

HST 202: History of United States W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897)

Home ► My courses ► HST 202 W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897) ► Week 9 ► Forum 4 ►
Native American Mascots in Oregon

 Search forums

Forum 4

Native American Mascots in Oregon

[• Subscribe](#)[◀ Chinese - Now & Then](#)[Professional Sports, Data, and Images ▶](#) Display replies in nested form Move this discussion to ... Move Pin

Native American Mascots in Oregon

by Joe Escobar - Friday, March 2, 2018, 11:19 PM

This thread is for discussions on the Native American Mascots in Oregon topic.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, something that describes which one of the questions you are addressing . Do NOT simply leave it RE: Native American Mascots in Oregon

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Native Indians' Time to Get to Make the Decisions

by Mariah Goodman - Sunday, March 4, 2018, 11:35 PM

I believe that the only people who get to “be Indian” for the purpose of speaking out about whether or not Indians resent mascots can only be Indians themselves. Those people not a part of Indian communities who support tribe-related mascots certainly mean well by justifying the mascot based on the respect they have for it and sense of pride they feel when representing it at school. I do not think, though, that their lack of experience within the culture gives them the right to speak toward the controversial issues regarding Indian-related

mascots. Only Indians truly have the correct perspective from which to determine the magnitude of and settle this issue. It does become difficult, though, when taking into account the fact that varying opinions exist among tribe members. I think then that it should depend on the actions and inputs of tribes to determine whether action must be taken against tribal school mascots in their local area. Clearly, many Indians feel greatly offended by these (mis)/representations, while others feel proud that their culture is being recognized in their community. I think that if two or more tribes are in dispute over the mascot issue in the same area, though, that the mascot should be changed. This may be problematic when it comes to properly respecting all tribes, as one clearly does not get their way, but it seems like it would be less controversial to remove the mascot for the sake of honoring one tribe, than keeping it and further disrespecting a people with such a difficult history behind them. Too many times have people outside of the Native American Indian realm imposed what they think is best, or want most, for the Indians. This has proven to be destructive to Indian culture and wellbeing, and thus, such decisions should only be determined by those who truly have an understanding and appreciation for their Native background.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Complete Agreement Unlikely Opinions Differ

by Jonathan Haskell - Monday, March 5, 2018, 12:34 AM

Mrs. Anne Williams tells us right at the start, it has been two years since the first mention of suggestion that the teams remove their team names. Names that they assume others find offensive. First one shouldn't assume it is offensive even if it is. Second, if you are in year two of discussion maybe your time might be better spent elsewhere doing something else. I am not a Native American, but I can not see how being Brave or being a skilled Warrior in battle is offensive. "Warrior Spirit" the superintendent Don Kordosky of Oakridge called it. However, being labeled due to the color of your skin such as "Redskin" or being called an Indian due to a very mean explorer from long ago mistaking America for India, I can see how both of those could be offensive to some. Is it offensive to the majority though? I do not think a minority being offended should result in change. I do think tradition matters. I do not think that tradition is more important than the opinion of the people you are trying to honor though. However, if they are not offended enough to take a stand like any of the federally recognized nine tribes of Oregon, or come out and say like Sue Shaffer or Louie Pitt that the majority of the peoples they represent not only do not find it offensive, but even felt some sort of honor then things do not need change. It also matters how they are represented as well. If the mascot image is obviously shown reflecting toughness then one would feel less disrespected in comparison to a cartoony interpretation reflecting a lighthearted less honorable reflection of their race. I lived in Hawthorne in Los Angeles just for a couple of years. I remember distinctly driving down the street and seeing this high school that had a mascot I believed they called themselves the Amigos though I could be mistaken. Their mascot was drawn on the building and it looked very similar to the drawing labeled "Cleveland Hispanic" in the cartoon for the professional sports forum question. It was obviously offensive. I was offended and I am not even Mexican American. I read online later long after having moved out of L.A. that they were changing their mascot. I felt that was an obvious choice as it shouldn't have existed in the first place. Mr. Escobar being from L.A. may know more about this than me. I do not agree with a full fledged changing of all mascots simply because it is regarding in name, a type of people. My favorite sports team the Boston Celtics is labeled from a people. My people. I am diehard fan. Would I like the team as much if it wasn't representing both my people and my city where I was born? No. I can see how a Native American could be a fan of say the Kansas City Chiefs simply

