverse populations American Indians, Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans to the field of philanthropy within their own communities.

---

<sup>110</sup> Carey, Sarah C. (1975). Philanthropy and the Powerless. *Research papers Sponsored by the Commission on Philanthropy and Public Needs*. II. 1111-1114. Washington, DC: The Author.

<sup>111</sup> Ruffin, David C. (May/June 1990). Not for Survival Alone: Minority Foundations at Work. *Foundation News: The Journal of Philanthropy*. 52-57.

<sup>112</sup> Joseph, James A. (1995). *Remaking America; How the Benevolent Traditions of Many Cultures are Transforming Our National Life*. xiv. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. The book contains a lengthy biography on Zikala-Sa, Gertrude Simmons Bonnin, Yankton Sioux, an active member of the Society of American Indians and the leader of an Indian settlement house, located on the Ft. Duchesne Reservation in Utah.

Recent efforts by philanthropic organizations however, have been increasingly more inclusive of minority foundations which may have an impact on the recognition and expansion of the foundations of diverse peoples, including American Indians. During the late 1980s and early 1990s, the Council on Foundation Pluralism in Philanthropy project for example, encouraged philanthropy of diverse peoples including American Indians.<sup>113</sup> Several research papers by American Indians were written for the project including the author's *Native American Philanthropy*.<sup>114</sup>

Alan Rabinowitz writes from his own experience as a participant in the social change philanthropy movement in America. In *Social Change Philanthropy in America*<sup>115</sup> he provides an historical overview of the development of the field of social change philanthropy and then examines it from the perspectives of grantmakers and from the perspectives of grantees. He includes a prototypical analysis of grants given by several foundations in the years 1986 - 1988 to 91 grantees in 16 different categories of support including American Indians. In this analysis, he provides an observation regarding the impact of the *Seventh Generation Fund for American Indian Development* thusly “run by Native

---

<sup>113</sup> *Foundations News* (May/June 1990). [Special Issue on Pluralism and Philanthropy: How American Indians, Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics are Enriching Our Culture of Giving.] 31(3). Washington, DC: The Pluralism in Philanthropy Project of the Council on Foundations.

<sup>114</sup> Thorpe, Dagmar (1989). *Native Americans in Philanthropy: A paper developed for the Council on Foundations Pluralism in Philanthropy Project*. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.

<sup>115</sup> Rabinowitz, Alan (1990). *Social Change Philanthropy in America*. New York: Quorum Books.

Americans [the Fund] plays a special role in steering grants from the funding community to local groups.”<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup> Rabinowitz, Alan (1990). *Social Change Philanthropy in America*. 163. New York: Quorum Books.

## References Chapter Two

Addams, Jane (1902). *Democracy and Social Ethics*. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Addams, Jane (1932). *Twenty Years at Hull House with Autobiographical Notes*. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Boris, Elizabeth (1992). *Philanthropic Foundations in the United States*. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.

Bremner, Robert H. (1960). *American Philanthropy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Brilliant, Eleanor (1995.). Looking Backward to Look Forward: The Filer Commission in Perspective. In *Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector: The "Filer Commission" and the State of Philanthropy* (1995). Conference materials for a meeting held on December 8, 1995. Indianapolis: Center on Philanthropy at Indian University.

Brilliant, Eleanor L. (2000). *Private Charity and Public Inquiry, A History of the Filer and Peterson Commissions*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Burgess, Larry E. (1972). *The Lake Mohonk Conferences of the Indian* (1883-1916). Dissertation, Claremont Graduate School. Microfilm.

Carey, Sarah C. (1975). Philanthropy and the Powerless, contains a status report on Philanthropy and American Indians. 1128-1132. In *Research Papers sponsored by the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs* (1977). II, 1109-1164.

Center for Community Change. (Retrieved August 8, 2006 from Center for Community Change website [www.communitychange.org](http://www.communitychange.org) ).

Center for Community Change (1970, April 22). Letter and proposal to Executive Director, The Field Foundation. This is accompanied by Field Foundation Docket Write-Up on the Center for Community Change proposal, 2<sup>nd</sup> Spring 1970.

Center on Philanthropy (1995). *Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector: The "Filer Commission" and the State of Philanthropy*. Conference materials for a meeting held on December 8, 1995. Indianapolis: The Author. See also, Center on Philanthropy (1996). *Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector: The "Filer Commission" and the State of Philanthropy*. Indianapolis: The Author. Report of the proceedings for the convening held in 1995. The materials contained several



briefing papers including: Brilliant, Eleanor (Undated.) *Looking Backward to Look Forward: the Filer Commission in Perspective.*

Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropy (1970). *Foundations, Private Giving, and Public Policy: Report and Recommendations of the Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (1975). *Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector: Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs.* Washington, DC: The Author.

Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (1975). *Guide to Sponsored Research of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs.* Washington, DC: Library of Congress. The Guide contains abstracts of the Research Papers Sponsored by the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, where the papers emphasizing *minorities* including Native Americans are located.

Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (1977). Sponsored Research Papers. Volume I-V. Washington, DC: Department of the Treasury. The research papers compliment the Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs. Although there was no specific report of Native Americans and philanthropy, there were sections contained within the reports. Volume II Philanthropic Fields of Interest contains commissioned research papers which included Carey, Sarah C. (1975). *Philanthropy and the Powerless* which contains a status report on Philanthropy and American Indians. 1128-1132.; *U.S. Foundations and Minority Group Interests* reference to grantmaking to Native Americans in the paper 1239-1241; and to minorities in general 1165-1282. There are additional references to the Youth Project which sponsored the Tribal Sovereignty Program (Carey, 1975, 1151).

Curry, J.L.M. (1898). *A Brief Sketch of George Peabody, and a History of the Peabody Education Fund through 30 Years.* New York: Negro University Press.

Eisenberg, Pablo (1975, December-January). The Filer Commission: A Critical Perspective. *Grantsmanship Center News.* Reprinted in Eisenberg, Pablo (2005). *Challenges for Nonprofits and Philanthropy: The Courage to Change.* 37-40. Medford: Tufts University Press.

Faber, Daniel R. and Mc Carthy, Deborah (2005). *Foundations for Social Change: Critical Perspectives on Philanthropy and Popular Movements.* Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

The Pluralism in Philanthropy Project of the Council on Foundations (May/June 1990). [Special Issue on Pluralism and Philanthropy: How American Indians,

Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics are Enriching Our Culture of Giving.] 31(3). Washington, DC: *Foundations News*.

Gipp, David (1975.) *Directory of American Indian Private Funding Sources*. Denver: American Indian Higher Education Consortium. References Martin, Twila and Baker, Paige (1974, July 19). *A Comparative Study of the Relationship Between Native Americans and Private Foundations*. Masters Paper. Pennsylvania State University.

Glenn, John M., Brandt, Lillian, and Andrews, F. Emerson (1947). *Russell Sage Foundation 1907-1946*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Goodale, Frances A. Ed. (1893). *The Literature of Philanthropy*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Hall, Peter Dobkin (1987). A Historical Overview of the Private Nonprofit Sector. In Powell, Walter W. Ed. *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hall, Peter Dobkin (Undated). *A Historical Overview of Philanthropy, Voluntary Associations, and Nonprofit Organizations in the United States. 1600-2000*. Cambridge: Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations. (Retrieved from website.)

Hertzberg, Hazel (1971). *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

History of the Council on Foundations, (Retrieved November 26, 2006 from Council on Foundations website [www.cof.org](http://www.cof.org)).

Institute for Government Research (1928). *The Problem of Indian Administration; Summary and Findings and Recommendations* (The Meriam Report). Washington, DC: The Author.

Jenkins, J. Craig (1989). Social Movement Philanthropy and American Democracy. In Magat, Richard. *Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties and Goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. Craig and Halci, Abigail (1999). The Development and Impact of Social Movement Philanthropy (1953-1990). In Lageman, Ellen Condliffe Ed. (1999). *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Joseph, James A. (1995). *Remaking America; How the Benevolent Traditions of Many Cultures are Transforming Our National Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lageman, Ellen Condliffe Ed. (1999). *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

La Potin, Armand S. (1987). *Native American Voluntary Organizations*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Margolis, Richard J. (1973, March/April). White Philanthropy and the Red Man. *Foundation News*; See also, Margolis, Richard (1984, March/April). To Live Upon this Earth. 18-28. *Foundation News: The Magazine of Philanthropy*.

Martin, Twila and Baker, Paige (1974, July 19). *A Comparative Study of the Relationship Between Native Americans and Private Foundations*. Masters Paper. Pennsylvania State University.

Nagai, Althea K., Lerner, Robert, and Rothman, Stanley (1994). *Giving for Social Change: Foundations, Public Policy, and the American Political Agenda*. Westport: Praeger.

National Network of Grantmakers. (Retrieved March 23, 2006 from the National Network of Grantmakers website [www.nng.org](http://www.nng.org)).

Ostrander, Susan A. (1995). *Money for Change: Social Movement Philanthropy at Haymarket Peoples Fund*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ostrander, Susan A. and Schervish, Paul G. (1990). Giving and Getting: Philanthropy as Social Relation. In Van Til, John (1990). *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Ostrander, Susan A. (1999). *When Grantees become Grantors: Accountability, Democracy, and Social Movement Philanthropy*. In Lageman, Ellen Condliffe Ed. (1999). *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Phelps-Stokes Fund (1992-1994). *Phelps-Stokes Fund Annual Report, 1992-1994*. Washington, DC: The Author.

Phelps-Stokes Fund (1977-1978). *Phelps-Stokes Fund Report, 1977-1978*. Washington, DC: Phelps-Stokes Fund.

Powell, Walter W. and Clemens, Elizabeth S. (1998). *Private Action and the Public Good*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rabinowitz, Alan (1990). *Social Change Philanthropy in America*. New York: Quorum Books.

Ruffin, David C. (May/June 1990). Not for Survival Alone: Minority Foundations. *Foundation News: The Journal of Philanthropy*.

Schardt, Arlie (May/June 1990). [Pluralism: The Time has Come. Special Issue on Pluralism in Philanthropy; How American Indians, Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics are Enriching Our Culture of Giving]. *Foundation News*.

Shellow, Jill R. (1981). *The Grantseekers Guide: A Directory for Social and Economic Justice Projects*. Chicago: Illinois.

Shellow, Jill R. (1985). *Grantseekers Guide; Funding Sourcebook Revised and Expanded*. National Network of Grantmakers. Mt. Kisco: Moyer Bell Limited.

Stanfield, II, John H. (1997). *Research in Social Policy: Social Justice Philanthropy*. Greenwich: JAI Press.

The Donee Group (1975). Private Philanthropy: Vital and Innovative or Passive and Irrelevant: The Donee Group Report and Recommendations. In *Research Papers sponsored by The Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs*, 1, 49-85.

Thorpe, Dagmar (1989). Looking at Philanthropy through Native American Eyes. In a Special Issue on Minorities in Fundraising. *The Journal: Contemporary Issues in Fundraising*.

Tocqueville, Alexis de (1988). *Democracy in America*. New York: Harper and Rowe; See also, Tocqueville, Alexis de (1959). *Journey to America*. Great Britain: Faber and Faber Limited.

Vanguard Public Foundation (1977). *Robin Hood was Right: A Guide to Giving Your Money for Social Change*. San Francisco: Vanguard Public Foundation.

Van Til, John (1990). *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

The Youth Project (1971, August). *Annual Report and Proposal*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

The Youth Project (1972, September). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

The Youth Project (1975, January). *The Annual Report of the Youth*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

## Opening Vignette

“The story of the Seventh Generation Fund starts in the mid-1970s when a young man, Daniel Bomberry, began to question and to search for new methods of community organizing which would reach the hearts of Indian people and would grow into everyday practical solutions to the problems people face. He met and talked with as many people as he could find, those who were working within their communities, were writing, were moving back to the land, were building their own homes, educating their children, people who were seeking a good way of life. He listened to what their concerns were, what their dreams were, what their lives were like, what they wanted for themselves, their children and grandchildren. He had a great ability for drawing people out and helping them to see clearly what the possibilities are. Encouraging people to act on their own convictions came naturally to him.

