When many of the Native peoples in the Pacific Northwest signed treaties with the United States during the nineteenth century, they reserved the right to hunt and fish in ceded or "non-reservation" areas. In Washington, however, the state government passed laws that forced Muckleshoots, Puyallups, Nisqualliis, Lummis, and fifteen other treaty tribes to endure hostility and risk imprisonment in order to exercise those rights. During the 1960s, the fish-in-movement brought national attention to the controversy. It would take more than a decade for the landmark Boldt decision (United States v. Washington) to resolve it (see table 5, 1974). Past scholarship has focused particular attention on the legal arena, as well as on certain Indian families and communities central to the fishing rights struggle. Sherry L. Smith's chapter offers a new perspective by critically assessing the roles played by members of the counterculture, the New Left, civil rights organizations, and churches. Acknowledging their positive contributions, she also reveals tensions arising from their involvement. Her work reminds readers that non-Native participation in the Indian reform movement has a complex history that deserves closer scrutiny. She articulates an analytical model that could be applied to other facets of twentieth-century American Indian politics and activism.
broaden support for significant policy change. This argument might surprise those who see non-Indian sympathizers from the Left and the counterculture, in particular, as doing more harm than good in Indian communities, or who see these non-Indians’ interests as superficial, ephemeral, or exploitative. But non-Indians supported Indian rights movements with their money, personnel, and skills (particularly the lawyers among them) and, in demonstration, with their bodies. This interest and these actions mattered.

In the years following World War II, the nation began to confront its failure to ensure the civil rights of all its citizens. Interest in the concerns of all minorities followed. But the issues raised by Indian activists were about more than voting rights, and they did not seek integration. What they demanded was acknowledgment of difference. They called for realization of past promises that codified a separate and special status for tribal people. Instead of a rightful place within the mainstream, many Indians demanded their rightful place apart from it (see tables 3 and 4).

Americans who first understood and appreciated this distinction were those who were increasingly identified as counterculture. These people “discovered” Indians and found them appealing because they presumably offered an actual, living base for an alternative American identity. Challenging bourgeois culture’s values and beliefs in progress, order, achievement, and established authority, the youthful counterculture advocated freedom from discipline and convention. They looked to drugs, sex, and music as vehicles for expression and liberation. Many also looked to Indians as symbols of, and even models for, alternative ways of life. Native Americans seemed like perfect foils to all that these predominantly Anglo Americans disdained about their parents’ lives. Indians supposedly were not only spiritual and ecological but also tribal and communal. Further, they were genuine holdouts against American conformity, the original American “long hairs.” Counterculture iconography consequently became drenched in superficial images purporting to reflect “Indianness.”

Inspired by these simplistic, romantic ideas, some young people began drifting to Native American Church ceremonies and eventually to reservations. Many Indians did not welcome the newcomers. Others proved more willing to interact and eventually enlisted non-Indians in their efforts to promote treaty rights and tribal sovereignty. The more politically oriented “hippies” and elements of the New Left formed the most visible alliances with elements of reservation-based and urban Indian communities. Likewise inspired, in part, by African American civil rights, black nationalism, Chicano-Chicana, and Vietnam antiwar movements, some Indians (particularly, young, studen, and urban-based) sought partnerships with these other groups and patterned their strategies for change, tactics, and rhetoric on models from these groups, although for distinctively Indian goals. By the late 1960s, the boundaries among these identifiable groups and interests were porous. Influences spread in all directions. What activists shared was a deep discontent with conventional values, viewpoints, and politics. The tendency of historians and others, in retrospect, to separate them from each other does a disservice to the sometimes tension and temporary, but powerful, intersections that took place. It ignores the collaborations that occurred in a constellation of overlapping interests and issues.

