Appendix A: Research Considerations

From Landscape Traveled by Coyote and Crane: the World of the Schitsu'umsh (Coeur d'Alene)
Seattle: University of Washington Press 2001

“Collaboration,” from the Latin, collaborare, i.e., com-, “with” and laborare, “to work,” can be defined “as the working together, especially in an artistic, literary, and/or scientific manner.” There can be no more appropriate word to characterize how and why The World of the Schitsu'umsh (Coeur d’Alene Indians): Landscape Traveled by Crane and Coyote came into being. By its very nature, ethnography can never be a solitary endeavor. And in this particular endeavor are realized the contributions of so many voices, indeed, some artistic, some literary, and some scientific, at least one Euro-American, and many many Schitsu'umsh. The following discussion will highlight the how and why of this collaboration.

Conceptual Framework  The selection of a conceptual framework and the usage of certain terms, such as “landscape” and “teachings,” for presenting the Schitsu’umsh story was not without considerable deliberation. How does one attempt to describe to an audience primarily made up of Euro-Americans the experience of a people that is so unlike their own? An interpretive framework and specific constructs are needed that both accurately represent the Schitsu’umsh experience, yet at the same time are understandable and accessible to the non-Schitsu’umsh. A bridge is needed. The search for appropriate terms and categories to refer to such items as “camas” and “deer,” “mountain” and “lake,” for example, led to use the more inclusive and culturally sensitive terms, “gifts” and “landscape.” Electing to use what for many would be a more readily identifiable term, such as “natural resource,” to capture and communicate the meaning of “camas” would have left our bridge without a Schitsu’umsh foundation. While the term may be identifiable for Euro-Americans, is its problematic for the Schitsu’umsh. To the extent that “natural resources” can be interpreted to denote a commodity of monetary value, exploited from an environment for its utilitarian worth, lacking spiritual properties, and implicitly objectified and inexorably distinct from the human experience it also succeeds not only in missing the mark and not corresponding to the Schitsu’umsh experience, but in distorting the story of the Schitsu’umsh. It is for this reason, in lieu of the use of the term “natural resources” that the term “gifts” was consistently used to refer to specific phenomena. It more effectively conveys the meaning of the notion that “camas,” “deer,” and “water potato” were created by the First Peoples in preparation for the coming of Human Peoples, who, in turn, share them unselfishly with those in need.

Let me briefly elaborate on how I have come to define and use two of the key concepts incorporated throughout this study - “landscape” and “teachings.” “Landscape” refers to the way a people have conceptualized the phenomena of their environment (lakes, rivers, mountains, animals, fish and plants), investing that phenomena with cultural significance and meaning.1 While essentially denoting and anchored to a physical geography, the significance of “landscape” transcends its material properties and resides in the symbolic and cultural meaning it holds for a particular people. Hence a “landscape” can entail phenomena that is fundamentally aesthetic, affective, moral, and/or...
spiritual, as well as economic in nature. “Landscape” is to be understood and felt. The comprehension of the Schitsu’umsh “landscape” is not unlike how you are to approach the significance of the oral traditions. As Cliff SiJohn constantly reminded me in reference to the stories, you have to use “your heart [gently patting himself on his chest], not up here [pointing to his head]. If you tell it with your heart, you’ll have clean hands” (Frey 1995:216).

As an individual grounded in Euro-American cultural sensibilities, I have always found it challenging when, as an ethnographer, I am confronted with the possibility of a world lacking in something which seems so elementary - the Cartesian duality. But this is exactly what we must wrestle with in the Schitsu’umsh world. As I venture to give definition to such a pivotal construct as “landscape,” the particular meanings of the “teachings,” especially the second “teaching” which speaks to the notion of “kinship inclusivity,” add new dimension to the construct. Implicit in my usage of “landscape,” as applied to the Coeur d’Alene experience, is thus the understanding that “landscape” does not have an existence separate from that of the human, as if viewed from afar. The Human Peoples, in kinship with the Animals Peoples, have their very existence to the extent they are a part of the world, and not living apart from it. We see this understanding expressed in the act of giving voice to a story, in the rhythmic movements of the Jump Dancers, and in the song sung in the heat of the Sweat House. In each instance, the human assumes an active and essential role in continuing to bring forth the world, and, in so doing, placing himself firmly within it. Consequently, as the Schitsu’umsh experience is multi-dimensional, inclusive of aesthetic, affective, moral, spiritual, and economic significances, something understood, something felt, “landscape” and its many Peoples are necessarily and indivisibly so endowed. “Landscape” has neither solitary nor objectified qualities.

A second key construct is “teachings.” Expressed in the Schitsu’umsh term, miyp, literally meaning, “teachings from all things” (Frey 1995:42), “teachings” refers to the knowledge - practical, ceremonial, social, as well as moral - which has been handed down from the First Peoples and which is indispensable if one is to live a Schitsu’umsh life. The concept has affinity with Clifford Geertz’s notion of “religion” as a “model of” and “model for” the world (1973:123). The “teachings” not only reflect the way the world is perceived, passively describing it and acting as a model of the world, but most critically also contribute to the conceiving of the world, actively helping bring it about, a model for the world. Through the “teachings,” the Schitsu’umsh come to learn about their world, i.e, the “teachings” serving as a model of it, while at the same time, contribute to the making of it, i.e., the “teachings” acting as a model for the world.

In the instance of the usage of “teachings,” it is itself a concept used by many of my Schitsu’umsh consultants. In my application of the term and in how I approached my research I have attempted to parallel their usage. As the First Peoples, such as Crane and Coyote, taught the people how to behave and conveyed that knowledge through the oral traditions, I first studied the oral traditions to identify the “teachings.” In turn, as the ceremonial expressions are a “bringing to life” of that which was taught by the First Peoples, I then looked at the Jump Dance Ceremony and Memorial Give Aways, for example, to see how the “teachings” may have been manifested. From the “teachings” the world is made and the Schitsu’umsh understood. My usage of “teachings” became the cue for another consideration.