because they are representing their people. As far as the Oregon ban I am against it as I am against most bans. Freedom isn't about bans. I do not agree with a partial ban or a complete elimination like the Oregon Indian Education Association, or a phasing-in prohibition like the Oregon mascot advisory committee. I agree with the committee that included the Oregon School Activities Association when they said "It is not the privilege of any group to determine what makes another group feel devalued or stereotyped. It is the responsibility of each person to respond to others in a manner that assures mutual dignity and respect." One must look at the name of the team combined with the mascots general appearance and get a sense if an ignorance in the past is reflected onto the schools or teams persona. If so it should be changed, sorry Cleveland. If not then they should have pride in their team and its chosen representation.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Both Sides are Logical

by Alex McCall - Monday, March 5, 2018, 10:58 AM

I completely understand why this would be offensive. I'm glad we changed it, like Brainard said imagine if we did this with other ethnic groups, it would be really wild and probably never happen. I actually went to High School in The Dalles. My freshman and sophomore year we were the "Eagle-Indians". Why did we have two names? I don't know. But after this we got to vote for a new mascot. And all the students were fine with it. We ended up with a cooler name (Riverhawks) instead, so I think taking it away was a good thing. I do find it somewhat odd that some Native-Americans aren't offended by this. However I do understand them being proud of their heritage, and if they want their mascot to be that then they should definitely have it. Maybe they could've left it up to a city vote or something like that.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Both Sides are Logical

by Hayley Allen - Thursday, March 8, 2018, 11:44 AM

I think you are overlooking the article, "Letters in the Editors mailbox" that illustrates the use of other ethnic groups as mascots. Although the letter is a little extreme and one-sided, I do think they bring up some of the examples even in Eugene like Sheldon High School's "Fighting Irish" which is an ethnic group or the North Eugene "Highlanders" which refers to the Scottish mountain people. Although these ethnic groups do not have as unsettling and oppressive past by our government as Native communities do, the Irish have been historically discriminated against based on their race. I do think many of these portrayals can be offensive and I do not think mascots should glorify stereotypes or offend anyone of any ethnic background, I do argue that Native people are not the only people being used as mascots. I also think that a city-wide vote would not properly represent the opinions of native people therefore, a vote from local tribes on the use of their culture as a mascot would be more appropriate in my opinion.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Re: Both Sides are Logical



by Alex McCall - Friday, March 9, 2018, 12:18 PM

Yeah, these portrayals seem to be 'offensive' to us. But I think that is because we think everything is offensive nowadays. Even in situations where the group that is being "discriminated" doesn't find it offensive. That's why "a vote from local tribes" won't work. A majority of the Native American population aren't offended by these names. And yes the Fighting Irish and the Highlanders have names based on ethnic groups, however these names are clearly not just "Irishmen" or "Scottish" like how most of the high schools had "Indians" as their name. These names are representing the ethnic groups in a more positive way.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Respect for Native People

by Hayley Allen - Monday, March 5, 2018, 7:30 PM

After reading the articles describing the discussions around Indian mascots, I disagree with Oregon's decision about no exceptions, the mascot is no longer allowed. The main argument that convinced me that Oregon did not do this right was that some tribes gave their opinions and even suggestions about policies however they were ignored. "Both tribes had previously opposed a blanket ban, asking the board to endorse an alternate rule that would have allowed local tribes to work with schools on their portrayal of Native culture" (Kost). This seems like a much more inclusive, respectful and even honorable way to handle the mascot debate rather than ignoring their wishes because of fearing the 'racist' opinion. There were many different voices in the different articles from native people which made it difficult to pick a side. However while reading them, I felt there was an attempt and even a chance to expand the respect for native cultures which historically has not been the case. In chapter 18 of the textbook, the bloody and hideous past of US government's intervention of native populations is one we cannot erase or ignore. There were several massacres like the Sand Creek Massacre "killing 200 indians, half of them women and children" (Murrin 609) as well as "Indian boarding schools, established beginning in the late 1870s, were another attempt to deny Indians their culture" (Murrin 611). I think this historical context is important to how we handle issues surrounding the native people especially with this mascot issue. I felt the opinions of some were taken more seriously than the opinions of others. I definitely agree that having Native American culture and history symbolized as a school mascot can be insensitive and negative as Se-ah-dom Edmo, vice president of the Oregon Indian Education Association states, "It is racist. It is harmful. It is shaming. It is dehumanizing" I have always held this belief when it came to the debate of the "Red Skins" mascot although I do think there can be more to the discussion than simply all portrayals being racist. It is important to respect the culture therefore having actual mascots dressed in ceremonial wardrobe is not appropriate as well as any student dressing as such would not be okay however I think there could be potential to honor their traditions and even shine light on the historically suppressed culture. It would be necessary to have involvement of the native tribes and also education of their histories, not only the negative but also the positive history. I think it is important to expand the stereotypical portrayal of what it means to be Native American from the typical feather wearing, face painted warrior but to learn of their costumes, beliefs and values because there is so much to learn from their rich culture.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Respect for Native People