“Everywhere he went he was reminded by the old people and the traditionalists that we are a free sovereign people with our own nations and we should act like it. The issue of tribal sovereignty had generalized support throughout Indian country but few tribes had consciously developed a strategy for achieving sovereignty. . . . Daniel could see the strengths of individuals, what talents and resources they had. He encouraged everyone and pulled together a remarkable group of people which grew into a national network. . . . In his short life he laid the framework for the Seventh Generation Fund. . . .”<sup>117</sup>

During the late 1970s a new form of American Indian self-help began to develop – American Indian foundations formed by them to assist their communities. In 1977 the Tribal Sovereignty Program, an American Indian grantmaking program,

---

<sup>117</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1986). 8(1), 1, 3. Forestville: *Seventh Generation* Fund.

became a program of the Youth Project, one of the most successful social change foundations during the 1960s-1980s.<sup>118</sup>

This case study is principally focused on the formative years of the development of the *Seventh Generation* Fund for Indian Development including its predecessor grantmaking program during the years 1977 - 1985. There are three stages of development covered by this case study: the origins of the Tribal Sovereignty Program during the year 1977; the emergence of a grantmaker reviewing the four year period 1978-1982; and the origin and early development of the independent public foundation, the *Seventh Generation* Fund for Indian Development during the years 1983-1985.

The trajectory of the foundation in becoming can be viewed throughout its development as evidenced in the case study. It is a huge leap from a self-conceptualization as a nonprofit organization to becoming a foundation. As first expressed in the premier edition of its newspaper, *Native Self-Sufficiency* in April of 1978, “The Tribal Sovereignty Program is a program under the auspices of the Youth Project, a national privately funded foundation which supports a wide range of youth-initiated social change efforts. . . .” The program viewed its purpose to provide financial aid in the form of direct grants and fundraising technical

---

<sup>118</sup> Carey, Sarah C. (1975). *Philanthropy and the Powerless. Research papers sponsored by the Commission on Philanthropy and Public Needs. II.*, 1151. Washington, DC: The Author.

assistance, “We are here to provide . . . financial aid (small seed grants and assistance in applying for other grant funding)” to Native American efforts.<sup>119</sup>

Several months later in June of 1978 the Tribal Sovereignty Program further defined itself as “a nonprofit organization under the auspices of the Youth Project, designed to provide technical and financial assistance to Native groups who are working to reestablish tribal sovereignty.”<sup>120</sup> The Program expanded its self-definition as a nonprofit organization which asserts independence or semi-autonomy within the Youth Project structure, in contrast to simply a special program.

By 1981, the Tribal Sovereignty Program had expanded its role and self-definition through declaring its status as a nonprofit foundation, thus further clarifying its grantmaking function. *Native Self-Sufficiency* the newspaper of the Tribal Sovereignty Program described the Program as a “nonprofit foundation under the auspices of the Youth Project.”<sup>121</sup>

Significantly in 1983, as the Project developed plans to become a foundation in its own right, clarity with regard to its ultimate institutional structure was defined as it stated its intention to become an American Indian foundation. In a memorandum to the Youth Project describing the latest version of the foundation idea, Daniel

---

<sup>119</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, April). Our First Issue. 1(1), 1-2.

<sup>120</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, June). Masthead. 1, No.

<sup>121</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1981, September). 4(3, 4).

Bomberry proposed and characterized the future direction of the Tribal Sovereignty Program as an “American Indian Foundation”.<sup>122</sup>

During the next year, as plans for the new foundation were underway, the newly developing foundation recognized its status as the first national American Indian foundation. In announcing the formation of The *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development it was characterized as the “first national Indian-controlled community foundation”.<sup>123</sup>

The history of the Program’s emergence as part of a public foundation and inter-relationship with other foundations, the contributions of both respectively Native American and mainstream thought directed toward the common good, can help to understand and articulate a successful relationship between a public foundation and the inception of an American Indian grantmaking program. The Tribal Sovereignty Program is an excellent example of the support of an early innovative and creative foundation in helping to develop an American Indian innovation in philanthropy.

### The Role of the Youth Project

American Indians are frequently counted in summaries of grantmaking to social change-oriented nonprofits. In 1977, the founding year of the Tribal Sovereignty

---

<sup>122</sup> Bomberry, Daniel (1983, March 3). Letter to Executive Director, The Youth Project. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>123</sup> Daniel R. Bomberry (December 19, 1984). Letter published in *Native Self-Sufficiency*. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.



Program of the Youth Project, J. Craig Jenkins in *Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties and Goals* reported that social movement funding accounted for only .69 percent of total foundation giving and only 131 foundations out of the total of 22,000 grantmakers made grants in this area. Of this total constituting less than 1% of total foundation grantmaking, Native Americans received only 3.07 percent or \$9,095,165 in contributions.<sup>124</sup>

In an effort to expand insufficient resources and technical assistance designated for American Indians and other issues, The Youth Project engaged in a series of conversations with Daniel Bomberry, Salish and Cayuga Indian, about a new concept they were exploring and how they could clarify their assistance to American Indians.<sup>125</sup> The 1978 Annual Report of the Youth Project described this process of exploration with a variety of methods to increase support for special constituencies:

“In addition to its regular support of local projects, the Youth Project is beginning to experiment with several special issue or constituency oriented programs which complement our overall work. Using earmarked funds, these programs will provide more substantial funding and in-depth technical assistance support to organizations working on specific issues. The programs have emerged from the experience of our staff in local communities and were developed in response to recurring requests for ongoing assistance on key issues. . . .

“To implement the programs, a variety of staffing models will be employed including administering the programs through our existing field office structure, hiring program coordinators in new offices,

---

<sup>124</sup> Jenkins, J. Craig (1989). Social Movement Philanthropy and American Democracy. In Magat, Richard. (1989). *Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties and Goals*. 292-314. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<sup>125</sup> The Youth Project (1978, March). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1977*. 45-47. Washington, DC: The Author.

utilizing field stringers or some combination of these methods. Each program will report to the Youth Project Board, although some will have their own advisory boards with principal oversight responsibility.”<sup>126</sup>

One of the unique staffing models eventually employed was the formation of special programs, among them was the Tribal Sovereignty Program.

### The Origins

In 1977 the Tribal Sovereignty Program, first called the Native American Tribal Sovereignty Program<sup>127</sup>, was established at The Youth Project by American Indians and others:

“[T]o support the assertion of sovereignty by Indian Nations, tribes, and organizations. It was initiated with the premise Indians need to move away from the rhetoric of sovereignty and towards the quiet building of the political and economic infrastructures of our communities that would make sovereignty a practicality. . . . Our ability and our commitment to provide modest seed funds to discretionary projects allows many new efforts to get firmly established.”<sup>128</sup>

During the first year of the Tribal Sovereignty Program, the conceptual approach was defined, the methodology of operations and support to potential grantees and fiscally-sponsored projects was clarified, the role of the Tribal Sovereignty Program as *a special program* in relationship to the Youth Project, its programs, and staff was established. In collaboration with the Policy Board and other Native Americans, the foremost issues and policies which could have the most beneficial

---

<sup>126</sup> The Youth Project, 1978, 13.

<sup>127</sup> The Youth Project, 1978.

<sup>128</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (March, 1980). 3(1).

impact on the sovereignty of Indian nations were enunciated culminating in grantmaking guidelines; and initial exploration of potential projects which could be supported under this grantmaking criteria were identified. In addition, the fundraising base for program operations and grantmaking was initiated.

The Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project was conceptualized and developed by Daniel R. Bomberry in early 1977. He formally joined the staff of the Youth Project in June as Program Coordinator.<sup>129</sup> He and Lenny Conway, Executive Director of the Youth Project, engaged in a series of discussions about how the Project could be of assistance to American Indians.<sup>130</sup>

“The Program grew out of discussions between Youth Project staff and an experienced Native American community organizer, now the program coordinator, seeking to clarify the role the Youth Project could play in supporting Indian nations. While Youth Project field staff had funded Indian projects, they were finding it increasingly difficult to adequately analyze the complex issues involved and to provide sufficient on-site technical assistance. These discussions and that organizers dialogue with traditional Indian leaders led to the conclusion that a special program focused specifically on sovereignty issues was needed.”<sup>131</sup>

Bomberry, founder and Coordinator of the Tribal Sovereignty Program, was Salish and Cayuga Indian. He had taught at several California colleges and universities including California State University at Long Beach, Santa Rosa Junior College, and directed the American Indian Studies Program at Sonoma State. He served as consultant over a two-year period to Save the Children Federation in the redesign

---

<sup>129</sup> The Youth Project (1978, March). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1977*. 53. Washington, DC: The Author.

<sup>130</sup> The Youth Project, 1978, 46.

<sup>131</sup> The Youth Project, 1978, 46.

of their American Indian Program. He co-founded American Indian Training Associates, a nonprofit management and community organizing training firm.

Bomberry was active locally and nationally and also served on the Boards of Directors of the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards, Sonoma County Indian Health Project, and the North Bay Health Systems Agency. He served as a delegate to the 1977 United Nations Conference on Discrimination against the Indigenous Peoples of the Western Hemisphere in Geneva, Switzerland. He was an activist and educator who participated in the Alcatraz and Mount Rushmore land occupations by Native Americans.<sup>132</sup>

During the first six months of planning for the Tribal Sovereignty Program, Bomberry developed the program including the conceptual framework, organizational plan, and fundraising strategy; and established the policy board, office, and staff of the Program which became a formal part of the Youth Project in June 1977. The first office of the Tribal Sovereignty Program was located in Guerneville, California<sup>133</sup> and later moved to Forestville several towns distant.<sup>134</sup>

Bomberry founded the grantmaking initiative around the concept of tribal sovereignty, a complex and pressing issue during this era, which was set forth

---

<sup>132</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program (1981, April). Proposal submitted to the Needmor Fund. 3. Forestville: The Author.

<sup>133</sup> The Youth Project (1978). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1977*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

<sup>134</sup> The Youth Project (1979). *The 1979 Youth Project Annual Report*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

eloquently in the *1977 Youth Project Annual Report*, the first year of the program's operations:

“To understand why sovereignty is such an important issue to Indian people is requires us to place it in historical perspective. When European colonizers first arrived in North America, they quickly realized that the Indian Nations, which had already existed here for thousands of years, were highly sophisticated in their social, economic, and political organization. In fact the Indian “tribes” fit the description of sovereign nations as defined in the then relatively new field of international law. Indian “tribes” had a defined territory, self-government and freedom external control, a sense of nationhood, a form of economics, and a shared history which placed them within the international concept of a sovereign nation.

“Recognizing the necessity of dealing with the Indians on a nation-to-nation basis, European countries began to negotiate treaties which under international law are only made between sovereign nations. Subsequently, the United States Government, whose Constitution also allows treaties to be made only between sovereign nations, negotiated more than 300 treaties with various Indian tribes.

“The issue of Native American tribal sovereignty is now central to the critical resource development and population growth questions which face the West and impact heavily on the nation as a whole. In an ironic twist of fate, the undesirable land ‘reserved’ by treaty for Indian Nations has been found to contain vast mineral wealth. In addition, the treaties have been interpreted by the Supreme Court to guarantee Indian tribes priority rights to scarce water resources.

“However, as the stakes in the energy and water struggles in the West intensify, the idea of politically independent tribes possessing large mineral reserves and water rights is increasingly unacceptable to many corporations, state governments, and energy planners. The concept of tribal sovereignty is under attack. Many states have implemented aggressive legal and political strategies to limit the rights of tribes in areas of taxation, water, criminal and civil jurisdiction. At the time, well financed white backlash groups are lobbying for numerous bills in Congress and would severely curtail the sovereignty of the Indian nations.”<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> The Youth Project (1978, March). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1977*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

Bomberry identified and requested several Native Americans and one Canadian Indian to join him as members of the Policy Board which would meet twice annually and provide guidance with regard to Program policy, grantmaking, and oversight.<sup>136</sup> On July 16, 1977, the newly formed Policy Board of the Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project met in Denver, Colorado.

The founding board members came from diverse tribes and Indian organizations. They included American Indians: Harris Arthur, Navajo, Office of Natural Resources, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Window Rock, Arizona; Betty Gress, Mandan/Hidatsa, active with Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards; Birgil Kills Straight, Oglala Lakota, District Chairman, Medicine Root District, Pine Ridge Reservation, South Dakota; John Mohawk, Seneca, Editor of *Akwesasne Notes* in New York; and Raymond Spang, Northern Cheyenne.<sup>137</sup> A Canadian policy board member selected was Robert Antone, Oneida, a farmer.<sup>138</sup>

In an effort to seriously address the issues of tribal sovereignty which impelled the development of the program, the Policy Board established “the following components of sovereignty as priorities for the coming year”. The newly created grantmaking guidelines provided the focus of the work of the Tribal Sovereignty Program for most of the next decade and established the track record upon which it

---

<sup>136</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program (1981, March). *Tribal Sovereignty Program Annual Report 1980*. 5. Forestville: The Author.

<sup>137</sup> Daniel R. Bomberry (1977, September 12). Update on Tribal Sovereignty Program. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program; Tribal Sovereignty Program (1980). *The Tribal Sovereignty Program Annual Report 1980*. 3. Forestville: The Author.