The organizational presentation of the ethnographic materials in this book may itself seem somewhat unconventional, e.g., “Preparing the World,” “Receiving the Gifts,” and “Sharing the Gifts.” In so doing I believe we are in a better
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2 For a presentation of the “linguistic geography” of the Schitsu’umsh landscape, see Palmer, Nicodemus and Felsman (1987). This insightful work provides the Schitsu’umsh terms for many of the specific features in their landscape, as well as some valuable historical notes.
conceptual position to approximate how the Schitsu’umsh approach the nature and the knowing of their world, approximate a Schitsu’umsh ontology and epistemology. As so many elders reminded me, the place to begin is with the oral traditions. It is from the First Peoples that the world was first created and all that would be needed for Human Peoples to thrive brought forth. From the First Peoples the various ways to relate to the Spirit, Animal and Human Peoples were instituted, in prayer and song, and through the Sweat House or Memorial Give Away, for example. In continuing to tell of the First Peoples these ways of relating and the world of the Schitsu’umsh itself are perpetuated. In turn, it is with the oral traditions that an elder would seek to teach and pass on to a grandchild that which is most vital to the Schitsu’umsh, or even attempt to educate a stranger to the Schitsu’umsh ways. It is for this reason that I did not select a more customary ethnographic structure, whose chapter headings could have read, beginning with, “Subsistence and Economics,” then, “Social Organization,” followed by, “Religion,” and ending with, “Mythology,” for example.

In incorporating a Schitsu’umsh perspective to the organization of this book we have not, however, neglected consideration of many of the critical and diverse topics that characterize Schitsu’umsh ethnography or, for that matter, Plateau ethnological research in general. Such items, interspersed throughout the book, include consideration of ecological and subsistence activities, the economics of redistribution, the inclusiveness of “kinship” and the cultural boundaries of intertribal relations, religious ceremonials, aesthetic expression as in the Pow Wow and storytelling, and the richness of the creation-mythic accounts. In addition, key “historic” and Indian-White contact issues, such the influence of the Jesuits and United States government on Schitsu’umsh society, are considered. As an “unconventional” framework for presenting the Schitsu’umsh story, one in which I have not previously seen in the literature of Plateau peoples, the structure of the organizational presentation will itself hopefully spawn further ethnographic discussion, finding application and contributing to a better overall conceptualization and understanding of Plateau peoples.

Research Methods and Ethnographic Sources Research for this project is based extensively upon three types of ethnographic methods and, in turn, sources of information - participant-observations, published and unpublished materials, and consultant interviews. In each source I have focused particular attention on the oral literature texts, the subsistence and ceremonial activities, and the exchange relationships that are revealed within those texts and transpire during those activities. The order of the following discussion does not reflect on the respective ethnographic importance of each method and type of information. Each was essential and complemented the others.

The first source of ethnographic information came from my observing and participating in the lives of the Schitsu’umsh. The time frame and bases for this field research began in 1991 and continued through March of 1998. During this period, I observed and participated in such activities as digging and gathering camas and water potato, evenings of storytelling, a Mother’s Day quilting bee, horse races (as a spectator), tribal council meetings, pow wows, wakes and funerals, memorial give aways, sweat house rituals, and the Jump Dances. I attended the Hngwsunm (Steptoe Battle) Memorial Horse Ride (From the Agency near Plummer, Idaho to a site near Rosalia, Washington) in May of 1996, and the annual Pilgrimage to Cataldo and the Feast of the Assumption in August of 1996 and 1997.

As I participated in these events, many of which expressed some very intense family and religious sentiments, the significance of what had been described to me in an interview was in many instances literally “brought to life,” and made that much more accessible and understandable. This was certainly the case when I experienced the exertion of digging water potato in knee-deep mud and the reaction on the faces of those “elders” who received the “gift” of water potatoes. In so doing I began to better understand the “ethic of
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sharing.” Minute and seemingly insignificant aspects of a family relation or ritual procedure may simply be “taken for granted” by an interviewee, only to be enunciated by an ethnographer’s observations of them. In addition, by participating in these Schitsu’umsh actualities, there are also insights and significances revealed that even the words of an elder might have difficulty capturing. Until you have undergone a sweat for yourself, no amount of interview discussion could possibly convey with certainty the “life” that is indeed found in those Sweat House rocks. A consultant can speak of the meaning of the Wake and, in turn, those words can help guide you through the unfolding of an evening’s events. But those same words alone cannot prepare you for the grievous cries of a mournful grandmother as she stands beside the open casket supported by a granddaughter. And I learned something more about what it means to “arise from the womb” and to “get the grief out in the open.” Participant-observation can disclose meanings inherent in an event but which have found only awkward verbal articulation, or perhaps no words at all, by their Schitsu’umsh participants. The rich details as well as the overarching gestalts are made more accessible for a stranger.

The second source of ethnographic information derived from an examination of previously published materials and unpublished documents, e.g., Joset 1838-77, Teit 1930, and Reichard 1947. It is primarily on the basis of the Gladys Reichard and James Teit materials, along with the Joseph Joset (1838-77), Nicolas Point (1967), Verne Ray (1942), and Joseph Seltice (Kowrach and Connolly 1990) materials that the historical time frame for the Schitsu’umsh can be extended back to the mid-1800s. A bibliography of all sources utilized is provided.

It is important to note that James Teit (1917 and 1930) did his field research among the Schitsu’umsh people in 1904, working with elders who were most likely middle-aged, if not older. One of Teit’s primary consultants was Croutous (Cyprian) Nicodemus, the husband of Dorothy (Dorothea) Nicodemus and one of the signers to the Executive Order Agreement of 1889. His Schitsu’umsh name was Kwarrauty (Teit spelled it “Qwaro’tus”), referring to “something yellow or gold, apparently on face” (Palmer, Nicodemus and Connolly 1987:32). In turn, Croutous and Dorothy Nicodemus were the paternal grandparents of Lawrence Nicodemus, one of my consultants. Lawrence’s maternal grandparents were Louis (baptized Xwipep and often known as “Walking Antelope”) and Susan Antelope.

Verne Ray did his fieldwork on the Coeur d’Alene Reservation in 1937, working exclusively with Morris (Moris or Maurice) Antelope, who “was born about 1870 near the south end of Lake Coeur d’Alene” (1942:103). His Schitsu’umsh name was Ats’ghu’lumkhw, meaning “Looking at the Earth,” implying to watch over and guard the earth (Palmer, Nicodemus and Connolly 1987:10). Morris Antelope (see his letter to the superintendent on pp. XX-XX) was the stepson of Susan Antelope, who was cited by Reichard for her “reputation” in camas baking (see pp. XX-XX), and the stepbrother of Julia Antelope Nicodemus, the mother of Lawrence Nicodemus and daughter-in-law to Dorothy Nicodemus. Morris was born to Louis Antelope and his first wife, Mary Catherine.

Gladys Reichard did her field research in 1927 and 1929, with her primary consultant, the “over seventy” year old Dorothy Nicodemus, Croutous Nicodemus’s wife (1947:33). Her Schitsu’umsh name was Qwnta’l, likely meaning, “Blue Clothes” (Palmer, Nicodemus and Connolly 1987:57). Reichard’s other consultant was Tom Miyal. It was Julia Antelope Nicodemus who assisted Reichard in her English translation of Dorothy’s Schitsu’umsh narratives (1946 and 1947). In Reichard we can view Schitsu’umsh oral literature from the last half of the nineteenth century.