by Jonathan Haskell - Tuesday, March 6, 2018, 1:04 PM

I agree with your thoughts. The fact that the tribes opposed a blanket ban and asked to give their input to educate and suggest changes or alternatives and were ignored is telling. It tells me the purpose is to be politically correct. It is not to change the outlook of ignorant people of other persuasions to the historical truth about the race or to discontinue the perpetual usage offensive to some of a Native American or its tradition, as a representation for a sports team. I am of course not arguing for doing nothing. If that representation is anything but glorifying their past and their way of life as many aren't, then it should be changed. The opinion of the surrounding Native American tribes and not whatever bureaucratic committee thinks that their opinions matter, should be the only regard.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Majority Shouldn't Always Rule

by Decker Robinson - Monday, March 5, 2018, 8:32 PM

I am conflicted on this subject because on one hand I firmly believe in democracy and the right for the people to decide; however, I do believe that the Redskins should change their name because it is a derogatory name for Native Americans and based on that fact alone it should not matter if even a minority of Indians are offended. I think that majority rules in this case would be a huge injustice because Native Americans that are offended by the name shouldn't have to accept that for the sole reason that they are in the minority of Indians. I read a while back that the Cleveland Indians are removing "Chief Wahoo" logos from their jerseys in 2019. I believe that this was a monumental step in the right direction because although I might not be offended by it; a mascot for a sports team should not be around if it makes people feel uncomfortable and racist. This is all coming from a huge sports fan that has unproudly cried tears of joy and sadness from games; however, in reality it is just a game and in the year 2018 it's surprising that we still have a racist team name.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Wrong Section

by Decker Robinson - Thursday, March 8, 2018, 4:49 PM

This reply was meant for the Professional Sports, Data, and Images section.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



How Native Americans decide.

by Stephen Sorber - Monday, March 5, 2018, 9:56 PM

The controversy over who gets to be Indian is simple. I believe if it is done to the specifications of the American Indians the mascot was designed after, then they can keep their mascot, yet changing it to a way that is seen as a sign of respect. American Indian's input is important because some American Indians find it respectful to keep their heritage alive through the history of the school's mascot. The people who the mascot was created from should receive

the ultimate choice to change it or not because they are the people who are being represented by the image. For example, if a man were to take a picture of a woman and use it as his background for his phone. Don't you think it should be the woman's choice on whether or not the man gets to keep the photo?

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: How Native Americans decide.

by Jonathan Haskell - Tuesday, March 6, 2018, 1:26 PM

"The controversy over who gets to be Indian is simple?". I don't think it is simple. They had been meeting about it for two years without any resolution at all. Not even like a working plan on how to go about resolving. Part of the reason though as you mentioned that there is no resolution is because they are not listening to the people they are pretending they are offending. They are only worried about taking the high road. They are only worried about doing the right thing and not worried about doing the correct thing. It is respectful to keep their heritage alive through representation, but of course only true representation glorifying their historical struggle without offensive name calling. Anyway the reason I am even responding to your post is the man photo of a woman thing. So, like a guy is just in a odd place and takes a picture of a random female person and uses it as a backdrop on his phone? Who does that? That's creepy. Creepy or not though no it is not the woman's choice if he keeps that photo. That's his photo. He took it. That is one creepy dude though. If he uses this person likeness for any reason for profit or to degrade her in some way or shares it on the internet for some reason, then I think she has a lawful reason to sue but I still say the photo in question is his not hers. Creepy. I could be way off with the legality of it, but makes me think of like a Horror convention I went to a few years ago. I have always had a huge crush on Danielle Harris. She was at this convention and I have a picture of her on my fridge right now. Is that picture hers? I paid ten bucks for that. No, it's mine. Is it that ten dollars that makes it mine? No I actually paid ten bucks for the right to stand in line to take that picture, or is it because it is was taken on MY camera phone that it is mine?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Don't the Two tribes also have say

