

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Unlearning the Language of Conquest: Scholars Expose Anti-Indianism in America. Edited by Four Arrows (Don Trent Jacobs).

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0mt1j1zs>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 31(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Grande, Sandy

Publication Date

2007-03-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Some readers will find *The Secret Power of Naming* refreshing, illuminating, brave, and truthful, and on some levels it is. However, the preachier poems can come off as too much of a jeremiad. Littlecrow-Russell is at her best when she merges these two tendencies. This happens in “Letter to Human Resources” and most effectively in the wonderful “Noble Savagery,” the best poem in the book. This text works on many levels because it blends ironic humor and tell-it-like-it-is anger, at the same time altering our perceptions of both Native and Anglo realities. It also draws on classic poetic techniques of anaphora, epanalepsis, and synoeciosis, converting common discourse into uncommonly startling poetic turns of phrase.

The University of Arizona Press tries to peg Littlecrow-Russell to Alexie, but her work better resembles Esther Belin’s first book, *In the Belly of My Beauty*. Like Belin (Navajo), Littlecrow-Russell addresses the complexities of urban Indianness, gender, poverty, biculturalism, and alcoholism. Though she lacks Belin’s facility with poetic technique, she resembles Belin’s ability to convert the prosaic into the poetic.

Readers who prefer the poetry of Louise Erdrich, Luci Tapahonso, or Linda Hogan may not enjoy *The Secret Power of Naming*, but those who are interested in grizzly snapshots and humorous takes on Indian realities, and how a smart, Indian woman deals with Indian realities, then this just may be the book for you.

Dean Rader

University of San Francisco

Unlearning the Language of Conquest: Scholars Expose Anti-Indianism in America. Edited by Four Arrows (Don Trent Jacobs). Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006. 300 pages. \$55.00 cloth; \$21.95 paper.

The idea for this text—to allow a space for diverse voices to speak back against “empire” and expose the language of conquest—is estimable. The intent, as articulated by Jacobs is to bring to the fore indigenous knowledge as a means of offering a vital alternative to “the devastating effects of free-market globalization, greed, war, and ecological ignorance” (19). He is particularly interested in presenting a “scholarly challenge” to the anti-Indian rhetoric that often passes as scholarship in the academy. Jacobs specifically sites books such as Robert Whelan’s *Wild in the Woods: The Myth of the Peaceful Eco-Savage*, Christy Turner’s *Man Corn: Cannibalism and Violence in Prehistoric American Southwest*, Steven LeBlanc’s *Constant Battles: The Myth of the Peaceful, Noble Savage*, and Lawrence Keeley’s *War before Civilization: The Myth of the Peaceful Savage* as examples of works that perpetuate negative stereotypes and specious scholarship about Indians. He argues that such scholarship represents a kind of “hegemony that prevents peoples from realizing that . . . the current form of global capitalism is not the only economic system available to humanity; or that living Indigenous cultures possess a measure of wisdom that might be vital for all of our futures” (24).

Although Jacobs clearly articulates an ambitious and important project, the delivery is pretty inconsistent. The strongest chapters, perhaps not surprisingly, are those written by Native authors. Among them, Angela Cavendar Wilson's chapter on the rhetorical racism inherent to Laura Ingalls Wilder's *Little House on the Prairie*, Devon Mihesuah's "Overcoming Hegemony in Native Studies Programs," and Greg Cajete's "Western Science and the Loss of Natural Creativity" are particularly strong and poignant. They all offer incisive, scholarly critique as well as suggestions for transformation in accessible language and style. Wilson's critique of Wilder, though at times hyperbolic (comparing Wilder's text to a Nazi primer), draws attention to the dangers of literary racism and the need to decolonize the school curriculum. Mihesuah's contribution offers the only chapter centered on students and teachers, providing basic but sound advice to Native students and teachers of Native students. Finally, Cajete's chapter on contemporary science and its correlation to indigenous knowledge systems is fascinating. Although he articulates analyses of subjects as complex as chaos theory, the Cartesian worldview, and "participation and creative sensibilities," he does so in a manner that is very accessible to the nonscientist. Jacobs's "prologue" on the qualitative differences between the school shootings at Columbine High School and Red Lake Indian Reservation also weaves a cogent analysis of the inner workings of colonization.