---

3 Palmer, Nicodemus and Connolly (1987:41) offer a brief biographical sketch of Lawrence Nicodemus.

century into the first quarter of the twentieth. I relied exclusively upon Gladys Reichard’s materials, essentially her “Coeur d’Alene Texts” (1946), in conjunction with her An Analysis of Coeur d’Alene Myths (1947), for four of the narrative accounts included in this work, “Coyote and Coyote,” “Coyote and the Salmon,” “Coyote and Woodtick,” and “Chief Child of the Yellow Root,” while the “Chipmunk and Snake” story is based solely on Reichard’s 1947 work and the “Little Muskrat and Otter” narrative is based on Reichard’s 1938 linguistic study supplemented by her 1947 work. The “Rabbit and Jack Rabbit” narrative is based on the Julia Antelope Nicodemus manuscript (undated) and the Dorothy Nicodemus text in Reichard (1947).

It is worth reiterating. In the research of James Teit, Gladys Reichard and Verne Ray, working closely with Croutous and Dorothy Nicodemus, and Morris Antelope, we are indebted to so few for so much of our early ethnographic understanding of so many Schitsu’umsh.

Research on the contemporary expression of Schitsu’umsh oral traditions was significantly based upon my association with Lawrence Aripa, the great grandson of Rufinus Shi’itsin. Beginning in 1991, I had the opportunity to observe Lawrence present the stories of Coyote and the traditions of his own family to a variety of audiences. Throughout our seven-year association, I extensively interviewed and on numerous occasions informally discussed with Lawrence the role and significance of the stories. The culmination of this oral literature collaboration is presented in Frey (1995 and 1998) and here. In addition, the “Hawk and Turtle” and “Coyote Devours His Children” narratives were provided by Cliff SiJohn. They were first told to Cliff by the elders of his family, and, in turn, he continues to share them, along with other oral traditions, with his family members. Albeit a limited collection, in these sources are recorded a sampling of the Schitsu’umsh oral literature as told at the end of the twentieth century.

The third ethnographic source involved working directly with twenty-four Schitsu’umsh consultants. Over 50 scheduled interview-sessions were conducted with these individuals. These tape-recorded interviews typically lasted from two to three hours each. In the process of reviewing an earlier draft of The World of the Schitsu’umsh, an additional 12 follow-up interview sessions were held. Complementing these more formal sessions were scores of ad hoc interviews conducted with the key consultants throughout the duration of the project. Initiated in April 1996, the scheduled interviews were completed during March of 1998, while the last ad hoc interview occurred in December of 1999. Fourteen consultants were men, while ten were women, ranging in ages (at the time of the interviews) from 24 to 89. In all, the consultants were representative of 13 different Schitsu’umsh families. A list of the names of these consultants and their associated Schitsu’umsh families are provided below.

With the exception of one interviewee who declined to have his interview tape recorded, I found all the interviewees most cooperative and enthusiastic about the project’s intent, and willing to give up considerable time to be interviewed. Virtually all interviews were conducted in a setting familiar to the consultants, usually in their homes or at a workplace. Many of the ad hoc interviews took place during family or tribally-sponsored events, while others were follow-up questions asked while writing on some section of the manuscript. More than one of these follow-up interviews was actually conducted over the telephone. With the exception of a few key consultants whom I first met only during the course of this project, I had already established from my involvement in other projects a good

---

2 For a brief biographical introduction to Lawrence Aripa, see Frey (1995:31-34). Lawrence’s great grandfather, Rufinus Shi’itsin, had three sons, Louis, Andrew and Stanislaw, and a daughter, Mary Madeline. The eldest son, Louis Aripa, was one of the signers of the 1889 Agreement and the youngest son, Stanislaw, was Lawrence’s grandfather. It was Shi’itsin who was given the name, “Albert,” after Saint Albert, by the Jesuit priests. “Difficult to pronounce by the Indians,” over time Albert became “Aripa.”
working relationship with the key consultants before conducting the interviews. The nature of this involvement will be discussed below.

While an extensive questionnaire was designed, made up of a series of generalized as well as consultant-specific, open-ended questions, the questionnaire format only set the stage for and merely oriented the very broad outlines of the disposition of any given scheduled interview. Among other uses, the standardized questionnaire allowed me to compare and corroborate specific ethnographic points. But the questions of such a tool, often composed prior to fully engaging the specific Schitsu’umsh activities of concern, can falsely presuppose that which they seek to reveal. So in practice I engaged each consultant in what was more akin to a semi-structured interview, and, for a couple of elders, an unstructured interview. Having offered a question from the questionnaire, I typically would pose a series of follow-up questions based upon the information just shared by the consultant. As a result, it would be the interviewee who would ultimately set the course of the unfolding “conversation.” Only following the completion of a specific topic, which was not always easy to delineate, would I then pose the next designated question from the questionnaire. Our conversations often and thankfully strayed far from the intended course sought by the questionnaire, thus revealing what could not possibly be anticipated by a predetermined set of rigidly adhered to questions.

With regard to the selection of consultants, two considerations helped define my sampling criteria. First, I sought out those individuals who were generally recognized by other Schitsu’umsh as the most knowledgeable on such subjects as the oral and ceremonial traditions, and subsistence activities. Throughout any given interview and as we completed consideration of a specific topic, I would ask, “Who today among the Coeur d’Alene people is the most informed on and able to discuss this subject?” The responses from the various interviews would be cross-referenced with each other, and helped assure that those individuals consistently referred to were among those I interviewed. Secondly, I wanted to make sure that I interviewed individuals who continue to be active participants in the events under consideration. Those referenced in the interviews were then compared against the individuals I personally observed participating in the storytelling, camas digging, pow wow singing, or Sweat House prayer, for example, further refining the selection of potential interviewees. The first consideration helped assure that the most informed “elders,” while perhaps less active today as participants in certain activities, were interviewed. Such interviewees offered tremendous breadth of knowledge, historical perspective, and, most importantly, wisdom or what Cliff SiJohn calls, “heart knowledge.” While the second consideration allowed access to those individuals, who could typically provide more technical, detailed knowledge on the contemporary expressions of the activities under consideration. The selection technique thus utilized is known in the research literature as “snowball sampling.” Those selected for interviews were determined by criteria generated the host people themselves, triangulating a series of various interview responses with each other and against field observations. The result in a progressive expansion, focusing on the “informed” interviewees, to eventually define the sampling parameters and my key consultants.