<sup>138</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program (1980). *Tribal Sovereignty Program Annual Report 1980*. 3. Forestville: The Author.

later formed the public foundation, the *Seventh Generation* Fund for Indian Development, in 1985.

- Land and natural resource issues – Efforts to reclaim and live on aboriginal lands. Efforts to protect tribal lands and natural resources, i.e., strip mining, coal gasification, water rights struggle;
- Self-sufficiency and alternative economics – Efforts to develop self-sufficient communities, tribes and nations through food production and creative use of limited or appropriate technology, i.e., labor intensive farming, solar greenhouses, wind powered energy, energy efficient housing such as low cost approaches will begin to provide alternatives to large scale industrialization and/or mineral extractions; and
- Traditional Indian governments – Efforts to restore traditional indigenous forms of political organization rather than Bureau of Indian Affairs dominated councils.<sup>139</sup>

Following the format established by the Youth Project, the Tribal Sovereignty Program began an interrelated program of grants, hands-on technical assistance, fundraising and management support. On September 12, 1977, Bomberry wrote a Memorandum to Interested Folks providing an update on the formation of the

---

<sup>139</sup> Bomberry, Daniel R. (1977, September 12). Update on Tribal Sovereignty Program. 1. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

Tribal Sovereignty Program indicating that this supplemented a larger proposal submitted called “Native American Tribal Sovereignty.”

The memorandum further specified the beginning program operations of the Program which would be similar in the way a field office operates:

“We will be responsible for seeking out emerging groups, evaluating their goals, staff, community support and potential for success. If the group looks solid a small seed grant will be provided for a given time period to achieve clear objectives. Grants will probably average around \$2,200. Technical assistance will be provided to strengthen all aspects of the organization’s development. Access to the various Youth Project technical assistance networks will be offered to all Indian groups contacted.”<sup>140</sup>

In addition to direct support provided by them, the program also provided fundraising assistance to supplement the grants and technical assistance given.

“The Program will also assist groups seeking foundation support. We will recommend to the various foundations projects that have proven themselves capable through participation in the Tribal Sovereignty Program. We will also be available to foundations to evaluate Indian organizations or proposals.”<sup>141</sup>

The grants given by the Tribal Sovereignty Program were amplified significantly by the supplemental grants which the Program assisted in raising through proposal development, providing fundraising contacts and suggestions, and donor and foundation advocacy. At this point in its formative development with regard to its

---

<sup>140</sup> Bomberry, 1977.

<sup>141</sup> Bomberry, 1977, 2.



reporting, the Program did not distinguish between grants given and supplemental funds raised and/or assisted by the Tribal Sovereignty Program.

The first contributors he noted to the Tribal Sovereignty Program included of course, The Youth Project, and additionally the Eastman Fund, Shalan Foundation, Save the Children Federation, and others.<sup>142</sup> Later one of the early contributors was the Akbar Fund which noted in its 1978 annual report a general support contribution to the Tribal Sovereignty Program (The Youth Project) which summarized:

“Established last year within the structure of the Youth Project, the Tribal Sovereignty Program is an Indian controlled source of seed grants and technical assistance to Indian community projects aimed at enhancing tribal self-government and economic self-sufficiency. Viewing tribal sovereignty more as an attitude of independence than as a narrow legal conception, the program encourages Indian communities with three types of problems: the recovery and defense of lands and natural resources, the re-emergence of traditional forms of Indian government, and the effort to develop small-scale economic activities promising tribes greater independence from external sources of funding. The coordinator, Daniel Bomberry, identified several important projects during 1978 and played an important role in helping these local groups obtain further funding from foundation and government sources.”<sup>143</sup>

Early on his first efforts were to locate potential projects requiring support to “*make sovereignty a practicality.*” Bomberry provided support to two initial projects and projected some others initially identified as prospective projects. Dan stated in September of 1977, “Although the program has been operative only a short time,

---

<sup>142</sup> Bomberry, 1977, 2.

<sup>143</sup> The Akbar Fund (1978). *Akbar Report for 1978*. Santa Fe: Akbar Fund.

we have identified a number of potential projects. We are moving on a couple now and anticipate having the others working prior to the new year.”<sup>144</sup>

The first two projects of the Tribal Sovereignty Program included: providing funding to the Lakota Treaty Council for a young organizer to do workshops on treaty rights and traditional forms of government and a supplemental grant for travel was raised; and the second was a small loan given to the Paiute Warrior Society Project for a cooperative farming effort.

Other projected projects the Program was considering for support in the first year included: early discussions were begun and a site visit was planned with the Pueblo Land Reclamation Project; the Program was cooperating with two other national Indian groups to assist the Traditional Seminoles set up a Seminole Community Land Trust and seek land through purchase or donation; the Program was interested in assisting the Creek National Council restructure forty townships to traditional forms of government; the Program planned to assist the Coso Hot Springs project publish and distribute a newsletter and hold a series of community meetings to stop desecration of this sacred site; and the program planned to assist the Owlshead Self-Sufficiency Project prepare a major proposal.<sup>145</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> Daniel R. Bomberry (1977, September 12). Update on Tribal Sovereignty Program. 2. Guerneville: The Author.

<sup>145</sup> Bomberry, Daniel R. (1977, September 12). Update on Tribal Sovereignty Program. 1-2. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

Later, the *Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1977* further clarified the role of the Program in relationship to the Youth Project in providing assistance to grantees as well as collaborating with Youth Project staff on some projects.

“The Tribal Sovereignty Program functions like a Youth Project field office, providing seed funding and technical assistance to sovereignty – enhancing projects. The project coordinator and a program advisory board comprised of six Indian people are responsible for identifying emerging groups, evaluating their goals, staff, community support, and potential for success. Access to the various Youth Project technical assistance programs is assured by close communication with field offices and national staff.”<sup>146</sup>

In summary during 1977, following the first year of the operations of the Tribal Sovereignty Program, after extensive field travel, and staff analysis, the Program cited a total of six projects which had received support. Already mentioned were the Lakota Treaty Council and the Phetonagwet Ranch project. In addition four other projects were supported. The Program provided support to the Pueblo Land Recovery Project, for an administrative position and research necessary to reclaim lands taken by the Indian Claims Commission. The Program provided fundraising and program technical assistance to Owlshead Self-Sufficiency Project, to establish a self-sufficient training and research demonstration farm for this project of Iroquois associated with *Akwesasne Notes*. The California Land Research project was supported by the Program for research and tribal education workshops on the land rights of the Pit River Tribe. The Program supported the Six Nations Self-Sufficiency Project’s search for land for traditional communal farming.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>146</sup> The Youth Project (1978, March). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1977*. 45-47. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

<sup>147</sup> The Youth Project, 1978, 45-47.

## Emergence of a Grantmaker

During the next developmental phase representing the four year period 1978 - 1982, the Tribal Sovereignty Program developed into an important resource for the support of American Indian community-based organizations in their efforts to address the issues related to land and natural resources, self-sufficiency and alternative economies, and governance.

In commenting about its original purpose “to move away from the rhetoric of sovereignty” towards community rebuilding which would make “sovereignty a practicality”, Bomberry further elucidated that:

“We have been heartened by both the numbers and dedication of grassroots Indian people sharing this vision. Throughout Indian country people are, without fanfare, going about the business of building their nations. Numerous tribes are moving to reclaim their aboriginal territories; farms and community gardens are springing up in long-abandoned field; and traditional leaders are stepping forward to reassume leadership of their people.”<sup>148</sup>

In addition, the Youth Project indicated that one of its highlights for 1978 regarding special program work “included the expansion of the Tribal Sovereignty Program”.<sup>149</sup> This was evidenced by the progressively growing number of projects for which the Tribal Sovereignty Program provided support. The report further encapsulated the following fourteen projects provided support by the Program which are organized into the categories of support for which grants were made.

---

<sup>148</sup> The Youth Project (1979, March). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1978*. 55. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

<sup>149</sup> The Youth Project, 1979, 8.

Land and resource related projects supported by the Tribal Sovereignty Program included: the California Indian Land Acquisition project, the program provided a grant and technical assistance for research, organizing, and education on Indian land in California; Mole Lake Chippewa Research project, financial support was provided by the Tribal Sovereignty Program for treaty research and analysis of the environmental and economic impacts of mining development; the Santa Ana Land Project, a grant helped to study historical and anthropological research to reaffirm title; and the Yurok Research and Information Center, a grant was provided to document swindles resulting in their lands passing to timber companies in support of potential litigation. As well support was provided to the Lakota Treaty Council, Santa Domingo Mining Research project, and Western Shoshone Land Project.

The growing programmatic area of self-sufficiency and alternative economies included support for: the Northern Cheyenne Land Project, assistance was provided to complete a study of economic and land use alternatives for lands adjacent to their reservation; and the Cameron Farm Training Center project, the program provided start-up funding and helped to secure half a million dollars in tribal, private foundation, and federal funding for an experimental agricultural project of the Cameron Chapter of the Navajo Tribe.

Other community development projects included the Indian Curriculum Development Project of the Federation of Native Controlled Survival Schools and

*Akwesasne Notes* to develop a curriculum for communities produced entirely by students on developing a survival school. The Program helped secure funds for the Iroquois Midwives to train and equip midwives. A collaborative research project was initiated with the Youth Project Western Office, a Tribal Resource Study intended to investigate a national anti-Indian backlash organization. As well, an Appropriate Technology Communications project which was the precursor to the quarterly newspaper, *Native Self-Sufficiency*, published information on community self-sufficiency in *Akwesasne Notes*.<sup>150</sup>

In April of 1978 the Tribal Sovereignty Program published the first issue of *Native Self-Sufficiency*, the monthly publication which provided information to grantees about the areas of focus of the Program.<sup>151</sup> These issues contain a great amount of information on the foundation and the grantmaking program, grantees, and general issues of the time. *Native Self-Sufficiency* was published for a decade from April of 1978 to June of 1988.<sup>152</sup> The paper clarified the status of the Tribal Sovereignty Program and noted, “The Tribal Sovereignty Program is a program under the auspices of the Youth Project, a national privately funded foundation which supports a wide range of youth-initiated social change efforts.”<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>150</sup> The Youth Project, 1979, 8.

<sup>151</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, April.) Our First Issue. 1(1), 1-2. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>152</sup> *Native Self Sufficiency* (1978-1988). In Historical Society Library Microforms Room. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

<sup>153</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, April.) Our First Issue. 1(1), 1-2. Guerneville: Native Self-Sufficiency.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* then stated the purpose of the Tribal Sovereignty Program and the publication to the subscribers which included a growing list of grantees, potential projects, friends and colleagues: “We are responsible for seeking out emerging Indian groups that are trying to reestablish some degree of tribal sovereignty and self-sufficiency. We are here to provide technical information, (in the form of this newsletter and on an individual basis) and/or financial aid (small seed grants and assistance in applying for other grant funding) when possible.”<sup>154</sup>

In addition to the concept of tribal sovereignty, the Program emphasized another growing concept critical to Indian communities – the concept of Native self-sufficiency. In introducing the first issue of *Native Self-Sufficiency*, the Program laid out its definition of this important community development concept:

“The purpose of the publication is to provide access to information to the Indian nations and tribes that stimulate serious consideration of our traditional economies as well as alternative forms of economic development. If Indian nations are to seriously pursue ‘self determination’, ‘tribal sovereignty’ or any form of political independence it is also necessary to develop economic independence.

“Our interest is to promote both individual and communal self-sufficiency. . . . Ironically the hand that now feeds the dependent tribal economies is the same hand that destroyed Native self-sufficiency as a method of colonizing our people. However the roots of self-sufficiency are deep within our cultures and traditional economies. With a little nurturing and some cross-fertilization from the contemporary ‘back to the land’ movement they can once again sprout new economies that can sustain our people in the future.”<sup>155</sup>

---

<sup>154</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency*, 1978, 1-2.

<sup>155</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency*, 1978, 1.

Several months later in June of 1978 the Tribal Sovereignty Program expanded its self-definition as a program to “a nonprofit organization under the auspices of the Youth Project, designed to provide technical and financial assistance to native groups who are working to reestablish tribal sovereignty.”<sup>156</sup>

Eighteen projects were funded in 1979 by the Native American Tribal Sovereignty Program during that period. Priorities are consistent with the original grantmaking criteria.<sup>157</sup> The overwhelming grantmaking category supported in this docket focused on land and resources.

Land and resources projects supported during this year included the California Indian Land Acquisition Project. Established to increase the self-sufficiency of California Indians through return of lands, the program provided technical assistance in newsletter production, management and organizational development. The Mole Lake Chippewa Research project was provided support and technical assistance regarding analysis of mineral development. The Nevada Uranium Project of Native Nevadans for Political Education and Action, was given a grant for information dissemination. A grant was provided to the Skagit Nuclear Research project to complete a tribal health baseline data collection.