The Pacific Northwest was one of the first places where such congruences occurred and resulted in important successes regarding the reassertion of treaty rights. Interestingly, in the early 1960s no one seemed to be paying much attention to this region, let alone to the Indians of Washington State. In fact, Americans appeared inordinately concerned with the South and a struggle against racial hatred that was conceptualized as white against black. Indians remained well below the radar screen of national consciousness. Meanwhile, a non-Indian writer from Oregon and Native American activists in Washington were engaging in a radical rethinking of the cultural meaning and political place of Indians in contemporary America. The writer, Ken Kesey, articulated an Anglo American’s sense of Indians’ significance, particularly for the emerging youth culture that eventually spawned San Francisco’s Haight-Ashbury hippies, Berkeley’s New Leftists, and New Mexico’s communarians. At the same time, Nisquallys, Lummiis, Puynesups, Malahs, and other tribes focused on their economic and political tribal interests, renewing their insistence that treaties matter and challenging state laws that ignored these.

Working apart, the author and activists never met. Yet their efforts related to each other. Moreover, other non-Indians did join Native activists’ fish-ins and demonstrations, including actor Marion Brando; comedian Dick Gregory; and hundreds of non-celebrity sympathizers. Indians pushed their cause onto newspaper front pages by borrowing, albeit altering, black civil rights tactics and by inviting Anglo and African American celebrities, as well as people of other races and ethnicities, to join them in acts of civil disobedience. The strategy worked.

Among the first non-Indians to signal an interest in things “Indian” were counterculture types. Among the first to define that difficult-to-define cultural movement and link it to Native Americans was Ken Kesey. By making an Indian the narrator and centerpiece of his first novel, One Flew over the Cuckoo’s Nest, he placed his readers on the periphery of American society. As counterculture people careened across the landscape looking for alternatives to their parents’ lifestyle, Kesey’s Chief Broom, a half-blood member of a fictional and defunct Columbia River tribe, may have been
their first engagement with a contemporary Indian figure and with contemporary Indian political issues.

The hero of Cahoos's Nest is Randall McMurphy, a man who challenges the brutalizing power of authority in the form of Big Nurse and consequently serves as inspiration to the other inmates of the mental hospital where he has been incarcerated. He ends up lobotomized and eventually dies. The observer, interpreter, narrator, and ultimate survivor, however, is the supposedly silent and schizophrenic "Chief Broom" Bromden. Bromden is the novel's most fully developed character and the only one with a history. He is also the one who observes, interprets, understands, evolves, and takes positive action. Bromden's tribe has disintegrated, its village inundated by a federally financed Columbia River dam. For years, his father, a "full-blood" named Tee Ah Millatoona, fought the hydroelectric project, with its attendant pressures to give up ancestral fishing rights and return to government housing. Government agents beat Bromden's father and cut his hair. Still, Tee Ah Millatoona resisted until other members of the tribe sold out. Some of them going to work on the dam construction with their "faces hypnotized by routine." Moreover, his own wife, a white woman from the Dalles, worked on him to submit, making him "too little to fight any more." Only then did he give up, turn to alcohol, and die.

What remained, however, was the son—and his memories. McMurphy helps Bromden not only revive that history but also regain his voice. "I still hear the sound of the falls on the Columbia, always will... hear the slap of the fish in the water, laughing naked kids on the bank, the women at the racks." He begins to speak, telling McMurphy his family history, as both explanation and cautionary tale. "The Combine" beat his father, he said. "It'll beat you too." This proved prophetic for the red-haired Irishman, but in joining McMurphy's firefight with the hospital attendants, in standing up for the patients' dignity, and in being subjected to one last shock treatment, Bromden concludes that he will never again be lost in the fog. This time he will beat them. Using the powers McMurphy helped him discover he still had, Bromden lifts the heavy control panel from the ward's tub room, leaves it through the window, and realizes his escape. His destination? Canada, eventually. But first he would go to the Dalles, seeking his Indian friends. "I'd like to see what they've been doing since the government tried to buy their right to be Indians. I've even heard that some of the tribe took to building their old ramshackle wood scaffolding all over that big million-dollar hydroelectric dam and are spearing salmon in the spillway. I'd give something to see that." And so the story ends. The hope for the future rests with an Indian as he strides through the moonlit night—flying, free.