While I “sought out” the “most informed,” it is important to acknowledge that the selection and complete interviewing of interviewees is never a fully realized process. In retrospect, I can point to an elder whom I wish I had conducted an additional follow-up interview, and, in at least one instance, I lament not having put greater effort in contacting a potential

---

6In Schitsu’umsh society, no one typically “retires” from active involvement in the oral and ceremonial traditions. While one may no longer hunt the deer, his voice would continue to instruct a grandson in how to track one. The grandfather’s voice would continue to be heard around the powwow drum and in the prayer offered in the Sweat House.
interviewee in the first place. But such is the “researcher’s burden.”

As the focus of this project was on researching the level of continuity and contemporary expression of the Schitsu’umsh “teachings,” it was among the individuals I interviewed that I continually saw during the eight-year period from 1991 through much of 1998 sponsoring, organizing, and/or, in some fashion, actively involved in the Schitsu’umsh ceremonial and subsistence life. Members of the two Schitsu’umsh drums (Pierced Heart Singers of the SiJohn family and the White Horse Drum of the Nomee family) who provide song for and the man who often emcees at the various Schitsu’umsh Pow Wows were among the individuals interviewed for this work. At those Pow Wows, the individual most often responsible for organizing the dinner and cooking much of it, as well as smoking the venison that might be given out was among those interviewed. The Wakes and Funerals are routinely assisted by the individuals interviewed for this project. Such assistance may come in the form of a song sung to help comfort the family of the deceased, to participating in the veteran’s honor guard which helps officiate over the event, to contributing food and cooking expertise to the meals served. The interviewees are individuals whose families continue to hold elaborate Memorial Give Aways and Dinners one year after the passing of a relative. It is among these individuals that the stories of Coyote and the other First Peoples continue to be told and are revered as “true.” It is among these individuals whose families continue to sponsor and attend the Jump Dances, and throughout the year conduct the Sweat House rituals. It is among these individuals who continue to dig for the camas in June and water potato in October, and distribute them to those in need. And these are members of families whose “designated hunters” continue to hunt the deer and elk, and who address the deer and elk as “brothers” and give prayer offerings when successful. The venison and elk meat thus provided may become the primary source of meat for their families, and will be freely donated to be served at Pow Wows, Wakes, Memorial Dinners, and other celebrations.

To the extent Schitsu’umsh oral literature, subsistence activities, and ceremonial life continue to be expressed with vitality, they are expressed in the words and actions of those I have interviewed and observed. All generalizations made about the contemporary oral and ceremonial traditions and subsistence activities of the Schitsu’umsh are in reference to the views held and actions carried forth by this core of participants and their families. While those I interviewed are among the key individuals who continue to sponsor and organize Schitsu’umsh religious and cultural activities, this is not to suggest that they are the only Schitsu’umsh people involved in such activities. The attendance at Pow Wow meals and dances held on the reservation and at Cataldo ranges from fifty (for individual family celebrations) to an estimated one thousand five hundred individuals (for the Pow Wow held during the Feast of the Assumption), with three to four hundred as typical for the Pow Wows held in the fall. With generally up to a quarter of those in attendance White friends and guests of the tribe at these particular Pow Wows, an average of 225 to 300 Schitsu’umsh regularly continue to share in the dried meat brought in by the “designated hunters,” enjoy and dance to the song provided by the two Schitsu’umsh drums, and stand to honor the elders, children and veterans as they are spotlighted during the Pow Wows. Many of these Schitsu’umsh also contribute food, such as a ham, pies or potato salad, for the meal served to all in attendance. With the initiation of the very successful July-amsh and Dinners in 1998, the Schitsu’umsh now sponsor one of the largest Pow Wows in the country, drawing in literally tens of thousands dancers, drum groups and spectators from throughout the United States and Canada. While very few Schitsu’umsh compete in the various “judged dances,” such as Fancy or Grass Dance, they do enjoy and regularly participate in the social and non-competitive Intertribal Dances, as well as the Owl, Rabbit and Round Dances, for instance. The competitive dances held within a
Schitsu’umsh Pow Wow typically draw in dancers from area reservations, such as Spokane, Nez Perce, and Yakama Reservations. I know of at least three different families who regularly sponsor the Jump Dances. At each of these Jump Dances, members of families other than the sponsor’s will also “jump,” with total attendance of men, women and children ranging from an estimated 45 to 70 participants. The stories of Coyote continue to be heard by all the youth of the Schitsu’umsh, as they attend summer youth camps and the elementary schools, both public and tribally operated. And the elaborate Wakes and Memorials held throughout the year affect virtually every Schitsu’umsh household at some point in time, whether it be an immediate or distant relative that is directly involved.

Based upon these observations, it is my assessment that at least a third of the Schitsu’umsh people regularly plan their lives around ceremonial activities expressive of the Schitsu’umsh “teachings,” while virtually all Schitsu’umsh people have participated in those activities at some point in their lives (as a child listening to Coyote stories or dancing at a Pow Wow, and certainly as an adult attending a Wake).


Vignettes In attempting to better represent the voice of the Schitsu’umsh, I have included in this book a series of what I call, “vignettes.” They are composed of texts from interviews I conducted with consultants, field observations I made, and oral narratives from previously published and unpublished sources that I have reformatted for this project.

In deciding which interview segments to include as vignettes, I focused on such criteria as insightfulness, as well as culturally representative and clarity of articulation. But as verbatim transcriptions of the audio-recorded conversations, I realize that they, like the oral tradition texts, may not make for an easy read. There were no alterations made in the actual language used by an interviewee, the grammar somehow “cleaned up.” As a result, the vignettes convey not only the sentiments and ideas of the interviewee, but also elements of the “Indian English” and the actualities of the speaker’s voice. Within any given text, as noted by the series of dot ellipses, I did, however, take the discretion of deleting discussion which strayed from the direct subject under consideration or phrases which were incompletely developed. In one instance, “They Blue Jayed” (pp. XX-XX), the order of the
The interview text was re-arranged to better present a chronological sequencing of events as discussed by the interviewee. As the actual interview unfolded, the interviewee jumped around considerably as she proceeded to recall events, continually going back to previously mentioned references to elaborate and more fully discuss.

I have also presented a number of observational “vignettes” throughout the text of this book. Each presents a first person description of a cultural scene, such as camas digging or a Sweat House ritual. The first person account is of course in reference to myself, a participant in the event. In each instance I attempted to capture some of the detail as well as sequencing of the events, and then present it in such a manner as to invite the reader to imagine him or herself an eyewitness observer in the unfolding events. In so doing the reader may gain additional insights into the meanings indicative of the lives of the Schitsu’umsh.