Additional grants were made to the New Mexico Indian Environmental Project; a grant for anthropological and historical research was made to the Sandia Peak

---

<sup>156</sup> Native Self-Sufficiency (1978, June). Masthead. 1.

<sup>157</sup> The Youth Project (1980, January). *The 1979 Youth Project Annual Report*. 61-70. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.



Project; and a grant was made for public education on issues concerning their sovereign rights to the Mohawk Nation project. Other projects included the Santa Ana Land Project, Santa Domingo Mining Research project, Western Shoshone Land Project, and Defense of the Western Gate.

Reflecting the emphasis on Native self-sufficiency and alternative economies, over time an increasing number of projects were supported in this area including the Klallam Silkscreen project, a small grant was given and expert assistance in marketing and business plans; and a small grant was made to the Sun Group on the Round Valley Reservation to make beneficial use of allotted lands.

The program also funded youth and family-oriented projects including the Tipi Project, the Program provided funds to construct a tipi for the Partridge Lake Nation House which serves cultural needs of Indian youth; and assisted in raising project funds and technical assistance for the Tule River Wilderness School which provided an alternative for youth.

In addition, the Program explored funding congressional education and litigation. The Youth Project and the Program provided funding, technical assistance, and leadership training to the Associated Tribes for Congressional Action, a project to educate Congress about treaty fishing rights and a loan was given to staff their organization and for travel; and DNA Legal Services Project, the Program provided

a grant in support of litigation under the National Environmental Protection Act on behalf of 91 Navajo plaintiffs.<sup>158</sup>

During the following year 1980, the Tribal Sovereignty Program first published a grant guidelines brochure indicating grantmaking interests and criteria along with its annual report. In addition to a general description of the Tribal Sovereignty Program, the guidelines specified funding priorities which indicated that projects “must be Indian initiated and controlled” and requested the form in which requests for assistance should be submitted: “a brief letter describing the present condition or need, your goal, your method or proposed solution, and a detailed budget.” The average grant size was specified as \$3,000 and indicated that there were no application deadlines.<sup>159</sup>

The Youth Project in 1981 in affirming the important contribution which the special program, the Tribal Sovereignty Program, provided: “These special programs using project support funds which supplement our general operating budget, allow the Youth Project to provide grassroots organizations with more substantial funding on in-depth technical assistance on specific issues.”<sup>160</sup>

In the *1980-1981 Annual Report*, the Tribal Sovereignty Program began to enumerate specifics with regard to direct grants made and supplemental funds

---

<sup>158</sup> The Youth Project, 1980, January, 61-70.

<sup>159</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program (c. 1980). *Grant Guidelines*. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>160</sup> The Youth Project (1981). *The Youth Project Annual Report 1980-1981*. 9. Forestville: The Author.

raised and managed on behalf of projects. “During the period January 1, 1980 through June 30, 1981, the Tribal Sovereignty Program distributed \$5,538 in small grants to projects for technical assistance; and the following groups received seed funds and/or supplemental funding administered and supervised by the Tribal Sovereignty Program.”<sup>161</sup>

In addition, the Tribal Sovereignty Program responsible for its own fundraising, began to expand the philanthropic resources available to American Indians beyond the Youth Project contribution.<sup>162</sup> By 1980 - 1981 the Tribal Sovereignty Program had significantly expanded its support by contributing to 25 American Indian grassroots projects in the following categories: grants, a combination of seed grants and supplemental grants they assisted the project to raise from other sources, and projects just provided supplemental fundraising and management support. Grants were provided totaling \$11,000 to the Geothermal Research Project, Iroquois Farm Project, Kalispel Buffalo Project, and Solar utilization for the Navajo Nation. In addition a combination of \$10,000 in seed grants and \$24,100 in supplemental grants from 9 other sources were provided to the Lakota Treaty Council, Navajo Uranium Project, and Northern Cheyenne Resource Research Project.

In addition support for projects was significantly amplified by \$405,995 in supplemental grants from forty-one sources for which the Tribal Sovereignty

---

<sup>161</sup> The Youth Project (1981). *The Youth Project Annual Report (1980-1981)*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

<sup>162</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program (1980). General support proposal. 7-8. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program; Daniel C. Bomberry (1980, October 6). Overview Memo. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

Program provided assistance to the following projects: Akwesasne Freedom School, *Akwesasne Notes*, American Indian Environmental Council, California Indian Land Acquisition Project, Chicano/Indian Mental Health Project, Emergency Response International Network, Indian America Project, Mohawk Nation Project, Nevada Uranium Project, Northwest Indian Women's Circle, Sandia Peak, Skagit Nuclear, Sun Group, Tule River, Upper Skagit Cooper Creek, Western Shoshone Research Project, and Women's Dance.<sup>163</sup>

In September of 1981, the Tribal Sovereignty Program first began to acknowledge itself as a public foundation in its publication *Native Self-Sufficiency* noting the Tribal Sovereignty Program as “a nonprofit foundation under the auspices of The Youth Project.”<sup>164</sup> During the following year in the September 1982 issue of *Native Self-Sufficiency* focusing on some of the accomplishments of the Tribal Sovereignty Program over the past five years summarized: “Our initial small investment with risky projects have paid large dividends to project success and fundraising.”<sup>165</sup> As we now enter our sixth year of service to the Indian community, our experience with over fifty-one grassroots efforts has proven the viability [of] our original funding focus ‘on the quiet building of our communities’ political and economic infra-structures, to allow sovereignty to become a practicality.’<sup>166</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup> The Youth Project, 1981.

<sup>164</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1981, September). 4(3, 4). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>165</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1982, September). 5(2). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>166</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1982, September). 5(2), 1. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

## Independent Foundation

During the period 1983 to 1985, the Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project was in the process of developing the national Native American foundation which later became known as the *Seventh Generation* Fund for Indian Development Inc. In a series of conversations, the Fund had emerged as a program of a national public foundation to a public foundation on its own merit.

In a March 3, 1983 letter to the Executive Director of the Youth Project, Daniel Bomberry submitted an American Indian Foundation Idea Paper which contained the “latest version of the American Indian Foundation idea as a proposed future direction for the Program”.<sup>167</sup> In citing his need for an American Indian foundation he stated:

”The idea behind the current concern is to allow the continuation of this work regardless of the personnel involved. Up to now the Tribal Sovereignty Program has been largely a personal creation of the founder. It has made some significant inroads into foundation funding for Indians. It is also one of the only foundation programs which has a good understanding of Indian affairs and is able to make programmatic sense out of them. The Tribal Sovereignty Program has also been promoting self-sufficiency since the inception of the program. It now appears it is the right moment in history for that message to be acted upon in Indian communities. A permanent organization needs to be created to carry on the work.”<sup>168</sup>

Daniel envisioned the American Indian foundation as a 501(c) (3) public charity and set up independent from the Youth Project. In his proposal for support of the

---

<sup>167</sup> Daniel Bomberry (1983, March 3). Letter and American Indian Foundation Idea Paper to Executive Director, the Youth Project. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>168</sup> Bomberry, 1983.

Foundation for American Indian Alternative Development and Native Rights, his goal was the:

“Creation of an American Indian public foundation to promote small scale appropriate reservation development and protect the traditional sovereign rights of Indian tribes. The objectives were: to establish alternative economic models for rural and reservation Indian development in order to insure the long term survival of the community; to define Indian sovereignty in pragmatic political and economic terms, and to respond to imminent threats to treaty rights, land base, water rights, or sovereignty.”<sup>169</sup>

The Fund filed for incorporation status with the State of California on July 17, 1984<sup>170</sup> and became independent of the Youth Project in January 1985.<sup>171</sup> An advance ruling for tax exempt status as a 501 (c) (3) tax exempt organization was obtained on July 27, 1984 and a final determination of exempt status received on December 18, 1986.<sup>172</sup> The incorporating officers of the new American Indian foundation were: John Mohawk, President, Daniel Bomberry, Secretary, and Jackie Castro, Chief Financial Officer.<sup>173</sup>

He proposed that the foundation would have two major program areas: The main focus of the foundation and where we could make the greatest contribution would be small-scale economic development. “We would provide funding, technical

---

<sup>169</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program (1983, April). Proposal for Foundation for American Indian Alternative Development and Native Rights. 6. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>170</sup> California Secretary of State (Retrieved September 17, 2006 from website [kepler.ss.ca.gov/corpdata](http://kepler.ss.ca.gov/corpdata).)

<sup>171</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1985). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>172</sup> Internal Revenue Service (December 18, 1986). Letter to the *Seventh Generation* Fund for Indian Development, Inc. San Francisco: IRS, Department of the Treasury.

<sup>173</sup> The *Seventh Generation* Fund (1982-1984). *Biennial Report 1982-1984*. 2. Forestville: *Seventh Generation* Fund.

assistance, and research/writing on small scale economic development ventures, subsistence economies, and other self-sufficiency or self-reliance efforts.”<sup>174</sup>

In this first proposal submitted a month later Bomberry suggested that these projects “are the vanguard of a new direction in Indian economic development. It is a movement towards the establishment of locally controlled economies serving local needs. We have been at the forefront of this effort to develop greater tribal self-sufficiency since our inception. The crucial test will be whether this mode of development can create viable economies before tribe’s are consumed by the plethora of problems facing them in the 1980s.”<sup>175</sup>

In addition, the foundation would continue to focus on Native rights for advocacy efforts “to respond to imminent threats to treaty rights, land base, water/resource rights or sovereignty.”<sup>176</sup> As well the Fund would develop several demonstration projects in small-scale economic development “appropriate to Indian culture” to “demonstrate the viability of small scale community economic development projects which utilize local renewable natural resources and human skills to provide basic goods and services for the community.”<sup>177</sup>

---

<sup>174</sup> Daniel Bomberry (1983, March 3). Letter and American Indian Foundation Idea Paper to Executive Director, the Youth Project. Forestville: The Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>175</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program (1983, April). Proposal for Foundation for American Indian Alternative Development and Native Rights. 4. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>176</sup> Bomberry, Daniel R. (1984). Native Rights and Advocacy Proposal. 12. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program/Seventh Generation Fund.

<sup>177</sup> Bomberry, Daniel R. (1984). Native Rights and Advocacy Proposal. 6. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program/Seventh Generation Fund.

The *Seventh Generation* Fund biennial report for 1982 - 1984 announced the final report of the Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project which for eight years had provided support to the work of 75 Native American projects throughout the nation. It also announced that in January 1985 the program would become independent of its parent organization, the Youth Project, and emerge as the “first national Native American community foundation.”<sup>178</sup> Operating under Daniel’s leadership it reported that the Tribal Sovereignty Program through the years 1977 - 1984 assisted in leveraging more than \$1,800,969 in supplemental funds, granted \$129,995 in discretionary grants, and provided important technical assistance and fiscal and management services.<sup>179</sup>

An important additional note is that in the first two years as an independent foundation, the Annual Reports of the *Seventh Generation* Fund reflected that the legacy continued during the years 1985 - 1986 with \$40,152 in direct grants and \$585,814 in assistance provided through supplemental fundraising<sup>180</sup>; and in 1986 - 1987 a total of \$109,590 in direct grants and \$209,503 in supplemental grant assistance.<sup>181</sup>

In addition to the founder and first Executive Director of the *Seventh Generation* Fund for Indian Development, Inc., Daniel C. Bomberry, the founding Board of

---

<sup>178</sup> *Seventh Generation* Fund (formerly the Tribal Sovereignty Program) (1982-1984). *Biennial Report 1982-1984*. Forestville: *Seventh Generation* Fund.

<sup>179</sup> *Seventh Generation* Fund, 1982-1984.

<sup>180</sup> *Seventh Generation* Fund (1985-1986). *Seventh Generation Fund Annual Report (1985-1986)*. Nevada: The Author.

<sup>181</sup> *Seventh Generation* Fund (1986-1987). *Seventh Generation Fund Annual Report (1986-1987)*. Nevada: The Author.



Directors were the following: American Indians John Mohawk, Seneca; Birgil Kills Straight, Oglala Lakota, and Wilma Mankiller, Cherokee, as well as Canadian Indian Robert Antone, Oneida.<sup>182</sup>

In reporting the emergence of the *Seventh Generation* Fund for Indian Development, “a nonprofit public foundation”, Daniel Bomberry wrote in 1984 that,

“This past year has been one of important growth and transition for our organization. January 1985 will mark an important milestone in our history. As we bring to a close our eighth year of operation we will end our long association with the Youth Project as the Tribal Sovereignty Program and emerge as a distinct organization, the Seventh Generation Fund.