Given the novel's publication date of 1962, it might seem surprising that Kesey chose a Native American narrator. Why use an Indian perspective—and a fishing tribe, to boot, complete with current political issues—to frame a novel populated otherwise by Anglo and African Americans? Kesey offered a light-hearted, playful explanation: peyote. An alternative explanation for the inspiration and centrality of Chief Broom rests on two things: Kesey's Western background and orientation and a long-standing literary tradition. Born in Colorado but raised in Oregon, Kesey certainly knew that Indians still existed. Apparently, he had some familiarity with ongoing conflicts between Indians and the government over fishing rights in the wake of hydroelectric dam construction. The details of Bromden's tribal life reveal a remarkable awareness of and sensitivity to Native politics in the twentieth-century West.

More than that, who could more appropriately represent the outsider who historically resists the omnipotence of expanding national power? What greater hope for this country than that supposedly offered by indigenous people, whom Kesey (and many others before him) associated with the beauty of the natural world, genuine freedom, life apart from the machine, an organic community free of industrialization's alienation? For all his countercultural inclinations, Kesey, in choosing an Indian narrator, was connecting with a time-honored tradition of associating Native Americans with resistance to modernity.

In linking up, perhaps unconsciously, with this literary convention, Kesey provided his readers with a symbol that served the purposes of a new generation. Indianness proved to be a powerful concept that inspired the emerging counterculture from that point on. Moreover, it is a story with political implications. The novels end promises Indian resistance, renewal, and renaissance in the erection of ramshackle wood scaffolding over the modern hydroelectric dam. If powerless Indians could fight the "Combine," surely others could too. It would be difficult to overstate Kesey's contribution to the counterculture. He served as a bridge between the Beats and the hippies of Haigton-Ashbury. He was the "Pied Piper of psychedelia" who, with the Merry Pranksters, "brewed the cultural mix that fermented everything from psychedelic art to acid-rock groups [and] in the process of his pilgrimage blew an entire generation's mind." If he was also among the first of his generation to turn to Indianness as inspiration for social criticism, political action, and cultural release.

The month President John F. Kennedy died in Dallas was the month Hank Adams dropped out of the University of Washington. A Siouk/Assiniboin who grew up on Washington's Quinault Reservation (his mother having married a member of that tribe), Adams decided to scrap the academic routine. Instead, he wanted to engage in direct action and organize protests.
The most pressing issue at hand, fishing rights, was one that had passed since territorial governor Isaac Stevens signed federal treaties with Northwest tribes in the 1850s, promising them, as they ceded huge swaths of property, the right to continue fishing in their "usual and accustomed places." Over time, Washington and Oregon ignored those rights, attempted to expand their jurisdiction over tribal members, and eroded sovereignty by harassing and sometimes arresting Indians who dropped nets on rivers outside reservation boundaries and beyond state-determined seasons. Indians maintained that their treaties allowed them to fish these spots, so they continued to do so, wherever and whenever they wanted. They believed that these nineteenth-century agreements provided immunity from state rules and regulations. Sports and commercial fishermen supported Washington State's efforts to prosecute, claiming that Indian fishing threatened the fisheries for everyone. In the early 1960s, with the lines now drawn, some Indians were continuing to challenge Washington State's interference with their fishing.11

Hank Adams attended his first National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) meeting in 1963, where he came into the orbit of Clyde Warrior, a Ponca from Oklahoma who helped found the group in 1961 (see table 4). The NIYC brought together young Indians inspired by the same impulse that was prompting other members of their generation to create new organizations with more activist agendas and aggressive strategies. When NIYC met at the Ute Reservation in Fort Duchesne, Utah, during the summer of 1963, Warrior invited Marlon Brando to join them. Brando had just participated in the March on Washington and had urged its leaders to participate in civil rights protests. Not all were interested, but Hank Adams and Bruce Wilkie (Makah), another NIYC founder, argued that black activists' methods, if not their goals, could be applied to Northwest Indian problems.