With regard to the oral narrative vignettes, it is instructive to mention a quick word on how I presented the Dorothy Nicodemus narratives (Reichard 1938, 1946 and 1947). As we have already considered, as the stories are being told aloud, how they are told is as vital as what is conveyed. As an oral tradition, the “voice” of the storytellers is critical in understanding the meaning of the story texts. Various techniques of storytelling used by the raconteur and specific linguistic structures and features within the narrative text itself all contribute to the conveyed meaning of the narratives. With this in mind, it is essential that as much of the original and contextual storytelling and linguistic nuance be represented in the literacy-formatted narratives presented in this book. This concern is reflected in utilizing a “poetic style” and demarcating intonation and pause patterns in formatting the stories of Lawrence Aripa.

Relying upon the interlinear translations of Dorothy Nicodemus’s stories (Reichard 1838 and 1946), of which we are so fortunate to have, I was able to include in the formatting of the narrative texts included in this book such linguistic features as deictics, e.g., “here” and “there,” which help anchor the story in a spatial immediacy, repetition of key words and phrases, and the insightful narrative ending, “then, the end of the trail.” As with the reincorporation of the adverb, “then,” I have tried to consistently format our text in the present tense to give the reader a greater sense of temporal immediacy. These features were typically not represented in Reichard’s 1947 “free-translations.” I also acknowledge that in attempting to convey something of the “how they are told,” as well as a relatively closer translation of the actual Schitsu’umsh phrases used, the story texts are not necessarily an easy read. As my students might say, “They’re a little choppy.” Nevertheless, the re-formatting of the Reichard texts can offer the reader insights into the oral traditions not otherwise available, hopefully facilitating a greater sense of participation in the stories, while still replicating the original storylines and plots. In the instance of the rather lengthy “Chief Child of the Yellow Root” narrative, I did slightly abbreviate the text as presented here without compromising the story’s integrity.

Let me illustrate the re-formatting process by sharing a short sample. The following two text segments are from the “Crane and Coyote” narrative, comparing, a) Reichard’s original literal translation, interlinear transcription and orthography (1946), with her b) free-translation (1947:100), and my c) re-formatted text. Note the re-inclusion of the deictics, hoi, “then” and lu’’u, “there.” While this particular example is anchored rather closely in Reichard’s interlinear transcription, in order to avoid the story texts becoming overly “choppy,” much of my re-formatting of the Dorothy Nicodemus narratives does take into consideration Reichard’s free-translations as well.
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a) hōi xʷi̱st ḥə skʷaɬɬ̌ən, xʷi̱st lut
uwi’hu’ əkʷn hōi na’ʔ tetəq’ił̓kup . . . . .

then he went Crane he went not very far he said we’ll stop to make fire . . .

b) They had not gone far when Crane said, “Let us stop here and make a fire . . .

c) Then Crane and the others go off. Having gone not too far, he says, “Now, we’ll stop to make a fire . . .

a) ḥəjəy̱ sm:yi’w l teta’ʔqalqʷ,
lutəsgw̱l̓ ps, tət c ḥə’ʔ tək’uk’

this Coyote that’s when he kicked the tree it did not burn toward there he fell

b) Coyote went to another tree and kicked it, but it did not burn. The impact made him fall

c) This Coyote goes to that tree, but when he kicks it, it doesn’t burn, and he falls on his

a) tsaqtsaqli’p̓əp, əkʷn u’nə’s,
on his back he said it is wet

b) over backwards. “Oh! That one must be wet,” he said,

c) back over there. He says, “It’s wet!”

Let me briefly explain my intended use of the “vignettes” throughout the book, be they from observations, interviews or the oral narrative texts themselves. In addition to allowing the reader access to a more authentic voice and image of the Schitsu’umsh people, there is another important rationale.

While teaching at a small liberal-arts college in Montana in 1983, I was involved with sponsoring a conference on storytelling from around the state. A “cowboy” storyteller had just completed his session, and, with such a booming voice, had easily delivered his stories squarely into laps of each member of the audience. Next to speak, Agnus Vanderburg came forward, a Bitterroot Salish elder from the Flathead Reservation. With neither the physical frame nor self-amplified voice of the previous teller, she began her stories. And soon all in the audience were moving their chairs a little closer and closer still, to catch each and every one of her deliberately spoken words. In no time, the members of the audience seemed completely engaged, eyes moving this way then that as Agnus pointed here then looked there, leading the way through an unveiling of her stories. Upon finishing and unlike the previous teller, she simply returned to her seat, offering neither commentary, explanation, nor Aesop-like moral lesson.

You had to work for Agnus’s stories. They would not be delivered to you, unwrapped and ready for use. Yet her stories spoke as easily to that six-year-old child who sat in the front row as they did to the thirty-six-year-old Salish man standing to the side as they did to that religious study’s scholar of sixty seated in the back row. For there was something that awaited discovery for each and everyone who was willing to travel the territory of her stories. As a masterful storyteller, this was, in deed, part of her magic.

Let me briefly explain my intended use of the “vignettes” throughout the book, be they from observations, interviews or the oral narrative texts themselves. In addition to allowing the reader access to a more authentic voice and image of the Schitsu’umsh people, there is another important rationale.

While teaching at a small liberal-arts college in Montana in 1983, I was involved with

Lawrence Aripa, telling of Coyote, 1997

Taking my cue from Agnus, a cue consistently reiterated to me by Schitsu’umsh
elders such as Lawrence Aripa and Lucy Finley, there is something about the “discovery process.” While I have wrapped each of the vignettes with considerable contextual information, both historic and cultural, and their particular placement throughout the book was not without deliberation, I have typically not provided specific interpretive anchoring. No individual analysis of the stories is provided, no “moral lessons” offered. As suggested by Agnus, given the multiple and varied levels of meanings that inundate any given story and recognizing the different orientations and levels of maturation which characterize the listeners of the stories, to offer a particular moral lesson would preclude a story’s full richness and potential. Agnus required each in her audience to fully engage and discover for him or herself what was meaningful within her stories. And even upon re-engaging the very same story at some future point, as the listener’s maturation had changed, something altogether new may await discovery. Agnus required participation in her stories. Accordingly, I invite and challenge the reader to thoroughly engage and explore for him or herself the territory of each of the vignettes, and discover their meanings and connections. What are the linkages, for example, between the “Crane and Coyote” and “The Water Potato” vignettes in the introductory chapter? It is a pedagogy much more in keeping with that followed by the elders themselves.