The remaining Native contributions are either plagued by hyperbole, as in Barbara Alice Mann's "Where Are Your Women? Missing in Action," or lack of originality, as in Vine Deloria's "Conquest Masquerading as Law." Although indigenous scholars have every right to be strident in their critiques, polemical writing does little to further the cause and can also perpetuate essentialist understandings of Indianness. To paint uncritically indigenous knowledge/practice as "wisdom" and Western knowledge/practice as unjust and oppressive seems only to provide fodder for scholars intent on "debunking" the "myths" of Native America.

Of far greater concern, however, are some of the contributions by the non-Native authors. With the exception of Trudy Sable's "Preserving the Whole: Principles of Sustainability in Mi' Kmaw Forms of Communication" and possibly David Gabbard's "Before Predator Came: A Plea for Expanding First Nations Scholarship as European Shadow Work," the contributions of the non-Native authors are comparatively weak. They offer little more than New Agey, overly romanticized, and otherwise problematic constructions of Indianness. Moreover, some of the chapters, namely those by James DeMeo, Lee Klinger, David Gibbs, Frank Bracho, and Chet Bowers, make bold (if not odd) statements yet don't appear to come from any scholarly basis.

For example, in "Peaceful Versus Warlike Societies in Pre-Columbian America," geographer James DeMeo presents his research project, which concludes that precontact American Indian cultures were "more oriented toward peace than war" (135). Aside from the somewhat problematic nature of the hypothesis (what does it really mean for a society to be more oriented toward peace?), one could certainly argue that modern US society, which has engaged in ten wars in more than two hundred years, is more oriented toward peace than war. It turns out that his "research" is rooted in the highly

controversial “science” of orgonomie—the study of the link between human sexuality and emotions. It is a “science” built upon the notion of “orgastic potency” (as in orgasm) and the supposed discovery of a form of energy called *orgone* that permeated the atmosphere and all living matter. Lee Klinger’s chapter is similarly rooted in the quasi-mystical, 1960s “science” of the Gaia hypothesis, and David Gibb’s chapter seems to come straight out of a Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) or Weathermen Underground handbook, essentially articulating a conspiracy theory that the CIA and academia are one and the same. Although, by comparison, Chet Bowers’s “The Language of Conquest and the Loss of the Commons” is more academically grounded, it is the only chapter that doesn’t provide a single footnote or reference. This seeming divide between the scholarly works of the Native authors and questionable contributions of the non-Native authors raises a serious question of whether and why these two groups of authors were held to different standards.

It’s unfortunate that such an ambitious and worthwhile project ultimately gets bogged down by some of the more problematic contributions. They not only overshadow the excellent work of some of the Native scholars, but also serve to replicate the uneven playing field in academic publishing. Aside from the issue of content, other aspects of the text detract from its potential strength. Due to the vast diversity among authors and contributions, it would have been a worthwhile organizational device for Jacobs to group chapters under broader subheadings such as the environment, worldviews, and language. The text would have also fared better if Jacobs exercised a bit more of a hands-on approach to his editing, achieving more uniformity of style. Some offerings were written in an accessible language and style open to a wide audience while others were quite esoteric and seemingly intended for a more specified audience. Finally, the italicized introductions written by Jacobs before each chapter were interesting but cumbersome. It would have made more sense to place all comments in the introductory chapter.

In the final analysis, *Unlearning the Language of Conquest* is a book that begins with a great idea but falters on execution. Though problematic on the whole for reasons cited, some of the individual contributions are quite insightful and interesting. Certainly some of the pieces are far greater than the sum of the whole. In the end, I don’t think it achieves its goal—to offer a cogent critique of the grammar of empire.

Sandy Grande
Connecticut College

The Unquiet Grave: The FBI and the Struggle for the Soul of Indian Country.
By Steve Hendricks. New York: Thunder’s Mouth Press, 2006. 490 pages.
\$27.95 cloth; \$15.95 paper.

The title of this book, *The Unquiet Grave: The FBI and the Struggle for the Soul of Indian Country*, while very descriptive of content, hardly covers the breadth of the author’s research and writing. *The Unquiet Grave* focuses primarily on