The following March, Adams and other NIYC members convinced Brando to participate in what the media would call a "fish-in." For several decades, Indians such as Billy Frank (Nisqually) and Bob Satiacum (Puyallup) had fished and endured arrest, assault, and imprisonment—with little media attention and no change in state policy. Now, Adams wanted to ratchet up the pressure. Not all local Indians welcomed NIYC's involvement, viewing its members as "college kids with sports jackets who showed up merely to make themselves look good."12 Not all advocated direct action, preferring to resolve differences in courts of law.

Meanwhile, Brando, although not a counterculture figure, embraced the persona of a rebel with a cause. He spent several days in Washington in early March 1964 and stayed consistently "on message" regarding the legitimacy of treaty rights. He understood what was at stake, and the fish-ins marked...
By the fall of 1966 even Gregory's Indian allies had become critical, claiming that although they had invited him to join their efforts, they were now disappointed. According to Janet McCloud, one of his associates, received publicity primarily in black magazines, which advanced his career, but not their cause. Further, the publicity discouraged small, local donations. In an attempt to undo some of this damage, NAIRA invited Jay Silverheels, the television character from 'The Lone Ranger,' to attend an Indian unity meeting. A Mohawk from Ontario, Canada, Silverheels arrived and posed for a photograph with Native American proponents and opponents of the fish-ins.

When Gregory returned to Tacoma for sentencing, the judge slammed him with a six-month jail term, suspending only one-third of it. On June 7, 1968, he began serving time in the Thurston County jail. Gregory's attorney, Jack Tanner, warned that black power advocates H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael, as well as the Reverend Ralph Abernathy, would show up to protest the sentence. He predicted that the Peace and Freedom Movement would demonstrate on behalf of Gregory, his candidate for president, and would boycott Washington State products such as apples and Olympia Beer. A group of Quakers, a Christian denomination formally known as the Society of Friends, paraded around the courthouse with "Set Dick Gregory Free" signs, having spent the preceding week discussing the Vietnam War and minorities' concerns. Some spotted "Eugene McCarthy for President" buttons and sang "We Shall Overcome." Once Gregory was let out of jail, the press coverage turned away from fishing rights and toward Gregory and African American issues. Gregory sent telegrams to President Lyndon Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, North Vietnam, China, and Ho Chi Minh, China's Mao Zedong, and twenty-four other heads of state in order "to tell the Indians' and his story [my emphasis] to the world literally." According to one account, Gregory was particularly miffed that Johnson and Rusk had not included him in a meeting with six other presidential candidates, a slight he characterized as "a racial insult." He also decided to consume only distilled water and bread during his incarceration, describing the hunger strike as a protest against the denial of fishing rights, the war in Vietnam, and other issues. Consequently, newspapers regularly reported on his weight loss, and one journalist even mused on the political costs to Republican governor Dan Evans, who should the activist die in custody. In the meantime, during a news conference called by Lillian Gregory and Jack Tanner, Janet McCloud tried to bring the focus back to the Indians' issues, reminding the state that she, as one reporter put it, "hadn't buried the hatchet." But the story's headline announcing "Gregory Tells World He's Alive, Hungry" indicated that the celebrity's health attracted most of the attention.

Finally, on July 17, 1968, Judge Hewitt Henry released Gregory from prison. About twenty pounds lighter than when he had entered jail six weeks earlier, Gregory left the courthouse in the company of I Spy television star Robert Culp and his actress-wife, France Nuyen. Insisting that his purpose remained publicizing "the plight of the Indians," Gregory told reporters that he hoped Indians would not have to become "as militant and violent as black people are for America to wake up" and that Washington State would solve its black problems and become a model for the rest of the nation. For now, he intended to turn his attention to a "world fact-finding tour" and would take him to North Vietnam, China, and North Korea, where he hoped to talk with crew members from the recently captured US Navy vessel The Pueblo. With that, Gregory left the Northwest. Without a doubt, Gregory's sympathies for Indian fishing rights were sincere. Yet this particular cross-racial partnership proved problematic and possibly counterproductive, diverting attention from treaty rights and diffusing it into a kaleidoscope of other issues.