**Vignette Anonymity** In reference to the “vignettes” involving direct quotes from consultants, I should explain why authorship to particular individuals is not attributed. As we have discussed with regard to “Continuity and Variation” in the introductory chapter, while the texts can and do reflect elements and aspects of individual family traditions and thus minor distinctions among and between various family traditions, the Schitsu’umsh elders see this entire body of knowledge as more generally representing them as a single people and, most importantly, ultimately derived from a single source. In this sense it is knowledge that cannot be claimed as individually attributed, nor in some sense “owned” at all. But it is knowledge that is of a “communal nature,” and most importantly, which is to be freely “shared with those in need.” What I have now come to realize is that the elders, in sharing their “teachings” with me, the public and the future generations, were doing in this entire project exactly what they were attempting to articulate in words and demonstrate in deeds about their “teachings.” The “teachings” are “gifts” to be freely shared with those in need, and not something “owned.” When the huckleberries are shared, the giver never seeks acknowledgment from the recipients for what was, in turn, shared with him by the Creator. In keeping with the Schitsu’umsh perspective, if attribution is to be made, it is the First Peoples who are the authors of these texts. It should also be pointed out that the “final approval” by the various elders’ groups and the Tribal Council to publically present this information is based on keeping the individual vignettes anonymous, though at the same time acknowledging all the specific elders who did contribute to the project as a whole.

**The Text as a Map** One of the elders, Mariane Hurley, was at first rather reluctant in participating in the project. She did not want her words “written down.” For in doing so, she felt that “the words can be interpreted any which way,” losing their meaning, as she “wouldn’t be there to correct someone.” Most importantly, “the words were dead.” For Mariane, it is only through the spoken words of “our fathers and grandfathers, mothers and grandmothers,” by
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being in their very presence, that you can come to learn the “teachings.” She eventually changed her mind, in fact, becoming one of my most indispensable and beloved teachers. But her reluctance does, however, spotlight an important point about the very nature of the text the reader now holds in his or her hands.

In conversation with Mariane, I concurred that something vital was indeed lost when the spoken word was rendered into a literacy-based text. I tried to acknowledge to her my understanding that what was deleted in this orality-to-literacy transformation is often what is essential to the meaning of the word when spoken aloud - that which is associated with the oral nuance (Frey 1995:141-177). This is particularly apparent in consideration of oral traditions of Crane and Coyote and the other First Peoples. Further, I agreed that only in the direct presence of the elders can the “teachings” truly be taught. I can reflect back upon those special moments I had experienced with an elder, when a tear was shed followed by a deafening silence, and then, perhaps, a laugh. Did I truly understand what he had just attempted to share with me? It is a very heavy burden that we as ethnographers shoulder when we attempt to comprehend and then convey to others what is so integral to and revered by someone else. And I ask myself, did I listen well enough? Finally, there can be something about the very nature of a “book” that so formalizes and intellectualizes a people, that what they most cherish, as in this instance, “heart knowledge,” can be banished from the pages of the text. And further, in utilizing a “book” as the medium of communication, you can run the risk of compromising the very goal you seek to accomplish and “objectify” a non-Cartesian ontology (Frey 1995:141-147). And I ask myself, how do I write down that “cry,” that “silence,” that “laugh?” How do I convey the dynamic of a human who “Blue Jays” or who has gone “inside and become the Coyote”? Did I come close to getting it right? And in turn, when engaging the pages of this book, will strangers have an opportunity to come close to getting it right?

As we continued our conversation, I reiterated to Mariane that I sought to convey the actual voice and deeds of the elders, attempting to do so in the many vignettes that appear in the book. As “context” can be so important in understanding a people, I spoke of placing the Schitsu’umsh within their unique historic and cultural setting. I assured Mariane that I sought to represent the world of the Schitsu’umsh from the perspective of people themselves. And to amplify that goal, I followed with reference to the extensive review process, stressing that nothing would be publically shared that the elders themselves thought should not be.

Ultimately, recognizing its shortcomings and in all humility, I conceded to Mariane that The World of the Schitsu’umsh should best be understood as a “secondary source.” It would hopefully inspire Schitsu’umsh youth to seek out their elders, and, as a “sort of road map,” be used by Indians, as well as Whites, to travel the landscape of the Schitsu’umsh. But as a “map,” The World of the Schitsu’umsh is most assuredly not the landscape itself. It can not replicate being in the presence of a Lawrence Aripa as he tells of Coyote or the experience of looking down at Lake Coeur d’Alene from atop Grassy Mountain with your son at your side and feeling the soul of your tribe.

And our’s is a very special “sort of road map.” In considering the implications of our previous discussions concerning the act of telling the oral traditions, when Lawrence or Angus would tell of Coyote the story would come “alive” and be meaningful to the extent it is participated in by the listeners. In attempting to approximate an Indian epistemology and pedagogy, the text of The World of the Schitsu’umsh would similarly become meaningful at that moment when the reader actively engages its many voices. You must attempt to travel the trails of the stories and “swirl around” with Crane and Coyote, and then explore the linkages they have with the gathering and distribution of the water potato.
Upon first accessing these stories, try having someone else read them aloud to you, paying attention to the deictics and the pauses and intonations in Lawrence’s voice. Imagine yourself bent over, with a *pitse’* in hand, digging the bitterroots or camas with your grandmother. Feel the intense heat of the Sweat House as a young boy shares his tears and “heart” with his elders. You are asked to participate in this text, not observe it and its stories from afar. By engaging the text, the distance between the map and landscape may be narrowed.

If this particular map is to be of value for a wide audience, the text of *The World of the Schitsu’umsh* must not only seek to chart the landscape traveled by Crane and Coyote, it must also accommodate its many and diverse non-*Schitsu’umsh* travelers. As considered at the beginning of this appendix, an interpretative framework is needed that bridges both Euro-American and *Schitsu’umsh* experiences. While I seek to identify the very same trails traveled by Crane and Coyote that would appear in an exclusively *Schitsu’umsh*-traveled map, the trails enunciated in *The World of the Schitsu’umsh* must also acclimate travelers, wholly accustomed to a very distant landscape, to a landscape that defies many basic Euro-American philosophic, economic and religious sensibilities. Extra, well-marked signposts and even a few rest areas must line the way - an historical context outlined, a scientific-based botanical taxonomy identified, pivotal constructs deliberated and utilized, an “interpretative analogy” offered, and then all told in the English language and disseminated in a literacy-based format. Our map is a translated map, with an expanded legend.

By encouraging a participation, the stories of Lawrence can, in some semblance, come “alive” and be appreciated, the words not quite so “dead.” By encouraging a participation that accommodates its many and diverse travelers, strangers can begin to appreciate a *Schitsu’umsh* perspective and chart a distant landscape traveled by Crane and Coyote. But in succeeding to do so, the text now held in hand is necessarily a map distinct from that experienced by *Schitsu’umsh* travelers exclusively. Extra signposts have lined the way for the participation of strangers who bring to the story their own particular experiences. Involvement by non-*Schitsu’umsh*, in and of itself, does not render it any less *Schitsu’umsh*, as Whites routinely partake in the stories, dances, songs, prayers, and “gifts” of the *Schitsu’umsh*. But this text, no matter of how aptly it may map a landscape, remains a translated map of a landscape, and when engaged by non-*Schitsu’umsh*, animated solely by the participation of those who are likely strangers.

