

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Immigration and the Political Economy of Home: West Indian Brooklyn and American Indian Minneapolis, 1945-1992. By Rachel Buff.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1p57h950>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 25(4)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Blu Barnd, Natchee

**Publication Date**

2001-09-01

**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/>

the allegedly “patriarchal” or “imperialistic domination” of art by a reader. Such attention to one’s own subjectivity can easily veer into forms of self-involvement that are as problematic as any Eurocentrically imposed master narrative. However, Hoy’s voice works well for her in her project, especially in her discussions of how these writers’ works were received by students in her graduate seminars, and of how their reactions in turn influenced her own self-aware critical stance.

Indeed, partly owing to Hoy’s self-aware and self-critical approach, this volume is quite useful to a wide audience. It offers much to those who wish to understand particular texts in more depth, to those who wish to teach these books to students without inadvertently misreading them according to a narrow interpretive frame of reference, and to those in need of an introductory education in Native literature. Hoy’s prose is clear and accessible, and her book has value for audiences new to Native literature as well as for those already well informed in the area. *How Should I Read These?* is also a welcome scholarly companion to studies of contemporary ethnic literature in general.

*Catherine Rainwater*

St. Edward’s University

**Immigration and the Political Economy of Home: West Indian Brooklyn and American Indian Minneapolis, 1945–1992.** By Rachel Buff. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001. 240 pages. \$48.00 cloth; \$18.95 paper.

Several of my colleagues came away with surprised looks on their faces after reading the title of Rachel Buff’s first book. Even for comparative-minded ethnic studies scholars, it seems, the idea of linking together American Indians from Minneapolis and West Indians from Brooklyn is quite original. Based upon those reactions, Buff’s work clearly has the potential to expand the thinking of scholars in ethnic studies. Buff’s work also offers broad and comparative theoretical approaches that are seldom found in the mostly anthropological and historical texts that heavily populate this journal’s review section. I welcome these departures. Hopefully her promise will open the door to more consideration of the relationship between national understandings of race and American Indians. In all, she offers the American Indianist powerful new tools for understanding the impact of colonialism and recognizing the braided contradictions that simultaneously combat and facilitate Indian, and other racialized peoples’, resistance to colonial projects.

At the center of Buff’s concern, then, is the violence embedded within the discourses that construct our ideas of the nation and citizen, and that simultaneously provide the backbone for policing the boundaries defined by such ideas (p. 6). Buff attempts to resist the power and violence of such boundaries. She textually crosses borders by crafting a project that brings together two normally disassociated groups of people. In treating West Indians from Brooklyn together with American Indians from Minneapolis, Buff makes links between cities, communities, and events that are rarely considered in relation

to one another. By the end of the project, Buff is quite successful in making the links she needs to justify the bringing together of two geographically and culturally separated groups of people.

In working out the daily materialization of her theoretical constructs, Buff interrogates the development of the powwow in Minneapolis and Carnival in Brooklyn. She uses these cultural sites to explore how American Indians and West Indians have negotiated the historical processes of colonialism and racialization in post-World War II urban settings. She carefully recounts the historical conditions that facilitated the emergence of each community and then goes on to describe how the cultural events of Carnival and powwow have been maintained even while being continually re-formed to meet the new social and cultural demands of living in urban spaces. Buff is especially concerned with how each community has developed their collective identities and complex (“transnational”) notions of home. These collective identities and transnational notions of home, she argues, garner particular interest as sources of everyday resistance to colonial and racial projects. These identities have also been formed through the selective appropriation and redeployment of colonial technologies, and in ways that combat the powerful national rhetorics of the nation and its legal and cultural boundaries. Buff shows that while these events do not always emerge as “active” stances of resistance, the maintenance of cultural productions necessarily reasserts “alternative notions of citizenship and subjectivity” that resist national ideals (p. 19).

Armed with such theoretical weaponry, Buff is able to more fully contextualize the phenomena of the powwow and Carnival and to expose the “hemispheric parallels” that have shaped both communities’ struggles for “geopolitical and cultural sovereignty” (p. 14). She further illuminates the parallels through the use of two important terms. First, she employs the slashed term *im/migrants* to link together the two communities by their shared experiences of movement from homeland “margins” into the urban “centers,” and by the complicated difficulties they face with that transition. I found her linking of immigration and migration quite useful for understanding the impact that crossing borders, whether national, rural/urban, or cultural/racial has for those who are pressed toward making those passages. Hence, the cultural productions that emerge in the new spaces of settlement gain an especially vital significance as transplanted peoples struggle to redefine their complex identities in the face of fierce (and contradictory) institutional pressures to abandon them altogether.

Buff also points out that transplanted people often formulate powerful social claims on particular spaces. She draws on the term *denizenship* to describe the relationships that people create with spaces/places, especially when those people are constructed as being outside of the ideological and geographic boundaries of such places/spaces. This conceptual framework seems to reveal some of the reasons why she choose these two particular “festivals” as her sites of investigation. Both American Indians in Minneapolis and West Indians in Brooklyn have established a notable presence in their respective cities. In her consideration of communities that resist national rhetorics of citizenship and identity, it seems Buff recognized the residential link that she had with two noticeable communities that had made claims in some pub-

lic spaces. As a dweller of Minnesota (as a graduate student) and New York (her home), Buff was a witness to the public expression of identity formation/maintenance and to important forms of cultural resistance to the racially and nationally sanctioned ideals of citizenship. The similarities that she likely noticed (racialized people forming transnational identities, adapting technologies, and resisting certain national discourses) probably seemed fertile ground for further investigation and study; and she was correct.

If two such seemingly different communities can be brought together, questions naturally arise about what links can be made between other groups and between other sites of cultural production. Using her two main theoretically saturated terms, Buff is able to successfully convey the importance of the links between American Indian communities in Minneapolis and West Indian communities in Brooklyn, and to raise simultaneously the question of why their separation seemed so natural in the first place.

*Natchee Blu Barnd*

University of California, San Diego

**Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans.** By Anthony F. C. Wallace. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999. 416 pages. \$31.50 cloth; \$18.95 paper.

Anthony F. C. Wallace has written a number of important scholarly works over the course of a long and productive career. His famous *Death and Rebirth of the Seneca* (1970) is required reading for any student of the ethnohistory of early America, masterfully describing the changes in Seneca society in the decades after the American Revolution. In *Jefferson and the Indians*, Wallace turns his attention to the other side of the frontier, exploring the career of the philosopher, statesman, and president who did so much, Wallace argues, to shape the contours of this nation's Indian policy. His goal is to understand Jefferson's "many inconsistencies," and to reconcile the "scholar and admirer" of American Indians with "the planner of cultural genocide" (p. vii).

Wallace argues that Jefferson came of age in a world that viewed Indians as enemies and as obstacles to the speculative land ventures of gentlemen like himself. After the Revolution, Jefferson's rhetoric mellowed and he adopted a tone of "paternalistic solicitude" as he commenced his studies of Indian origins and his work on the *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Jefferson believed in Indian potential, Wallace argues, and that Native peoples could assimilate into American society if guided properly by the benevolent hands of the American republic. Service in the cabinets of Washington and Adams and later his presidency forced Jefferson to put his philosophical speculations to the test. Jefferson, Wallace argues, found it difficult to reconcile his desire to civilize the Indians with his need to acquire lands for the sturdy American yeomanry. In the end, Indians lost out as Jefferson advocated removal and land cessions by Indians as the only way to protect them from the aggressive violence of the frontier population.