About the same time Dick Gregory left the Pacific Northwest, a University of California, Santa Cruz, undergraduate named Richard White migrated into the region. White quit his summer job on Independence Day, 1968, and agreed to join a friend—Joseph Quinones, a Yaqui from California—on a road trip to the Democratic National Convention meeting in Chicago that summer. They never made it. Instead, the young men found their way up to the Sky River Rock Festival in Washington State. There, they met Rolling Thunder, a Cherokee medicine man who lived on the Shoshone Reservation in Nevada and had been making appearances at counterculture events at least since the 1957. San Francisco Be-In. Upon learning that Quinones was Yaqui, Rolling Thunder told him, "You have to go Frank's Landing. Your people need you." The next day, White and Quinones drove to Frank's Landing, a center of fish-in activity and an Indian settlement
credibly rooted to their place, had been fighting for something for one hundred years, and "did not become distracted by the [counterculture] circus around them." White was not privy to the strategy meetings or the inner circle of Hank Adams, Billy Frank, and Al Bridges, nor did he expect to be. The fundamental justice of their cause and, in particular, his personal commitment to the Bridges family kept him there.

While the Nisqually and Puyallup men endured harassment and arrest, the women kept camp and political activities going by raising fish, collecting sympathetic people to contribute food and supplies, selling any salmon caught to willing buyers, and occasionally getting arrested, beaten, and jailed themselves. Maudie Bridges, Billy Frank's sister and Al Bridges' wife, "was the one you saw first and remembered," according to White. "She had calmness and a dignity that had seen outrages and survived intact." Her daughters, Valerie, Sueettie, and Alison, participated in all aspects of the camps' political activities. Hank Adams spent much of his time typing at the Bridges' kitchen table, strategizing and negotiating complicated arrangements that often fell apart. He had escalated the nature of the conflict by bringing in non-Indians for large protest demonstrations as a way to make it more costly to the state. Adams himself was not a "radical," but he used radicals to buy time, get concessions, and garner publicity.

In early September 1968, Students for a Democratic Society, the Peace and Freedom Party, and other leftist organizations announced an alliance with the "renegade" Nisqually fishermen. As Robby Stern, prominent member of the University of Washington SDS, saw it at the time, the state and federal governments had been systematically extinguishing Indians' cultures for years, and the "Red people are clearly among the most oppressed people in this society. They represent another important group that will join with other oppressed people of the society to destroy their oppressors." He also acknowledged the Vietnam War, a significant backdrop to all politics by the fall of 1968, noting that it was twice as deadly to be an Indian in America in 1965 to 1966 as a soldier in Vietnam. Others, too, noted parallels between Indian issues and those of the war in Vietnam. To Richard White, Frank's Landing represented "the backwater of Vietnam," another place where things had gone terribly wrong and the nation had committed grave injustices. Inclinations to join the issues found reinforcement from bitter Vietnam-era veterans in the camp and from Hank Adams, who identified a "commonality of historic and collective experience [which] established an affinity" between Indians and Vietnamese.