Regardless of the level of engagement, these travelers wear an assortment of clothing styles - an array of upbringings and maturations, attitudes and expectations, each engendering experiences unique from our host. Consequently, this engaged text must inevitably entail a diversity of experiences all of which are themselves ever so different from Mariane’s own unmediated experience of her landscape, hence her reluctance. But within the engaged text itself, Agnus would anticipate nothing less than diversity. For from the mix of experiences, each traveler in interaction with the trails of this text, can the reader uniquely discover those meanings held within the stories befitting his or her particular wardrobe. Paradoxically but appropriately so, while the text of *The World of the Schitsu’umsh* may culminate in the hands of the reader a portrayal of a landscape distinct from that which it seeks to represent and experienced by Mariane, the text may also approximate some of the epistemological and ontological premises of the world within which that landscape is conceived and Mariane experiences. It is a world precipitated by the participation of its travelers, guided by the teachings of Crane and Coyote.

These realizations need not deter us from the primary goal of this project, that of articulating a *Schitsu’umsh* view of their landscape, but expand the appreciation in the challenges of attempting to do so and reiterate
the awareness that the map is not the landscape.

**Review Process** As first asked with some trepidation in the introduction to this book, “could I truly convey to my reader a Schitsu’umsh perspective?” Given our previous discussion, how close would the resulting translated map, engaged by its many and diverse travelers, come to identifying the trails traveled by Crane and Coyote? Would this bridge of reinforced girders be anchored in the landscape of the Schitsu’umsh? In order to help answer these questions a thorough review process was initiated and completed. While not presumptiong that such a process would result in some sort of “guarantee,” it would nevertheless significantly contribute to the ethnographic accuracy, authenticity, and appropriateness of *The World of the Schitsu’umsh*. The review process would also help address the important ethical issues associated with publically presenting another people’s culture. Would I have the permission of the Schitsu’umsh to share with perfect strangers what which they consider most cherished? Would the strangers become invited guests?

During October of 1997, a draft copy of *The World of the Schitsu’umsh* was distributed for review and comment to each of the several elders and interviewees who had been working closely with me on the project, as well as to all the members of the Tribal Council. Follow-up interviews were then made over the next five months with my consultants. They included John Abraham, Lawrence Aripa, Mariane Hurley, Alfred Nomee, Dixie Saxon, Henry SiJohn, Cliff SiJohn, Frenchy SiJohn, Ernie Stensgar, and Marjorie Zarate. Felix Aripa was given a copy in January of 1998, with a follow-up interview held in March, while Lucy Finley received a copy in March of 1998. In addition, oral presentations discussing the methodology, subject content and conclusions of the project were made to key Schitsu’umsh elders (Lucy Finley on February 11, 1998 and Jeannette Whitford on February 2, 1998), along with the dozen or so other Schitsu’umsh elders who regularly attended the Senior’s Luncheons sponsored by the Tribe (on February 9, 1998 and March 2, 1998), and to key elders of the Spokane Tribe (Robert Sherwood, Hank Wynne, Alice “Vi” Cornelius Seymour, and Pauline Flett on March 27, 1998). The Spokane elders were consulted given their critical involvement in many Schitsu’umsh activities (e.g., pow wows, funerals and wakes, and Memorial Give Aways) and as they are “respected for their opinions” by the Schitsu’umsh. The manuscript was also reviewed by the tribal attorney for any possible impacts on on-going tribal litigation. None were found.

As a result of the comments and suggestions made by these elders and interviewees, I made numerous additions, clarified many unclear aspects, and re-organized major sections of the manuscript. Without exception, all those I had contacted agreed that the Schitsu’umsh “teachings” were appropriately identified, that these “teachings” were best anchored in and identified through the oral traditions of the Schitsu’umsh people, and that these materials should be disseminated for their educational value.

On April 16, 1998, the Tribal Council acting on “CDA Resolution 116-A (98)” voted unanimously to approve “*The World of the Coeur d’Alene Indians: Landscape Traveled by Crane and Coyote*” (as the manuscript was then entitled) for use in the Tribe’s Natural Resource Damage Assessment, and, along with the photos and interviews I conducted as part of the project, for use in “non-profit, educational purposes” and for consideration of publication. In a time when anthropological inquiry has so often been maligned by some in the Indian community, and, in many instances, rightfully so, it has been gratifying to be involved with a project that has produced a document the Schitsu’umsh themselves feel accurately represents their perspective and that they, in turn, desire to have publically disseminated and published. I believe this enthusiastic support is in no small part due to the collaborative nature of the entire project.

During January of 1999 the manuscript
was submitted to the University of Washington Press. By December of that year it had been approved for publication by the Press’ editorial board and outside faculty readers, and, in a unanimous vote, by its University Press Committee, made up of faculty members from throughout the university. Through January of 2000 I continued “fine-tuning” and editing the entire manuscript, expanding the “Since Time Immemorial” and “Winds of Change” chapters, including several additional vignettes based upon the interviews conducted for the NRDA, and adding the three Lawrence Aripa “Coyote stories,” which had originally appeared in Me-y-mi-ym: Oral Literature of the Coeur d’Alene People (Frey 1994). Some of the “fine-tuning” was initiated by the invaluable comments and suggestions provided by Robert McCarl of Boise State University and Gary Palmer of the University of Nevada - Las Vegas, who reviewed earlier drafts of the manuscript.

The anchoring at both ends of the bridge had been inspected and two forms of certification granted. It was now ready to welcome its travelers, Schitsu’umsh and non-Schitsu’umsh alike. Only in time and the subsequent participation of those who would use it could it be said that the bridge indeed offered an accurate, authentic, and appropriate mapping of the landscape traveled by Crane and Coyote.

Frey’s Voice  The World of the Schitsu’umsh is truly the culmination of the efforts of so many. As a collaborative project, this book presupposes a conversation among distinct voices, each in partnership, hopefully harmonious, with the others. While my goal throughout this endeavor has been to accurately and authentically convey the voice of the Schitsu’umsh people, I also acknowledge that something of my own voice is embedded within the text. To help the reader sort through the conversation and better understand the collaborative nature of The World of the Schitsu’umsh, let me share a little about my history of involvement with the Schitsu’umsh people and what I may have contributed to the conversation.