“Our new name comes from the Great Law of the Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy which states, ‘In our every deliberation, we must consider the impact of our decisions on the next seven generations . . . .’ It is our sincerest wish to bring to our work this ancient but tireless philosophy. . . .

“The Seventh Generation Fund is the first national Indian controlled community foundation. It will maintain a commitment to local community projects traditionally supported by the Tribal Sovereignty Program in the area of Native rights and natural resource protection, as well as Native Women’s issues.”<sup>183</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup> *Seventh Generation* Fund (1985, January 7). Letterhead.

<sup>183</sup> Daniel R. Bomberry (December 19, 1984). Letter. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program; See also Bomberry, Daniel (1985). Statement in *Native Self-Sufficiency*. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

### References Chapter Three

Akbar Fund (1978). *Akbar Fund Report for 1978*. Chicago: The Author.

Akbar Fund (1972). *A Report on Possible Foundation Involvement in American Indian Programs*. Chicago: The Akbar Fund.

Bomberry, Daniel (1983, March 3). Letter and American Indian Foundation Idea Paper. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

Bomberry, Daniel (1984, May). Native Rights and Advocacy Proposal. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program/*Seventh Generation* Fund.

Bomberry, Daniel (1984, December 19). Letter. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

Bomberry, Daniel R. (1977, September 12). Memorandum. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

Carey, Sarah C. (1975). Philanthropy and the Powerless. In *Research Papers Sponsored by the Commission on Philanthropy and Public Needs*. II, 1109-1164. Washington, DC: The Author.

Internal Revenue Service (1986, December 18). Letter to the Seventh Generation Fund for Indian Development, Inc. San Francisco: IRS Department of the Treasury.

Jenkins, J. Craig (1989). Social Movement Philanthropy and American Democracy. In Magat, Richard. *Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties and Goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978-1988). The newspaper of the Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program. First published by the Tribal Sovereignty Program, the Program spun off from the Youth Project in 1984 to become the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development. The inventory of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin for *Native Self-Sufficiency* has microfilm for most of the issues v. 1: no. 1 – v. 9: no. 4 (1978: April – 1988: spring) lacks one issue v. 9: no. 3 (1987/1988: winter). Located in Historical Society Library, Microforms Room. Madison: Wisconsin.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, April). Our First Issue. 1(1). Guerneville: The Author.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, June). 1. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (March, 1980). 3(1). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (1981, September). 4(3,4). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (1982, September). 5(2). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (1985). Forestville: *Seventh Generation* Fund.

*Native Self-Sufficiency* (1986). 8(1). Forestville: *Seventh Generation* Fund.

Phelps-Stokes Fund (1978). *Phelps-Stokes Fund Report 1977-1978*. Washington, DC: The Author.

Phelps-Stokes Fund (1994). *Report of the Phelps-Stokes Fund 1992-1994*. Washington, DC: The Author.

*Seventh Generation* Fund (1984). *Biennial Report 1982-1984*. Forestville, *Seventh Generation* Fund.

*Seventh Generation* Fund (1986). *Seventh Generation Fund Annual Report June 30, 1985-June 30, 1986*. Forestville: The Author.

State of California Secretary of State, Retrieved September 15, 2006 from website [kepler.ss.ca.gov/corpdata/ShowAllList](http://kepler.ss.ca.gov/corpdata/ShowAllList).

Tribal Sovereignty Program (1980). General Support Proposal. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

Tribal Sovereignty Program (c.1980). Grant Guidelines. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

Tribal Sovereignty Program (1981, March). *Tribal Sovereignty Program Annual Report 1980*. Forestville: The Author.

Tribal Sovereignty Program (1981, April). Proposal submitted to the Needmor Fund. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

Tribal Sovereignty Program (1983, April). Letter and proposal for *Foundation for American Indian Alternative Development and Native Rights*. Forestville: The Author.

The Youth Project (1978, March). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1977*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

The Youth Project (1979, March). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1978*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

The Youth Project (1980, January). *The 1979 Youth Project Annual Report*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

The Youth Project (1981). *The Youth Project Annual Report (1980-1981)*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

## CHAPTER FOUR Case Analysis

The case study depicts the historical development of the *Seventh Generation* Fund for Indian Development and its precedent grantmaking program. The four elements of the case which are analyzed reflect on this case history primarily emphasizing: factors which contributed to the inception of the grantmaking program and then foundation; challenges which had to be overcome; appropriate approaches to grantmaking, fundraising and technical support; and the unique distinctions of this American Indian foundation and its development.

### Factors Contributing to Its Inception

Three primary factors contributed to the nascent development of the Tribal Sovereignty Program and then *Seventh Generation* Fund for Indian Development: the growing numbers of self-help efforts by American Indians which could be aided immeasurably by an American Indian grantmaking entity; the interest of American Indians to develop a vital institutional method for the support of their pragmatic issues and communities; and the interest of the Youth Project to address in a more programmatic and effective way the philanthropic unrepresented, in this case American Indians.

During the conclusion of this period 1977 - 1985, the Tribal Sovereignty Program had provided constructive support to more than 75 American Indian projects from

diverse geographic locations through grants, supplemental fundraising and management support. Addressing a number of issues within the parameters established by the grantmaking guidelines, primarily reservation and community-based, and utilizing a number of different strategies and community organizing techniques, the projects reflected the growing trend in the development of nonprofit organizations in America. During this era, many nonprofits were in the developmental stages the assistance provided by the Program was principally to provide support to emerging efforts. The annual number of projects increased slowly through these years from 6 in 1977<sup>184</sup> to 26 by 1983<sup>185</sup>. In the early years, the primary focus of grantmaking appeared to be an emphasis on governance which shifted to sovereignty enhancing projects including rights, and then incorporated larger numbers of self-sufficiency projects.

The Youth Project as a public grantmaking foundation with an interest in providing support to underserved people, developed a variety of methods in an effort to provide support in better and more expansive ways. They had developed an active interest in American Indians early on and provided grants and other support to American Indian projects. Recognizing the complexity and difficulty in working with American Indians, they sought different methods by which they could improve their effectiveness with American Indian projects. The result was the

---

<sup>184</sup>The Youth Project (1978, March). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1977*. 45-47. Washington, DC: The Author.

<sup>185</sup> The Youth Project (1982/1983). *The Youth Project Annual Report*. 33-36. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

formation of a specialized program directed by an Indian and advised by an Indian board of directors which was unique in this era.

Developed and operated by Indians, the Tribal Sovereignty Program was able to address the complex issues confronting American Indian communities, often in isolated reservation communities in more effective and direct ways. As well the Program was able to identify the key issues which faced American Indians and assist, as community developers themselves, more effective and strategic approaches to address in positive and pragmatic ways significant community issues. Over time, they developed an expertise in providing effective grantmaking combined with referrals to other funding sources, technical and peer support references, and an opportunity to develop the project expertise in organizational development through fiscal sponsorship and financial and management assistance.

A major effort was providing referrals and contacts to other funding sources, developing expertise in grantsmanship and fundraising skills, and a knowledge base and familiarity with foundations and how they functioned. This was invaluable in the long-term in developing the ability of American Indian projects to sustain themselves through their own capabilities and knowledge. As well, this helped to develop the field of American Indian philanthropy and concomitantly American Indian nonprofits.

## Challenges

Among the many challenges which confronted Daniel Bomberry in his attempts to form an American Indian grantmaking program and then foundation included the following: American Indian philanthropy was a new field in the process of development and thus there was insufficient track record with foundations and donors and inexperience of staff and board members in this newly developing field. In addition, there was donor lack of knowledge and experience with American Indian communities and nonprofit organizations, specifically the undeveloped stance of public foundations within mainstream philanthropy, and especially a newly formed and first American Indian foundation.

There were scarce philanthropic resources for American Indians when the program was founded in 1977.<sup>186</sup> In the early years of contributing to American Indians, foundations were generally interested in contributing to large national or regional nonprofit organizations in law, education, or health.<sup>187</sup> Access by smaller and midsize Native American nonprofit organizations to foundations was difficult and often unobtainable. In his 1973 article *White Philanthropy and the Red Man*,

---

<sup>186</sup> Jenkins, J. Craig (1989). *Social Movement Philanthropy and American Democracy*. In Magat, Richard. *Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties and Goals*. 292-314. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<sup>187</sup> In 1973, *Foundation News*, the publication of the Council on Foundations, reported that, "At least 40 foundations are now grappling with Indian survival, supporting a variety of programs which last year [1972] cost the foundations about \$15 million. That is not very much; but it is considerably more than foundations have been accustomed to spend on Indians and it bespeaks a trend that has been inching upward since the mid 1960s. . . ." Margolis reported that grantmaking trends for Native Americans in 1972 were infrastructure development (e.g. developing health and legal systems), education, and community control and self-determination. Margolis, Richard J. (1973 March/April). *White Philanthropy and the Red Man*. 13-22. *Foundation News*.



Richard Margolis states that there was a ‘floundering’ of foundations with regard to Native American grantmaking.<sup>188</sup> This faltering of foundations could have been due to the lack of Native American staff and board members of foundations coupled with the lack of onsite visits to Indian projects which were factors cited in the article.

By the nature of devoting the foundation to “making sovereignty a practicality” and the Program formulated grantmaking around three concepts of sovereignty land and resources, self-sufficiency and economies, and governance. The Program then focused upon these issues of critical concern to American Indian tribes and communities.

Many of these issues American Indians addressed occurred within and were responded to within their respective communities and this was frequently difficult for grantmakers to understand or support.<sup>189</sup> Daniel Bomberry, founder of the Tribal Sovereignty Program, expressed that, “Most Indian organizations are not even aware of the existence of private funding sources. There are many people working on social action projects that may have important implications for future Indian policy that will never be heard.”<sup>190</sup>

---

<sup>188</sup> Margolis, Richard J. (1973 March/April). White Philanthropy and the Red Man. 13-22. *Foundation News*.

<sup>189</sup> Thorpe, Dagmar (1989, Autumn). Looking at Philanthropy through Native American Eyes. [In a Special Issue on Minorities in Fundraising]. 17-18. *The Journal: Contemporary Issues in Fundraising*.

<sup>190</sup> Thorpe, 1989, 17-18.

In addition, unlike other programs and the core operations of the Youth Project, the Tribal Sovereignty Program was responsible for raising its own operating and grantmaking budget.<sup>191</sup> As well the Program had to develop the foundation and donor resources to support their work in a yet undeveloped field. This required tremendous effort in identifying potential contributors, developing their interest, engaging them in relationship with American Indian projects and nonprofit organizations, and advocating for the field of American Indian philanthropy.

A primary contribution of the Tribal Sovereignty Program was providing entrée to communication with foundation sources, “The Tribal Sovereignty Program will remain an intermediary organization between grassroots Indian communities and private funding sources for the foreseeable future. Unlike the field offices of the Youth Project, whose general support budgets are raised by the national office, we raise both our general support and supplemental project funds ourselves.”<sup>192</sup>

One clear indicator of the influence of the Program in expanding philanthropic support for American Indians is that in 1977 when the Tribal Sovereignty Program was founded, Daniel had a handful of foundations who were interested in supporting this nascent effort<sup>193</sup>; by 1985, the number of major donors and foundations supporting the Seventh Generation Fund and its fiscally-sponsored

---

<sup>191</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program (1980). General support proposal. 7-8. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program; Daniel C. Bomberry (1980, October 6). Overview Memo. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>192</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program, 1980, 7-8; Bomberry, 1980.

<sup>193</sup> Bomberry, Daniel R. (1977, September 12). Memorandum. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

projects had risen to sixty-eight not including the hundreds of individuals contributing smaller donations.<sup>194</sup>

There were many projects which Native Americans wanted to accomplish in their communities but did not have the resources to initiate or accomplish such as, culturally appropriate economic development including agriculture, alternative housing, or appropriate technology, environmental protection, or language development.<sup>195</sup> These philanthropic resources provided resources for people to act in positive and meaningful ways for the best interest of their communities which would not be available otherwise.

One of the foremost challenges in the later development of the Fund was that of making a case for the importance and value of an American Indian fund as an important and worthy endeavor among foundations. With regard to American Indian foundations, the author wrote later in a paper for the Pluralism in Philanthropy Project of the Council on Foundations that:

“Philanthropy must parallel the ethnic diversity of the Nation. The creation of ethnic philanthropic institutions is vitally important to their constituent groups and to the field of philanthropy. Those with limited access to resources must be provided with support to create their own philanthropic institutions to assist their respective constituencies. . . .”<sup>196</sup>

---

<sup>194</sup> Seventh Generation Fund (1986). *Seventh Generation Fund Annual Report June 30, 1985- June 30, 1986*. Forestville: Seventh Generation Fund

<sup>195</sup>Seventh Generation Fund, 1986, 18.