Robby Stern, like White, understood that the fight was the Nisqually's, but he still believed that non-Indians could be of help. He attempted to impose order at Frank's Landing by creating committees for each fishing site.
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and a master committee to coordinate them all. The committees, however, quickly fell apart. Outside the camp, an Indian Rights Commission formed to raise money, replace confiscated fishing equipment, and provide legal defense and bail. Further, it hoped to recruit people from all over the country to come to Frank’s Landing. Suzette Bridges traveled to Denver to meet with Chicano activist Corky Gonzales, “The Guevara of the Rockies,” who promised a busload of demonstrators for a mid-October demonstration. After the Indian leaders decided on a demonstration date and site, Stern would call a meeting of non-Indians to decide whether any of them would be arrested—an “Alice and Wonderland” effort, because the police arrested whomever they chose. In the end, White concluded, the non-Indian camp was “ineffective, disorganized and tumultuous, but its weakness became its strength.” Law enforcement officers and locals in Olympia were fearful of what might happen at Frank’s Landing. Assuming that they were dealing with “unpredictable, drug-crazed maniacs,” they gave the camp more power than it ever had in reality. They feared hundreds of freaks and radicals in Olympia. This was Hank’s success. It was one of the few things he had to bargain with.”

Most people, of course, had no idea what was happening at Frank’s Landing. Their information came from newspaper accounts of the demonstrations. Just as Marlon Brando and Dick Gregory’s participation had ensured front-page news coverage, the hundreds of people who supported Billy Frank and other fishermen as they strung their nets at the spillway from the Deschutes River and Capitol Lake on September 8, 1968, found their photo on The Daily Olympian’s front page the following day. The accompanying article claimed that the Indian fishermen’s supporters were “goateed, long-haired, barefoot and bare-chested hippies from as far away as Los Angeles and Alabama, singing, swinging, and carrying signs protesting restrictions of civil rights and Indian rights.” Police arrested only six people, however. Among them was Joseph Quinones, who, upon being booked on the fifth floor of the county courthouse, opened up a window, flung his hat into the crowd below, and shouted, “Freedom now!”

One month later, state and county officers seized a net at Frank’s Landing and subsequently confronted about thirty people camping there, “mostly non-Indians, long-haired, bearded youths and their girls.” Officers arrested fisherman George Meskootis, but the featured photo in the Olympia paper depicted not Meskootis but non-Indian men and women “lecturing” Bruce Guert, assistant chief of the Fisheries Patrol. The story focused on the “hippies’” verbal abuse of the lawmen. The same day, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer printed a photo of Quinones and Stern delivering a dead salmon to the Governor’s Mansion and a photo of two hundred young people (again, mostly non-Indian) sitting in on the state’s Temple of Justice in support of fishing rights. Most news accounts, in fact, led with sentences mentioning the presence of Black Panthers, Socialist Worker Party members, and SDSers as a way to underscore the radicals’ presence and, perhaps, discredit the Indians’ position.

Such allies most assuredly carried costs. No doubt, many readers, including Native ones, found the hippies and political radicals quite disconcertingly. When the Seattle Liberation Front joined the Payuallups at their encampment along the Payuallup River, Bob Satlacum made a pointed comment in answer to a reporter’s query about how he liked such volunteers: “Well, you don’t see any of the good church people down here helping us, do you?” Quite simply, supporters of any political stripe and race were welcomed. Moreover, the presence of middle-class Anglo “kids” catalyzed these events into people’s consciousness. It brought home to people in the Northwest the challenges to the status quo regarding race relations and Indian politics were real, immediate, and gaining strength. The story was no longer about a handful of so-called renegade Indians demanding treaty rights. Non-Indians from across racial, ethnic, religious, geographic, and generational lines were joining them. Nothing quite like this had ever occurred in American history. Something big was happening here.

Simultaneously, behind the scenes other non-Indians, including “some good church people,” were supporting the fish-ins in less public ways. Adams, Janet McCloud, Ramona Bennett (Payuallup), Gaye McMind (Quinault), and others had for years been establishing ongoing relationships with church groups and gathering support. Episcopal canon Yvar’s participation in the 1964 fish-in signaled an early response. In 1968, at the invitation of Olympia’s Episcopal bishop, Adams and Bennett met with various Protestant leaders in seeking continuous, not just crisis, involvement. Bishop Ivol Curtis acknowledged that his denomination operated a church on Payuallup land and that it could become a political sanctuary for Indian fishermen, much as other Episcopal churches had been used by conscientious objectors to the Vietnam War. At the end of this particular meeting, the Indians received a check for $500 from an anonymous donor and a promise of $5,000 more.