Several years ago some words were spoken that have resonated with me ever since. Vic Charlo, a Bitterroot Salish poet and playwright, shared the first of those words. He told me, “The stories define us. When the story ended, the elder would say, ‘And this is true,’ pointing to that hill where the heart of the Monster is. And you look and see, see the story; we are linked. It’s a matter of just claiming that linkage” (Frey 1995:39). A short time later, Tom Yellowtail, a Crow elder, also spoke of stories. “Grandpa” had just finished retelling a series of his favorite oral traditions, when he turned to me and said, “If all these great stories were told, great stories will come” (ibid.:177). It would be stories that first brought me to the Schitsu’umsh people.

In the Fall of 1991, I was asked by the Coeur d’Alene school district (the city of Coeur d’Alene is a White community, some twenty miles to the north of the reservation) to serve on its Language Arts Curriculum Committee. As we were in a K-6 grade curriculum adoption phase and as there was very little mention of the history and culture of the people whose name the community had taken, I contacted elders of the Schitsu’umsh tribe to inquire if they would be interested in helping with a little project. They were. And I was soon working closely with Lawrence Aripa, Cliff SiJohn, Bingo SiJohn, and Mariane Hurley, among many other elders. Over the course of the next few months and with funding from the Idaho Humanities Council, we developed a video tape of several of their oral traditions, an anthology of stories was collected, a teacher’s guide written, followed by a teacher’s workshop. In April of 1993, the School Board formally adopted the fourth-grade Coeur d’Alene Indian language arts curriculum, Me-Y-Mi-Ym: Oral Literature of the Coeur d’Alene Indian People. With additional discussion with the elders and a re-write of the text for the teacher’s guide, Stories That Make the World: Oral Literature of the Indian

8For some background on Tom Yellowtail, see Frey (1995:34-37).
Peoples of the Inland Northwest As Told by Lawrence Aripa, Tom Yellowtail, and Other Elders was published in 1995. The greatest gratification the project has brought me is in hearing from those who knew Lawrence Aripa or Tom Yellowtail that “we can hear his voice when we read his book.”

Beginning during the 1992-93 academic school year, I found myself involved with the Schitsu’umsh in a new project. At the time, I was serving as Director of Lewis-Clark State College’s North Idaho Programs. Working in consort with Cliff SiJohn and later Dianne Allen, succeeding Directors of the Department of Education for the tribe, we built a partnership between the Coeur d’Alene Tribe and Lewis-Clark State College. We invited anyone from the reservation community, Schitsu’umsh and White, who sought a bachelors degree in Business Management to join a “learning community.” Students could complete a four-year degree, in four years, right in their home community, and do so while still maintaining their jobs and family ties. In the fall semester of 1993, the DeSmet Higher Education Program began offering courses, all of which were taught at DeSmet. Over the next four years I coordinated, using some rather creative scheduling, the delivery of the entire curriculum to DeSmet, served as the students’ academic advisor, even taught a couple of the courses, and helped facilitate the approval of a year-long Coeur d’Alene language course for satisfaction of the LCSC General Education Core Language requirement. In the arena of college academics, it was gratifying to be able elevate the Coeur d’Alene language to the same status as that of Spanish or French. The DeSmet Higher Education experience was a most unique situation for me, with many of my college students also among my most important Schitsu’umsh cultural teachers, as we reversed our roles in and out of the classroom! In May of 1997 we celebrated our first graduating class.

In January of 1996, I was contacted by Phil Cernera, Project Director for the Coeur d’Alene Tribe’s Natural Resource Damage Assessment, and Alfred Nomee, Director of the tribe’s Department of Natural Resources, and was asked to assist with a cultural study. “What does the surrounding landscape mean to the Schitsu’umsh people and what effect does that understanding have on how they relate to that landscape and to each other?” were among the overriding questions I would ask. To the extent and in whatever expression the lake, the rivers, and the mountains continue to be of significance, hold meaning, and are related to by the Schitsu’umsh, the varied impacts of environmental degradation on those relationships and meanings, could be better assessed and understood. It was auspicious that the first two elders I interviewed would be of such significance throughout the project. For it was Lawrence Aripa and Henry SiJohn who established the orientation and set the tone for the interviews and observations to come. And throughout the project, they were among my primary advisors. Lawrence and Henry could not have been better guides. As you have read, over fifty interviews were then conducted, the archives were consulted, and a wealth of observations made while participating in the many dimensions of Schitsu’umsh life over an eight-year period were drawn upon. In October of 1997, almost two years after initiating the project, The World of the Schitsu’umsh (Coeur d’Alene Indians): Landscape Traveled by Crane and Coyote was formally presented to the Coeur d’Alene Tribal Council, and, following the review process, on April 16th of 1998 the Council approved the manuscript for use in their NRDA and for publication. I can not help but

---

9Lewis-Clark State College’s main campus is located in Lewiston, Idaho, with the city of Coeur d’Alene the site of its largest “outreach” campus. LCSC’s North Idaho Program numbers over 300 students, with baccalaureate majors in Communication Arts, Interdisciplinary Studies, Justice Studies, Management, Nursing, and Social Work. I served as Director from 1987 through 1998, as well as Professor of Social Sciences. North Idaho College, a two-year community college located in Coeur d’Alene, joined the partnership in 1997.
attribute a certain degree of the collaborative success in the NRDA project to the cumulative trust and respect each of us had garnered for the other, the Schitsu’umsh people and myself, during my two previous projects.

I continue to be involved, professionally and personally, with Schitsu’umsh people. Under the coordination of Tiffany Allgood, from April of 1998 through October of 1999, I assisted in the Tribe’s Environmental Action Plan, chairing the Quality of Life sub-group. The stated objective in developing an Environmental Action Plan (EAP) is “to identify and reduce risks to human health, ecosystems and quality of life and to assist in the overall management of human and natural environments.” In the fall of 1998, many of my University of Idaho undergraduate and graduate students became involved in the project as well. To solicit additional information for the assessment phase of the plan, the students conducted interviews of reservation community members, and did so while “partnered” with and mentoring local high school students. That same October also saw many of those university students, under the guidance of Alfred Nomee, ankle-deep in the mud and among the reeds of Lake Coeur d’Alene, digging for the water potato. Then at a “senior citizen’s” noon luncheon, the students handed what they gathered to the elders, such as Lucy Finley and Bingo SiJohn, sharing with those “who could not make it down here today, someone in need of this water potato.”

On October 15th of 1998 and again on February 13th of 1999, I stood with so many, many other family members and friends who offered a tear, as we sought to grieve, to honor, to “thank,” and to remember first Lawrence Aripa and then Henry SiJohn. As we returned Lawrence and Henry to the earth from which they came and to which they so dearly loved and companioned, I know their voices will live on as long as we listen with our hearts. And the stories of Crane and Coyote continue to be told, the linkages reclaimed, and I am confident that great stories will come.