<sup>196</sup> Thorpe, Dagmar (1989). *Native Americans in Philanthropy: A paper developed for the Council on Foundations Pluralism in Philanthropy Project*. 24. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.

## Approach

In citing the Filer Commission paper featuring their work, the *1979 Youth Project Annual Report* elucidates the important reason for the development of public foundations, like the Youth Project, which provide once unavailable resources to community-based organizations. In noting the reference of a paper commissioned by the Filer Commission regarding the importance of their unique contributions to the field of philanthropy:

“Beyond the services, we provide to local projects, The Youth Project has proven to be an extremely valuable intermediary organization, serving the needs of other foundations and individual contributors and was so cited in a report prepared for the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (Filer Commission).

“For a variety of reasons, most funding sources lack the ability to locate and evaluate community based projects. Large foundations, for instance, generally have highly professional staff members who receive input mainly from their peers, a contact system which rarely reaches the developing networks of young organizers, researchers and community workers around the country. At the same time, unproven new community organizations or young organizers with no track record are often hesitant to approach the larger foundations on their own. Smaller foundations, individual contributors, and corporate funding sources, on the other hand, have such small staffs, or none at all, that they often lack the mobility and outreach to find good local projects.”<sup>197</sup>

In addition, Program staff was skilled and knowledgeable in addressing the critical issues of the day confronting American Indians. They could assist in developing proposals which addressed in significant, strategic, and systematic ways the often

---

<sup>197</sup> The Youth Project (1980, January). *The 1979 Youth Project Annual Report*. 12-13. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

complex and difficult issues they faced. Staff could assist in identifying and developing resources, financial, technical, and peer resources which projects could utilize to address the issues and obtain their objectives. As well, as they assisted project to project, they helped to develop the field, not only of philanthropy, but also with regard to those aspects of sovereignty and self-sufficiency with which they were focused.

Paralleling the Youth Project unique combination of grants, supplemental fundraising and management assistance, and technical support the Tribal Sovereignty Program described its support to community-based projects in March of 1980.

“Our ability and commitment to provide modest seed funds to discretionary projects allows many new efforts to get firmly established. This funding is intended to enable the organization to define its objectives, establish its staff, and commence operations. Once on its way, a project may be eligible for additional external funding.

“The Tribal Sovereignty Program plays an important role at this stage as well both by providing access to foundations and in continuing our own financial support as the project grows. The Tribal Sovereignty Program also helps establish entrée to non-foundation sources appropriate to each project such as churches, corporations, individual donors, and the federal government. The Tribal Sovereignty Program also serves as a channeling agency and provides administrative support at a small percentage fee for projects without tax exempt status or administrative staff.”<sup>198</sup>

As well as borrowing from the time-honed technical, fundraising and management support developed by the Youth Project, as well as its grantmaking program, the

---

<sup>198</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1980, March). 3(1), 8. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

Tribal Sovereignty Program developed its own unique approach to supporting the efforts of community-based projects to address their issues. Staff accomplished extensive site visits to American Indian communities to provide assistance in ways meaningful to them, sought out people in communities who had an idea of a project needing assistance in order to address a particular issue, established a technical assistance publication to provide information on grantees and opportunities for technical assistance and support, developed long-term commitments to community projects to assure their health, wellbeing, and stability over time; and made it an informal policy to never refuse a request for help but to find some way in providing assistance.

In 1980, Dan Bomberry detailed the way in which the Tribal Sovereignty Program provided support to Native American communities and cited a specific example of the approach. One of the examples he used was the Mole Lake Chippewa who were confronted with plans for one of the largest copper pit mines to be located near their reservation in northern Wisconsin which could devastate their land and wild rice lake.

Bomberry was originally contacted by the Center for Alternative Mining Development to help provide support for a film on this situation. He turned down their request but had developed an interest in the issue. Later he received a proposal directly from the Mole Lake Chippewa and provided a grant for peer technical assistance, a visit to a similar project, the Northern Cheyenne Research Project in

Montana. As well he arranged for another foundation staff person to accompany him. The tribal staff person, Bomberry, and the accompanying foundation staff were able to get “a first hand assessment of the issue, the proposed mining site, tribal staff capabilities, the beauty of the reservation and the determination of the people.”<sup>199</sup>

Then the Tribal Sovereignty Program provided a research grant with regard to their treaty-protected land rights and their right to protect the mining site. The Program provided a \$2,000 grant for a trip to Washington D.C.; and the accompanying foundation supplemented this with a \$5,000 contribution. Daniel noted, that “the ability of the Mole Lake Chippewa to have a voice in their in a proposed development which could have a devastating impact on their people and land has been greatly enhanced.”<sup>200</sup>

### Distinctions

The *Seventh Generation* Fund was a unique effort by American Indians. It was the first national American Indian grantmaking public foundation. The Fund provided an entrance into the foundation world for American Indian community-based

---

<sup>199</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program (1980). General Support Proposal. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>200</sup> Tribal Sovereignty Program (1980). General Support Proposal. 6. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

projects. It acted as an advocate for American Indians in the field of philanthropy. It was created and governed by American Indians to address their own issues.<sup>201</sup>

It also represented a successful collaboration between a Native American grantmaking program and a prominent national public foundation. Operating for nearly a decade as a grantmaking program of the Youth Project, a public foundation, and under Daniel's leadership, the Tribal Sovereignty Program through the years 1977 - 1984, provided support to the work of seventy-five Native American projects throughout the nation, assisted in leveraging more than \$1,800,969 in supplemental funds, granted \$129,995 in discretionary grants, and provided important technical assistance and fiscal and management services. The cordial separation of the Tribal Sovereignty Program to become an independent public foundation was representative of the general tenor of collaboration, collegial relationships, and good partnership resulting in this significant work.

The Fund had the distinctive goal of providing for the support of Native American community-based projects in culturally-appropriate and meaningful ways; and thereby, to support the engagement of Native Americans in their own communities. In addition to the Tribal Sovereignty Program and subsequently the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development's own grantmaking, the fund also provided grantees with extensive technical assistance including proposal and

---

<sup>201</sup> Thorpe, Dagmar (1989, Autumn). Looking at Philanthropy through Native American Eyes. [In a Special Issue on Minorities in Fundraising.] 19. *The Journal Contemporary Issues in Fundraising*.



report development and preparation, networking, and assistance in obtaining supplemental grants.<sup>202</sup>

The foundation also provided an intermediary function of networking foundations to nonprofit organizations, and nonprofit organizations to foundations.<sup>203</sup> The foundation provided intermediary assistance to foundations with site visits, philanthropic field reports, communications including grantmaking dockets and annual reports, and philanthropic convening and presentations.<sup>204</sup>

Support for Native American nonprofit organizations by the Fund provided the means by which people could act in constructive ways to address community issues, develop innovative and creative projects, and respond to community needs.<sup>205</sup> Without the support for Native community-based initiatives for people to address their own issues, there would be the lack of an important and vital sector of American Indian communities. The foundation provided a method for supporting direct community action which people could take to act on their own behalf.<sup>206</sup>

The voluntary initiative of Native Americans to act on their own behalf for the common good, individually and organizationally, is the cornerstone of community involvement. The *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development and

---

<sup>202</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (March, 1980). 3(1).

<sup>203</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency*, 1980, 3(1).

<sup>204</sup> *Seventh Generation* Fund (1989). *Seventh Generation Fund for American Indian Development Annual Report 1988-1989*. 7-9. Nevada: *Seventh Generation* Fund.

<sup>205</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1982, September). 5( 2), 1.

<sup>206</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency*, 1982, 1.

its predecessor provided heretofore unavailable resources for Native American community-based efforts thereby supporting the organizational efforts of hundreds of community-based projects, affecting perhaps thousands of American Indians, throughout America.<sup>207</sup>

---

<sup>207</sup> *Seventh Generation Fund (1986-1987). Seventh Generation Fund for American Indian Development Annual Reports, 1986-1987.* Nevada: The Author; *Seventh Generation Fund (1988-1989). Seventh Generation Fund for American Indian Development Annual Report, 1988-1989.* Nevada: The Author.

## References Chapter Four

- Bomberry, Daniel R. (1977, September 12). Memorandum. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- Carey, Sarah C. (1975). Philanthropy and the Powerless. In *Research Papers Sponsored by the Commission on Philanthropy and Public Needs*. II, 1109-1164. Washington, DC: The Author.
- Gipp, David (1975). *Directory of American Indian Private Funding Sources*. Denver: American Indian Higher Education Consortium.
- Jenkins, J. Craig (1989). Social Movement Philanthropy and American Democracy. In Magat, Richard. *Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties and Goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Margolis, Richard J. (1973, March/April). White Philanthropy and the Red Man. 13-22. *Foundation News*.
- Native Self-Sufficiency* (March, 1980). 3(1). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- Native Self-Sufficiency* (1982, September). 5(2). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- Seventh Generation Fund (1986). *Seventh Generation Fund Annual Report June 30, 1985-June 30, 1986*. Forestville: The Author.
- Seventh Generation Fund (1989). *Seventh Generation Fund for American Indian Development Annual Report 1988-1989*. Nevada: Seventh Generation Fund.
- Thorpe, Dagmar (1989). Looking at Philanthropy through Native American Eyes. A Special Issue on Minorities in Fundraising. *The Journal: Contemporary Issues in Fundraising*.
- Thorpe, Dagmar (1989). *Native Americans in Philanthropy*. Unpublished paper developed for the Council on Foundations Pluralism in Philanthropy Project. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.
- Tribal Sovereignty Program (1980). General Support Proposal. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- The Youth Project (1980, January). *The 1979 Youth Project Annual Report*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

The Youth Project (1983). *The Youth Project Annual Report for 1982/1983*. Washington, DC: The Author.

Tribal Sovereignty Program (1980). General Support Proposal. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

The Youth Project (March, 1978). *The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1977*. Washington, DC: The Youth Project.

The Youth Project (1983). *The Youth Project Annual Report for 1982/1983*. Washington, DC: The Author.

Several theories arise from the thesis *American Indian Philanthropy: Philanthropic Change and Adaptation*. A formative theory which arises from the case study is that the primary theoretical basis for the founding of American Indian foundations was to build the theoretical concepts of sovereignty and self-sufficiency into practicality in Indian country. Although never put to the test of inquiry, this theory could be true as evidenced in the development of numerous community-based projects which it assisted to reach fruition. Many communities benefited from the proliferation of public education which these projects produced on numerous occasions, many families benefited directly from foods grown and produced by their communities, and many tribal members benefited in the formation of better policies which affected their long term best interest.

Noted earlier in this thesis was the hypothesis of Merle Curti, generally recognized as a leader in the early development of American philanthropy as a field of research that “philanthropy is one of the major aspects and keys to American social and cultural development.”<sup>208</sup> The first conclusion suggests that this hypothesis also holds true for American Indian philanthropy. Paraphrasing Curti, one could say that the first national Native American grantmaking foundation served as a major aspect and key to Native American social and cultural development during principally the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s.

---

<sup>208</sup> Curti, Merle (1957, January). The History of American Philanthropy as a Field of Research. 352. *The American Historical Review*. 62(2).

American Indian “self-help” is a prevalent contemporary concept noted first in the literature search for this thesis in October 1911 in the call to a national conference which resulted in the formation of the Society of American Indians.<sup>209</sup> Self-help is a broad concept which can also be applied to the formation of voluntary associations, nonprofit organizations, or foundations. The Tribal Sovereignty Program, then *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development, was such a self-help organization. It was a program then foundation started primarily by Native Americans for Native Americans. La Potin in *Native American Voluntary Organizations*, concluded that “the proliferation of self-created native associations serving a multitude of functions is a testimony to the vitality of American Indian communities in the United States today.”<sup>210</sup>

A second conclusion addresses the development of the field of philanthropy leading sequentially to Native American philanthropy as a natural occurrence. A formative philanthropic observation which can be seen sequentially in stages could explain the development of Native American foundations as part of a continuum of the expanded development of the goodwill of foundations to support human welfare<sup>211</sup>; thus, the making of funds for the public good, philanthropy; contributed to the making of funds for the good of the underrepresented, social change philanthropy; contributed to the making of funds for the good of diverse peoples,

---

<sup>209</sup> Hertzberg, Hazel (1971). *The Search for an American Indian Identity*. 37. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

<sup>210</sup> La Potin, Armand S. (1987). *Native American Voluntary Organizations*. 9. Westport: Greenwood

<sup>211</sup> *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (2002). Springfield: Merriam-Webster.

diverse philanthropy; and thence contributed to the making of funds for the good of American Indians, American Indian philanthropy.