Even more impressive was Quaker support, particularly through the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC). In 1967 the committee completed an eighteen-month study of Muckleshoot, Payuallup, and Nisqually fishing rights. The National Congress of American Indians initially printed a mimeographed version of the report, and in 1970 the University of Washington published a book edition. The work, by a collection of authors, initially intended to sort out the complicated and emotional issues. Gradually, the writers determined that the Indians’ side of things was not
well understood and needed an outlet. The fishing rights cases attracted the Quaker organization's interest in the first place because of the ramifications beyond Washington State.

In a statement reminiscent of Kesey's Chief Bromden, the AFSC author indicated that the Indians had come up against "the aggressive, development-oriented Western culture" and therefore shared much with other peoples' struggles around the globe. For too long, and to the Earth's detriment, Western civilization had imposed its values, religion, law, education, and technology on other cultures. Now, by recognizing the legitimacy of Native fishermen, people could also benefit "from the traditional conservation wisdom of Indians." The report explained that Indians integrated work, play, and religion with the environment and could consequently "serve as a model for the survival of man suffering now from too much fragmentation and not enough community feeling." If Robby Stern stressed the Indians' oppression, the AFSC stressed their "ecological awareness of kinship with environment." Indians were not the ones who built the Grand Coulee Dam and destroyed fisheries. They did not dump sewage and atomic waste into rivers. Yet conservation was not the core issue here. By adopting new values and attitudes, Americans not only could increase the number of salmon in their rivers but also could simultaneously cultivate diversity and cross-cultural respect. The hostility toward Indians and their legal rights reflected fear of difference. The larger concern, then, was to stop imposing conformity and to encourage the kind of diversity necessary for a healthy society and planet. In fact, the AFSC concluded, non-Indians needed to adopt a more Indian-like relationship with nature, based on harmony rather than on conquest. They also suggested that a commission made up of Indians, sportsmen, and commercial fishermen work on a fair allocation of fish. This was both the legally and the morally right thing to do. How many people read this book is impossible to determine, but it went into multiple printings and certainly helped shape the outcome of the fishing rights controversy.

Eventually, the controversy was resolved as activists turned away from demonstrations and the attendant publicity and looked to lawyers and the court system. They sought and received help from the Seattle Legal Services, the newly created Native American Rights Fund (NARF), and, most important, the United States Justice Department (see table 4). By September 1970 the Justice Department launched its case, United States v. Washington, and most of the state's tribes joined the litigation. This was a momentous turning point. The Indians now had the expertise of Indian lawyers, as well as the power and resources of the federal government, on their side. Finally, in February 1974 Judge George Boldt decided in favor of the tribes. It was a dramatic endorsement of treaty rights.

Indians, of course, deserve the lion's share of credit and responsibility for this impressive victory. They fought long and hard to sustain treaty rights. They were the ones who consistently risked life and limb and livelihood. But they also won because they operated in a national climate that was growing more conducive to acknowledgment of treaty rights and the justice of Indians' positions. Counterculture and radical types, celebrities and students, Quakers and Episcopalians, were no more than a "supporting cast" in all this—but an important, and perhaps even crucial element nevertheless. They did not represent a well-organized, disciplined, or regimented set of troops. Far from it. They wandered in and out of Franks' Landing and other sites of contention. Sometimes their attention and interest waned. But in their shared belief that the fishing rights issue represented America's legally sanctioned promises to a particular "minority" group, in their commitment to the validity, viability, and perpetuation of various cultures within the nation, and in their effort to redress America's imperialist past, as well as present foreign interventions, these allies helped to capture the eyes, ears, and hearts of fellow citizens, who, in the end, responded favorably to significant change. Hank Adams and others understood this at the time and used these groups for Indian purposes. To acknowledge the role of non-Indians reminds us that Indians and non-Indians were, and remain, deeply implicated in each other's cultures and politics.
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