by Oscar Medina - Monday, March 5, 2018, 10:24 PM

The two tribes that disagreed with the ban have a great point. Both tribes believe that there should not be blanket ban because there are Native American mascots that are not derogatory or racist, but instead promote a proud, brave native american. The reason for their disappointment with the passing of the ban is that they believed that not all native logos should be taken down or at least the schools should have had the chance to discuss the issue with the local tribes on how to effectively change the logo in a positive matter. Yes, I agree with the two Native tribes perspective, but I shouldn't have an input on the decision of what is or isn't racist to Native Americans. The ruling was wrong to remove all Native American school mascots. Under the ban, all the positive things about Native Americans are to be removed too. There should have been exceptions for some schools to be allowed to continue portraying Native American mascots as warriors. However, if a school uses a Native American Indian as a mascot, then there should be a display explaining why their mascot is an Indian warrior and Native Americans should decide what is appropriate. In addition, there also should be accurate

Native American history taught across the nation, in collaboration with local Native tribes. Additionally, no racist names or pictures should be allowed and Native Americans should decide what constitutes racist. It should be what all the Tribes come to an agreement on, only the Natives should have the final say.

article: (Two tribes call state's Native American mascot ban disappointing, Ryan Kost)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Appropriation vs. Appreciation.

by Camille Titus - Monday, March 5, 2018, 11:20 PM

School mascots has always been a weird idea to me and I never gave them much attention, until recently with the couple of big movements that have happened. I agree that native american mascots should not be used. Mostly because I think that they currently show a uneducated, stereotypical, and negative viewpoint. What it comes down to, for me, is appropriation vs. appreciation. If people were more educated and knew the cultural and historical background I would probably be more okay with it. Such as Siobhan Taylor said "... that the Board should focus on better educating students about Oregon tribal history." (pg. 7) Instead of having this band aid solution for racism I believe educating the mass public on the underlying issue would be more helpful. Rather than hiding or running away from our history with the native americans we should acknowledge it and learn from it. While I think the Oregon Board has their hearts in the right place and are trying to do the right thing, I just don't know if it is enough. For the tribes and people who were upset at this decision got me a little confused. I would have thought many more would like this change, but again I think it depends on how the mascot is presented.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Appropriation vs. Appreciation.

by Jonathan Haskell - Tuesday, March 6, 2018, 1:39 PM

Hi Camille!!!!!!! I agree the whole concept of a mascot is extremely weird. I can see a image or some sort of bird or knight or something on a logo that represents the team on like a hat or bag, but why is the team the Eagles? Why isn't the team just Philadelphia. The football team from Philadelphia. I am in disagreement of a complete ban which is what you seem to be arguing for and you know what that is fine! I would have no problem with a complete ban of Native American mascots if that is what Native Americans were calling for, but they just aren't. On a completely different subject I was reading this morning as I was sitting next to you waiting for this class to begin about a school in Tennessee, South Cumberland ELEMENTARY school. I capitalized that for the obvious reason of the students being so young, but in 2018 they are just now not only removing confederate flags which ok, but also a mural of an actual lynching. They argued since the guy that was getting lynched was white it didn't matter and that it represented their schools rivals not a type of people. What? Google Tennessee lynching mural and I am sure something would come up. Anyway, take care!