The trajectory of American Indian philanthropy as evidenced in this thesis could be said to follow this natural flow of philanthropic change and adaptation leading to American Indian philanthropy. As well there has been a continuum of two strands of philanthropic development resulting in American Indian philanthropy: American Indian volunteerism and philanthropy; and the parallel social, creative and innovative foundation development.

A third conclusion is that Native American philanthropy reflects a process of change and adaptation. Several social theories support this conclusion. New philanthropic forms emerge from this interaction. In Jane Addams era during the early 1900s, the challenge was the lack of equity and therefore to change the charitable relationship to make it more egalitarian, reciprocal and respectful. A social process of philanthropy was suggested by Jane Addams leading to more equitable relationship between benefactor and benefactee.<sup>212</sup>

A later theory of the 20<sup>th</sup> century espoused by Ostrander and Schervish expands this concept beyond equity to a “relational philanthropic approach” which brings the “recipient into the theory, research, and practice.”<sup>213</sup> Recent philanthropic changes

---

<sup>212</sup> Addams, Jane (1902). , *Democracy and Social Ethics*. 69. New York: The Macmillan Co.

<sup>213</sup> Ostrander, Susan A. and Schervish, Paul G. (1990). Giving and Getting: Philanthropy as Social Relation. In Van Til, John. *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice*. 68. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

expand this concept further to suggest equality between foundations including those created to serve specific constituencies.<sup>214</sup>

As well several occurrences suggest philanthropic change and adaptation including: organizational development as represented by the changing perceptions toward the establishment of a foundation; contributions to American Indian communities; and theoretical development discussed elsewhere.

An indicator of philanthropic change and adaptation relates to contributions to American Indian communities. During the 1970s American Indians were somewhat removed from the field of philanthropy. Following the development of this first national American Indian grantmaking foundation, there has been a proliferation of foundations and grantmaking entities.<sup>215</sup> The impact has been to transform philanthropy from a vehicle of charity towards American Indians to one of self-empowerment of American Indian communities. It has helped to transform philanthropy as a closed process to one of openness and receptivity to supporting the efforts of American Indian people in their own communities.

As well, the concept of recognizing the right and the desirability of American Indians developing their own initiated and controlled projects and programs which

---

<sup>214</sup>Thorpe, Dagmar (1989). *Native Americans in Philanthropy: A paper developed for the Council on Foundations Pluralism in Philanthropy Project*. 24. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations; This is also suggested by Joseph, James A. (1995). *Remaking America; How the Benevolent Traditions of Many Cultures are Transforming Our National Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

<sup>215</sup> Delgado, Louis (2006). *A Demographic Profile of Independently Incorporated Native America Foundations and Selected Funds in the United States*. Chicago: Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector Program and the Center for Urban Research and Learning of Loyola University.



meet their own intentions as they define them, once recognized by a few foundations, has now become the state of the art of philanthropy.

Another indicator of philanthropic change and adaptation is represented by changing organizational perceptions as documented primarily in the newspaper of the Program, *Native Self-Sufficiency*. Over time the organization changed and adapted to meet growing philanthropic challenges. One of the significant indicators of philanthropic change and adaptation was the changing conception over time of the Tribal Sovereignty Program and then the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development. The first conception of the Program was as an American Indian program of a national foundation<sup>216</sup> and later concluded with acknowledgement of itself as a national American Indian foundation.<sup>217</sup>

#### Further Areas of Research

Additional areas of research might include, exploration of the concept articulated by Curti regarding philanthropy as “one of the major aspects and keys to American social and cultural development”<sup>218</sup> and its application to American Indians. In particular, the implications of philanthropy for Native American community development including the development of nonprofit organizations, increase in

---

<sup>216</sup> *Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, April). Our First Issue. 1(1), 1-2.

<sup>217</sup> Daniel R. Bomberry (December 19, 1984). Letter. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program; See also Bomberry, Daniel (1985). Statement in *Native Self-Sufficiency*. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.

<sup>218</sup> Curti, Merle (1957, January). The History of American Philanthropy as a Field of Research. *The American Historical Review*. 62(2.), 352.

voluntary activity, and civic engagement including impact on policies. This would help to demonstrate the direct impact of philanthropy including Native foundations on American Indians.

Other areas for future research might include the influence of the first national American Indian foundation, the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development, on the later development of funds and foundations and the field of Native American philanthropy overall. Specifically utilizing the Fund as a case study, the implications of its grantmaking on the changing dynamics of Native American community development during the 1970s to the present could provide a historical narrative of one American Indian foundation's influence on the sector. This could be accomplished with regard to other Native American foundations and funds as well.

Another area which might be fruitful to explore are the present challenges confronting Native American foundations decades later. There have been significant changes within the philanthropic and nonprofit sector, as well as Native America, over the past four decades which could be enunciated through an analysis of the challenges and their solutions through a multiple decade analysis.

## References Chapter Five

- Bomberry, Daniel (1983, March 3). Letter. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- Bomberry, Daniel (1984, December 19). Letter. Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- Curti, Merle (1957, January). The History of American Philanthropy as a Field of Research. *The American Historical Review*. 62(2).
- Hertzberg, Hazel (1971). *The Search for an American Indian Identity*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- La Potin, Armand S. (1987). *Native American Voluntary Organizations*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, April). Our First Issue. 1(1). Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- Native Self-Sufficiency* (1978, June). 1. Guerneville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- Native Self-Sufficiency* (1981, September). 4(3,4). Forestville: Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- Ostrander, Susan A. and Schervish, Paul G. (1990). Giving and Getting: Philanthropy as Social Relation. In Van Til, John (1990). *Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Seventh Generation Fund* (1987). *Seventh Generation Fund for American Indian Development Annual Reports 1986-1987*. Nevada: The Seventh Generation Fund.
- Seventh Generation Fund for American Indian Development Annual Report 1988-1989*. Nevada: The *Seventh Generation Fund*.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (2002). Springfield: Merriam-Webster.

## APPENDIX      Thesis Case Study Timeline

### I.            The Origins

- Early 1977            Dan Bomberry developed the Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- June 1977            Dan joined the staff of the Youth Project as Program Coordinator for the Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- July 16, 1977        The Policy Board of the Tribal Sovereignty Program met in Denver, Colorado and approved grant guidelines and operations.
- Fall 1977            A major proposal was submitted for foundation support by the Tribal Sovereignty Program.

### II.            Fund Development

- March 1978            First annual report of the Youth Project, for the year 1977, which contains a report on the Tribal Sovereignty Program.
- April 1978            The first issue of Native Self-Sufficiency, the monthly publication of the Tribal Sovereignty Program, is published.

- March 1979      The Annual Report of the Youth Project for 1978 cites 14 projects provided support.
- January 1980      The 1979 Youth Project Annual Report contains the work of the Tribal Sovereignty Program and 18 projects supported.
- 1980 - 1981      Tribal Sovereignty Program in the Youth Project Annual Report 1980 - 1981 began to enumerate grants made and supplemental funds raised on behalf of projects.
- March 1981      Tribal Sovereignty Program Annual Report for 1980 published, perhaps the first stand-alone annual report.
- March 1981      Grantmaking guidelines published.
- June 1982      Six month report of the Tribal Sovereignty Program published.
- September 1982      *Native Self-Sufficiency* reports that over a 6 year period, fifty-one projects were provided support.

### III. Independent Foundation

March 3, 1983 Bomberry submits American Indian Foundation Idea Paper to the Executive Director of the Youth Project.

April 1983 Proposal for a Foundation for American Indian Alternative Development and Native Rights sent to foundations and donors.

October 1, 1983 Youth Project Annual Report describes 26 grantees and supplemental assisted projects of the Tribal Sovereignty Program.

The Tribal Sovereignty Program concluded in the Youth Project Annual Report that over the past seven years, the program had assisted 70 grassroots organizations through providing \$122,995 in discretionary grants and assisting to leverage \$1,800,969 in supplemental grants for projects.

1982 - 1984 Biennial Report of Tribal Sovereignty Program announced that the program would become independent of its parent organization, the Youth Project, and emerge as the first national Native American foundation.

July 17, 1984      The Fund filed for incorporation status with the State of California on July 17, 1984.

1985                The first six month report of the *Seventh Generation* Fund January – June 1985 is published.

1986                The first full annual report of the *Seventh Generation* Fund is published for the fiscal year June 30, 1985 - June 30, 1986.

December 18, 1986      Tax exempt status was received.

## Primary

Ruth Lilly Special Collections and Archives, University Library, Indiana University, Indianapolis.

The Carol Bernstein Ferry and W.H. Ferry Papers (1971-1997) contain papers of these early donors to American Indian causes inter alia. One early 1977 memorandum was located in this collection. Other original documents include annual reports of the Phelps-Stokes Fund 1977-1978, 1992-1994; and the Akbar Fund 1978. The special collection includes manuscripts, archives, and rare books. The manuscript collection contains primary source material for the study of philanthropy including the records of foundations.

Field Foundation Archives 1940-1990, Center for American History, University of Texas.

One of the contributors to the Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project, then *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development, was the Field Foundation of New York. The Field Foundation archives contain correspondence, reports, printed materials, and clippings. The Field Foundation Archives (1940-1990) are located at the University of Texas, Austin which contains the following relevant records for The Youth Project 1971, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1977, 1978, 1981, 1982-1984, 1983-1984; Tribal Sovereignty Program (of the Youth Project) 1978, 1980, 1982-1984, 1984-1985; Youth Project (Center for Community Change) 2<sup>nd</sup> Spring 1970. The Field Foundation Archives also contains documents of the Seventh Generation Fund and Seventh Generation Fund 1984-1988. The archives contain correspondence, reports, printed materials, and clippings.

The Youth Project Collection, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, Wisconsin.

One of the primary archival sources on the Youth Project (1971-1989) is the holdings of the Partnership for Democracy (formerly known as The Youth Project from 1971-1989) in the manuscript collection of the Wisconsin Historical Society. Records include annual reports, foundation files, donor advised fund docket, project plans and reports, correspondence, and information on field offices which included the Tribal Sovereignty Program. Another primary source is *Native Self-Sufficiency*, the newspaper of the Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project, which was published 4 to 6 times a year from 1978-1988. The Program spun off from the Youth Project in 1984 to become the *Seventh Generation* Fund for American Indian Development. These issues contain a great amount of information on the foundation and the grantmaking program, grantees, and general issues of the time. The inventory of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin for *Native Self-Sufficiency* indicates that it has microfilm for most of the issues v. 1: no. 1 – v. 9: no. 4 (1978: April – 1988: spring) lacks one issue v. 9: no. 3 (1987/1988: winter). This microfilm has been obtained for viewing through IUPUI inter-library loan.



Frank I. Sanchez Papers, Center for Southwest Research, University of New Mexico.

One of the Field Representatives of the Youth Project was Frank Sanchez who donated his extensive papers to the University of New Mexico. Although not included in this thesis, the Sanchez papers are referenced because they contain important correspondence, memoranda, and published materials of this era. The Frank I. Sanchez Papers (1951-1999) are located at the University of New Mexico which contains the following relevant records: general foundation annual reports 1988-1996; Youth Project 1976-1978, 1980-1983, 1984, 1984-1985; social change philanthropy 1988-1990, Youth Projects Annual Reports 1981-1982, Youth Project Quarterly Reports 1984-1986; Youth Project, Tribal Sovereignty Spin-Off Program 1986, Tribal Sovereignty Program 1981-1983, Tribal Sovereignty Program Annual Report 1983, Tribal Sovereignty Program/ Native Women's Project 1983; Native Self-Sufficiency, March 1983; Vol. 8, No. 3; Spring 1987. These records contains: in general foundation annual reports 1988-1996, Seventh Generation Fund Report 1982-1988, Biennial Report 1982-1984, and Seventh Generation Fund 1985. The Sanchez papers contain correspondence, memoranda, and published materials. Papers regarding the National Network of Grantmakers and its predecessor organization, the Network of Change-Oriented Foundations, can be located also in the collection which contains the following relevant records: National Network of Grantmakers 1983-1988, 1989-1992, National Network of Grantmakers conference information 1988-1990, 1983-1984, 1984-1985, 1985-1986, 1986-1988, 1986-1987, 6<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference 1983-1984 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference Parts I and II; NNG caucus information 1983-1993, Reports 1981-1983; and Network of Change-Oriented Foundations, 1978.

## Secondary

Joseph and Mathew Payton Philanthropic Studies Library, University Library, Indiana University, Indianapolis.

The Payton Philanthropic Studies Library provided the main source of secondary references in philanthropy which contributed to the writing of this thesis. Library includes "works from all disciplines as they relate to voluntary action." In addition to monographs, the collection includes audio-visual materials, periodicals, dissertations, and primary source material in print and microform.