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



Re: Appropriation vs. Appreciation.

by Camille Titus - Wednesday, March 7, 2018, 12:17 AM

Hello Jonathan, thank you for your note and the article, I think I might not have been clear on my stance on the ban. The "blanket ban" is something like a band aid solution to me, better than doing nothing but won't actually help anything. I believe it really depends on how we educate people on these cultures and why they are such a controversial topic. The most important aspect is very much on how they are presented. The Tennessee school mural was an interesting article, thank you for suggesting it. Though I do disagree that the children are too young to understand, that is what schools are for to teach them and give them tools to understand. Kids will grow up to be adults someday sooner rather than later and should be raised and taught with that in mind. In late elementary school I was learning about some sugar coated history that I now find myself being annoyed at because it didn't get much less sugar coated as I grew up, I was still only told some of the story. Now I have to remind myself about facts that our Professor brings up that I should know but I have all these serotypes in my head that I learned (such as not everyone in the south owned slaves.) I really think that painting them over isn't the perfect end all solution that seems to be the serotype with covering up or getting rid of these types of murals, but it's a start, and a way to have a bigger conversation about how to go from here. I do think it was wrong to exclude or not take what the native american tribes were saying into consideration, I feel like this could be a good example of people trying to over correct the past.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Make change because of just one person?

by Christopher Cormier - Wednesday, March 7, 2018, 10:33 PM

After reading all four articles, one particular quote stood out to me and kind of took me off guard. James Florendo of Lane Community college says that Indian mascots need to be eliminated if affecting "a single student." Is he serious? Don't get me wrong, I think that everyone has an opinion and everybody should have a voice. But to eliminate something because of what one person thinks, to me, isn't right. If that was the case for anything, schools would constantly be changing. If the mascots are becoming an issue, there needs to be a survey put out, like the Redskins survey. The opinions of everybody need to be heard. I completely agree to the response to that statement by Florendo. You're offending an entire nation!

I'm also trying to look at this as if I were a student at one of these schools. If my high school had an Indian mascot, personally, I wouldn't be offended. That's the mascot. Deal with it. I don't understand why its becoming such a big issue now. Not only that, but if my parents or family had gone to that same school, with the same mascot, and then you suddenly ban the mascot, I think that it would offend past students. But that doesn't get taken in to account. Overall, I feel like changing a mascot, especially because it offends a single student, is absolutely ridiculous.

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



Re: Make change because of just one person?

by Hayley Allen - Thursday, March 8, 2018, 12:03 PM

I think what James Florendo is trying to say is that if one person is offended then there is a great chance that it will offend other people. By validating one person, who is Native American, who has ties to the culture, the community and the people is extremely important to hear because maybe they are seeing something that is negative, offensive or even wrongly represented that non-native people don't understand or see. As the texts illustrates, Native people have historically been oppressed and had their culture striped from them therefore what right does a non-native have to say this is not offensive. These people have been murdered and silenced for hundreds of years and now they are being used again for the white person's entertainment as a sports team. Their heritage is so much greater than what is represented as a stereotypical mascot and only perpetuates the de-humanizing views of Native Americans and their culture.

I have to also disagree about changing people's mascots especially if they are offensive, I have experience as my middle school's original mascot was a crusader which obviously is not politically correct or something little 12 year olds should be proud to represent. We got to vote on a new mascot and were actually more proud to have a mascot that is not 'someone who kills people based on their religion' but to something we got to pick and be a part of. I think if parents and families feel that connected to their school mascot, then they should be educated on the historical context of Native Americans so they can better understand why that is offensive to people of Native heritage. I feel it may be hard to understand if you have not been a part of a minority group that has been oppressed historically that is why education is key rather than emotion or ignorance.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Make change because of just one person?

by Christopher Cormier - Thursday, March 8, 2018, 10:18 PM

Florendo didn't say anything about the person who it offends being Native American. If they were, I could see how that could be relevant. But even if that was the case, who's to say that that person has the right to speak on behalf of all Native Americans? What qualifies them to have a voice for others? You may think that other people feel strongly about it, but nobody would know if they weren't asked. If they are asked, there should be a poll or survey done. With that being said, what if the person that was offended wasn't a Native American? Would it still matter? To me, like I stated in my post, take a survey and see what the majority says. If it doesn't change, deal with it. I think that even if they are Native American, are they active in their tribe? Just because somebody has Native American in their heritage doesn't necessarily mean that they are active. That's like saying that I participate in my Irish heritage, which I don't, just because I'm a quarter Irish.