## General References

- Research and University Graduate School Indiana University (August 2005). *A Guide to the Preparation of Theses and Dissertations*. Indianapolis: Indiana University.
- American Psychological Association (2002). *Publication Manual 5<sup>th</sup> ed.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Booth, Wayne C., Colomb, Gregory G., and Williams, Joseph M. (2003). *The Craft of Research 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bremner, Robert H. (1960). *American Philanthropy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burlingame, Dwight (2002). *Philanthropy in America: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia*. Vol.1-3. Santa Barbara: ABC CLIO.
- Hall, Peter Dobkin (1987). A Historical Overview of the Private Nonprofit Sector. In Powell, Walter W. (Ed.). *The Nonprofit Sector A Research Handbook*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- La Potin, Armand S. Ed. (1987). *Native American Voluntary Organizations*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Madsen, David (1992). *Successful Dissertations and Theses; A Guide to Graduate Student Research from Proposal to Completion 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Nies, Judith (1996). *Native American History; a Chronology of a Culture's Vast Achievements and Their Links to World Events*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Robson, Colin (1993). *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Tracey, Diane H. and Mandel Morrow, Lesley (2006). *Lenses on Reading: An Introduction to Theories and Models*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Turabian, Kate L. (1996). *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations 6<sup>th</sup> ed.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (2002). Springfield: Merriam-Webster.

## CURRICULUM VITAE

DAGMAR SEELY

### EDUCATION 2005 - 2007

Master of Arts in Philanthropic Studies May 2007  
Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana  
Thesis Subject: *American Indian Philanthropy: Philanthropic Change and Adaptation*

Bachelor of Arts, May 1972  
Goddard College, Plainfield, Vermont

Graduation Goal: To teach philanthropic studies in a college or university and in other venues

Longterm Goal: Ph.D. in Education  
Minors in Teaching and Philanthropic Studies

### Service

Graduate Student Assistant, Third Millennium Philanthropy and Leadership Initiative, Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, focusing on the development of a Preliminary Report of Native American Philanthropy which incorporated an annotated bibliography exploring: the numbers of Native Americans in the field of philanthropy, the correlations between increased numbers of Native Americans and increases in contributions to Native American causes, and the opportunities for Native American leadership in philanthropy.

### Teaching

Alumna of Preparing Future Faculty Scholars Program which included seminars in teaching, research, and service. The Program was established by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Council of Graduate Schools to prepare future faculty. Workshops attended included: publishing and documenting work in a portfolio, designing a service learning class, graduate grants program, society and culture, diversifying faculty and staff, funding for faculty of color, preparing future faculty of color for academic positions, developing humanities proposals, and a culminating capstone event. Participated in the PFF Summer Institute which focused on preparing graduate students for a career in the professoriate including academic job search/preparation, course design, and classroom management; and the *Edwin C. Moore Symposium* which focused on teaching excellence

## Research

Recipient of a Center on Philanthropy Thesis Research Grant which provided the opportunity for travel to archives and collections for primary source research (May 2006).

PowerPoint Presentation on Native American Philanthropy before the 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Symposium Highlighting the Research of Faculty, Students, and Staff of Color (2006).

## HONORS, AWARDS, FELLOWSHIPS

### Fellowships

Rockefeller Fellowship in the Humanities for a residency at the D'Arcy McNickel Center of American Indian History, Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois (2003).

### Awards

Henry A. Rosso Award for Lifetime Achievement in Ethical Fundraising, presented by the Center on Philanthropy, Indiana University, for *lifetime contribution to the field of fundraising emphasizing values and ethics of philanthropy; serving as a mentor to young professionals; contribution to raising the level of professionalism of the field; and lifetime achievement in and commitment to ethical fundraising* (1998).

Distinguished Grantmaker Award presented by Native Americans in Philanthropy for *exemplary work and commitment regarding philanthropy and Native American communities* (1996).

Points of Lightning National Activist in Philanthropy Award presented by the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy for *effectuating a national impact on philanthropy and increasing grants to Native Americans* (1991).

### Honors

Featured in Anft, Michael (2002, January 10). Preserving Her Heritage: an American Indians Struggle; Activist devotes her life to preserving Native cultures and shaking up philanthropy by Michael Anft, [Special Issue A Changing Palette; The Nation's minority population is reshaping the non-profit landscape]. *The Chronicles of Philanthropy: the Newspaper of the Non-Profit World*; Vol. XIV, No.6.

Indian Women of the Year in Media, National Indian Media Conference, for researching and writing (1981).

Special Friends Recognition, American Indian Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York for *friendship and consistent support of Akwe:kon Press and help to the American Indian Program to extend its services nationally* (1995).

## Teaching and Lecturing

Adjunct Faculty, Oklahoma State University, College of Education, Tulsa, Oklahoma, conducting graduate seminars in fundraising and nonprofit development; and grantmaking and foundation development (2000).

Preparing Future Faculty Program, alumna, Indiana University, Indianapolis.

Presentation on *Native American Philanthropy*, Class on Philanthropy, Public Policy and Community Change, Loyola University (2002).

Lecture and practicum, Dartmouth College Senior Seminar, *Leadership Resources and Community Development for Native America*, Hanover, New Hampshire (2001).

## Curriculum Development

Consultant in the development and writing of Native American Foundations and Community Development; A Teaching Case Arising from the Hopi Foundation. In *Case Studies in Philanthropy*, Philanthropy and Nonprofit Sector Program, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois. (2003).

Curriculum developed from *Native American Millennium*, an inter-generational forum hosted by the American Indian Program at Cornell University, distributed without charge to tribal high schools and colleges. More than fifty individuals, educational and community institutions participated throughout the four year process. (2001-2005).

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1992 - 2003

Founder and Director of the Lifeway Project which for a decade provided assistance to community projects emphasizing support for local efforts seeking to continue Native lifeways and languages including fundraising and technical assistance; and advocacy with regard to philanthropy and Native American community issues. A companion project was the LifeWay Fund which supported the development of Native American community-based initiatives. A major accomplishment of Lifeway was the book *People of the Seventh Fire*, published by Akwe:Kon Press, an imprint of Cornell University Press, which provided a context of grantmaking for the renewal of Native lifeways and languages. This book was widely distributed to foundations and Native American community projects. Another effort was the Thakiwa Foundation, locally created by Sac and Fox people to support agriculture, language, and other programs.

2001

Featured Speaker, *Philanthropy and Native Americans*, National Society of Fundraising Executives – Oklahoma Chapter, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (2001).

2000

Assistant, American Indians Into Psychology Program (AIPP); Research Assistant, National Native American Mental Health Survey; and Mentor to student participants in the summer program, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

1994 - 1995

Consultant, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Primary Review Selection Process, Kellogg National Fellowship Program, Battle Creek, Michigan.

Director, Sac and Fox National Library and Archives of Stroud, Oklahoma which provided tribal citizens and the general public with a wide range of programs intended to support Sauk and Fox history, culture, and language including a collaborative research project which resulted in an exhibit at the library, *"Retracing the Steps of Our Ancestors"*; and in that capacity also served as Managing Editor, *Sac and Fox News*, the tribe's monthly newspaper.

1990 - 1991

Consultant to the Special Grants and General Grants Programs of the J.D. and C.T. MacArthur Foundation, in the formation and design of *Indigenous Voices 1992*, a special Native American initiative, Chicago, Illinois.

Featured Speaker, Center on Philanthropy, Indiana University Third Annual Symposium, *"Taking Fundraising Seriously"* (1990).

1984 - 1990

Executive Director of the *Seventh Generation Fund*, a national Native American foundation created to support the efforts of Native American reservation based communities in economic renewal, cultural revitalization, rights, community rebuilding, women and families. Ultimately responsible for the direction and management of a thirteen person staff and fundraising for an \$800,000 annual budget. Over this decade, the Fund provided more than \$2.7 million in combined grantmaking, technical assistance, and grant management services to more than 150 projects nationally. (Executive Director 1985-1990; Acting Executive Director 1983-1985; Program Officer 1981-1983; Project Researcher 1981; Project Community Organizer 1980.)

1982 -1983

Program Officer, *Tribal Sovereignty Program of the Youth Project* (predecessor to the Seventh Generation Fund), a program of a public foundation, which was organized to support the sovereignty and self-sufficiency of Indian nations; developed and implemented the Native Women's program.

1980 - 1981

Community Organizer for the *Western Shoshone Sacred Lands Association*, fiscally sponsored by the Tribal Sovereignty Program, an organization of Western Shoshone people seeking to protect Shoshone land rights. Under the guidance of the Association, responsible for conceptualizing, developing and implementing a community education and public information program, project administrator, newspaper editor and writer.

1978-1979

Founder and Coordinator *Native Nevadans for Political Education and Action*, Reno, Nevada a research and educational program fiscally sponsored by the Inter-Tribal Council

of Nevada, developed to support Native rights; responsible for conceptualizing, developing and implementing the following projects: research, publication, and dissemination of issues impacting Nevada tribes, community legal education, media and public relations, and technical assistance.

1977 - 1978

Legal Assistant for Nevada Indian Legal Services, wrote "*Mutual Recognition of Tribal and State Court Judgments in Nevada*" prepared for the Nevada Indian Commission under contract with the Nevada Indian Legal Services; and "*The Development of a Tribal Court Appellate Process and Board of Native American Justice*" submitted to the Nevada Indian Legal Services, Carson City, Nevada and the American Indian Lawyer Training Program, Oakland, California.

1975

Summer Internship, United States Commission on Civil Rights, Office of Research and Evaluation, Washington D.C. (1975).

1970 - 1971

Student Representative for *Students Without Walls*; Planning, Review, and Coordinating Council, Goddard College, Vermont.

1967 - 1968

*Volunteer in Service to America*, Marion County Community Action Program, Salem, Oregon; Program Coordinator, Community Coordinated Child Care, Marion County, Oregon.

## PUBLICATIONS

### Books

Author and Editor, *People of the Seventh Fire: Renewing Lifeways of Native America* (1996), published by Akwe:Kon Press, an imprint of Cornell University Press, which documents Native people's efforts to continue their lifeways. The book was distributed to foundations to encourage them to increase their grantmaking in these areas; and to Native Americans.

### Papers and Articles

Native American Community Development and Philanthropy (Summer 2002). *NFG Reports*, Neighborhood Funders Group, 9(2).

Native American Philanthropy and Non-Profits; Increasing Human and Financial Resources for Native Communities (Winter 2002). *Native Americas Journal*. New York: Cornell University.

*Renewing the Universe; How Philanthropy Can Support Native Lifeways* (1998). A paper written for a grantmakers briefing. San Francisco: Tides Foundation.

Sovereignty; A State of Mind (March 1998). Prepared for the Silver Anniversary of the American Indian Law Symposium. *American Indian Law Review*. Norman: University of Oklahoma.

Native Languages; Philanthropy through Native American Eyes (July/August 1997). *Foundation News*.

*Looking at Philanthropy with Native Eyes* (Autumn 1989). [In a special report on Minorities in Fundraising.] *The Journal: Contemporary Issues in Fundraising*.

*Native Americans in Philanthropy* (1989). Co-author. Unpublished paper for the Pluralism and Philanthropy Project of the Council on Foundations, Washington, DC.

*A Context for Grantmaking to Native American Women* (1983). Discussion paper for annual National Network of Grantmakers conference. Santa Barbara: National Network of Grantmakers;

*Newe Sogobia* (1981). A historical and public education document. Elko: Western Shoshone Sacred Lands Association; and Editor, Western Shoshone Sacred Lands Association Newsletter.

Founder and Producer, "*On Indian Time*" (1978-79). Program designed to explore legal, political, and cultural issues affecting Nevada tribes. Reno, Nevada: KOLO Television.

Columnist (1978-79). *Native Nevadan*, a statewide Indian newspaper. Reno: Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada.

## BOARDS, ADVISORY COUNCILS, MEMBERSHIPS

### Boards of Directors

Co-founder (1989) and Founding Board Member (1990-1991), *Native Americans in Philanthropy*.

Board of Directors, serving on the Executive Committee, and conference co-chair, National Network of Grantmakers Annual Conference "*Building a Vision for the Future*", Seattle, Washington (1987).

Planning committee and co-convenor for *Women of Color Pre-Conference*, National Network of Grantmakers, Annual Conference (1984).

Board of Directors, Sac and Fox National Public Library, Stroud, Oklahoma (1993-1994).

Board of Directors, Women and Foundations/Corporate Philanthropy, Washington D.C. (1991).



## Advisory Councils

Advisory Committee, The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University 15th Annual Symposium: *Taking Fundraising Seriously: Youth and Philanthropy* (2002).

Advisory Committee, *Council on Foundations*, Pluralism in Philanthropy Project, Washington D.C. (1989-1990).

Member, Board of Consultants, The Fundraising School, San Raphael, California (1988).