It's not hard for me to understand at all. Although I'm not Native American, I understand what being a minority is like. I grew up in Los Angeles where, in most of LA, if you were white, you are the minority. The high school that I went to was 85% Hispanic and African

American. Being white in a place like that makes you understand how it is to be the minority. When I moved to Oregon, it was the complete opposite. Living there, it made me appreciate diversity. So yes, I do understand. Being somewhere like that, I never heard anything about people wanting to take a mascot down because it was "offensive." Who cares if the mascot is something that you don't like. It hasn't been as big of a deal as much as it is now. Why's that? I understand that education of our history is important, but what I'm saying isn't emotion or ignorance. It's opinion, just as your response was. No matter what history says, everyone is going to have an opinion. I wouldn't always say that its emotion, and ignorance is overstepping a bit.

Did you notice the first few words at the beginning of the third article? "The 5-1 vote.." In stead of saying what Florendo said, may there needs to be a poll or survey taken. To me, it seems that turned out to have the best results. A perfect example would be the Redskins article.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Make change because of just one person?

by Hayley Allen - Friday, March 9, 2018, 2:16 PM

I think a survey would be a good way to hear from more people of all backgrounds then those represented in official institutions that have the decision making power. I do think that a person of native heritage who isn't active in their tribe should still still have a valid opinion over this topic. It does get difficult to differentiate how much native they should be because there are so many people who have like 1/16th or less native blood that might not even identify as native American. Although I still think that they have more of a right to argue something as offensive versus someone of European decent because they have as we learned in class their ancestors have been murdered for their culture and beliefs. Even though today they may not be discriminated against they can still feel connections to their ancestors who died fighting to protect their ways of life that are now being simplified into mascots for sports teams. I don't think they should be completely banned but making sure that local tribes have control over how they are represented and including more classes on their history so that people have more knowledge then just the stereotypical depictions you see as school mascots.

I also did not mean to call you emotional or ignorant but meant that what you said about parents who feel that strongly for a school mascot knowing it is offensive would be emotional and ignorant because they do not have the knowledge and understanding to see that it could be offensive. I also feel that even living in a place where you may be the minority does give you perspective however it does not change the way society sees you outside of those situations. What I mean is that if someone has white skin, American society treats them a certain way than someone who has darker skin, that's just the world we live in. Same for someone who is male or female or even straight or gay. I think it is difficult for anyone to truly understand or say how someone else feels if they are not that race, gender, sexual orientation, if you get what I mean. Lately there is so much debate over people being too sensitive over different things which I do agree there has to be a limit. Although our country is getting more and more diverse with minority groups finally feeling comfortable to

speaking out against things that are offensive that they may not have been able to say 20 years ago. I know some tribes did say that it was not offensive to them however others felt it was, so I feel a change needed to happen. It is not the place for parents who had attended the school to argue because they were proud of that mascot but for our community to sympathize with the Native people or hear how to better represent them as an ethnic group.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Can We Please Everybody

by Josiah Sugai - Thursday, March 8, 2018, 1:54 PM

I believe High Schools that have a deep respect for Indian culture should be allowed to use an Indian Mascot. If they are using the Mascot under a tribe's consent and are not trying to be racist, what is wrong about that? In what way have these schools been racist by wanting to use a powerful and respected figure as a mascot? I feel that it does matter how Indians view the mascots because they are the people it's portraying. However, if a small minority is offended, but a majority enjoys it, who should win. If we changed the name of everything because one person is offended, that would mean that we should ban many other school mascots because of who is offended by it (SE Axemen, Sheldon Fighting Irish, Grants Pass Cavemen, and Pleasant Hill Billies). Personally, I don't agree with the state of Oregon's decision especially since they threaten to cut state funding if schools don't change their mascot. The two tribes that spoke out against this can be considered a minority as well. If they are frustrated/"offended" by this decision, why not reverse the law so it satisfies them. This reminds me of one of Aesop's Fables. It was of the father, son and donkey. This guy, his son and donkey were going into town. At first, the son was riding, and people were telling the son to let the dad ride. When the dad was riding, people criticized him because he made his son walk. Now, the father and son are both riding the donkey and they criticize them for overworking the donkey. So, the father and son try to carry it. Well the donkey falls and runs away. The main morale of this story is that you can't please everybody. Somehow Oregon needs to come to a compromise that allows both sides to be satisfied. The exception rule is smart, but one provision should be added. Let's say that a school hopes to accurately and respectfully portray an Indian for their mascot. I believe they should reach out to a tribe to request permission and ask for guidance on how to accurately portray the Indian. Then the school can not be racist but truly try to honor Indians.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Can We Please Everybody

by Alex McCall - Saturday, March 10, 2018, 5:31 PM

I like the analogy, it paints your picture very well. I guess maybe the fact that it's just plain "Indians" in most cases, compared to your examples of mascots where they are less direct with it. There is no way to make everyone happy in this situation. I do think "Indians" is a little too direct but if the Native American population doesn't find it offensive, and in some cases like having their heritage expressed, then I personally think it shouldn't matter.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



The Tribe's Opinion Should Matter Most

by Decker Robinson - Thursday, March 8, 2018, 5:05 PM

In my opinion, in order for someone to “be indian” for the purposes of speaking for indians and resenting mascots they should still be apart of the tribe that the mascot is representing. I am not saying that other people’s opinion is not valid and that they shouldn’t be offended; however, I believe that the tribe being represented should be the ones to say if the mascot is offending to them which would be the most valid concern. In the case of the Redskins, I said that the name should be banned even if a minority of native americans think that it is offensive because it was a derogatory name for native americans. My opinion differs in this opinion because I believe the majority should rule for schools and teams who wish to honor tribes. For instance, in Ryan Kost’s article, “Two tribes call state’s Native American mascot ban disappointing”, he speaks about the Florida State Seminoles by saying “The Seminoles have official permission from the two remaining Seminole Indian groups (the Seminole Tribe of Florida and Seminole Nation in Oklahoma) to use the name for their sports teams. It is the only official exemption for any sports team”. I think this is an excellent point because the Seminole tribe’s opinion is the one that should matter the most. If they believe that the school’s mascot is not offensive, then there shouldn’t be any further discussion about it.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: The Tribe's Opinion Should Matter Most

by Christopher Cormier - Saturday, March 10, 2018, 9:57 PM

Decker, Finally! I feel the exact same way! I'm completely fine if a mascot were to be changed if people in the active tribes were the ones wanting it changed. If that doesn't happen and other people want it changed, who aren't Native American, then there needs to be a majority vote. I don't think its right to change something because of what a single person says or feels. Kost's article hits the nail on the head. That is the perfect example of what is acceptable. Everyone is going to have an opinion, and some are going to be offended regardless of what happens, so I think in the case of Indian mascots, whoever is trying to make a change needs to be active in their tribe. As I was reading your post, I was happy to see that we had the same views.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Changing Mascots, Yes vs No

by Kerianne Guza - Friday, March 9, 2018, 1:03 PM

When it comes to Indian mascots for public schools, the opinion that matters the most is the opinions of the local tribes. If no tribe, explicitly makes a comment saying that they are offended, then I don’t see a problem with keeping the name, just as long as the school uses it in a respectful manner. Some Native Americans “see it as an honor to be” represented in the mascot because they are seen as warriors. However, other individuals feel like it is a mockery and “dehumanizing”, and therefore, should not continue. This is why “tribes [are] reluctant to weight in” on the decision.

Sometimes even when a tribe doesn’t officially state an opinion, others within the tribe do. If it seems that quite a few people within the tribe are offended, then the school should change its mascot out of respect for them. When it comes to public schools it still means quite a bit of

work to change a mascot, but most of that is just picking out a new one and repainting things or getting sports uniforms. This change takes effort, but it is nothing compared to the amount demanded if, for example, the NFL Redskins team changed their mascot.

I think that the ban on using Native American mascots in Oregon was unnecessary. Proof of this was the two tribes that were also disappointed by it. The mascots opened an opportunity to try and bring up their culture and teach the students about it, but now that is taken away. Although one good thing about the change is that we no longer have to worry about who is or isn't offended because the mascots are what they are, which is no longer Native American.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Native Americans' View's Matter

by Nicholas Stevens - Saturday, March 10, 2018, 4:22 PM

This whole topic is so controversial, but I think it all grinds down to how the Native Americans view the mascot names. In Anne William's article it talks about Brenda Brainard who runs the Eugene School District's NATIVES Indian Education program, brought the controversy to her tribal leaders in 2007, but she found that the majority didn't share her urgency in this matter. I think this shows that the tribal people don't share all of these opinions that the mascot names are offensive. If they don't find this to be urgent then why should urgent measures be taken?

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

◀ Chinese - Now & Then

Professional Sports, Data, and Images ▶

Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 202 W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897)