

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Foot of the Mountain and Other Stories. By Joseph Bruchac.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3181v206>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 30(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Baringer, Sandra

Publication Date

2006-03-01

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/>

earlier historiography about North American missions and stimulates many new questions about the subject. For students and scholars interested in the early contact period, *Feast of Souls* will be a must-read for some time to come. Galgano's sophistication in revealing new problems and issues about this subject makes this book a splendid example of modern scholarship.

James A. Lewis

Western Carolina University

Foot of the Mountain and Other Stories. By Joseph Bruchac. Duluth, MN: Holy Cow! Press, 2003. 188 pages. \$14.95 paper.

Joseph Bruchac is probably best known as a poet and as a storyteller whose written work reflects traditions of Native American storytelling. He is also a widely traveled teacher and storyteller who follows the oral "tradition" in both traditional and nontraditional ways, but his live storytelling is not the subject of this review, nor is his poetry. Likewise, Bruchac has performed important scholarly work in anthologizing the poetry of prisoners and other "third world Americans," work that is beyond the scope of this review.

Foot of the Mountain is primarily an anthology of some of Bruchac's recent short fiction, though it also includes a few reflective essays on his life and his craft. Some of the stories are recognizable, acknowledged variations on traditional Native American stories whereas others are more uniquely "Bruchacian." The book starts with a story set during the Civil War that recounts an encounter between two youths, one Abenaki and one Mohawk, in a New York combat regiment. The next story moves forward to the late boarding-school era, and subsequent stories range back and forth from the past through the present, into the future on another planet and back again.

The second part of the book is more autobiographical and reflective, starting with an essay on the importance of sharing old stories. The pieces that follow take us to Bruchac's childhood in the Adirondack mountains: trout, deer, owls, turkeys in blueberry bushes, turtles in tomato patches, the earth feeding them, the *dodems* overseeing them.

Reading these stories leads to stories within stories. A boy who is running away meets with a situation that ends differently, at least in the immediate sense, than the boy who lived with the bears in the traditional story. At the same time, the stories tell stories about stories. In another story, Bigman sabotages an environmentally destructive construction operation. And a man worries that "people like [Bigman] eat [people]." The elder replies, "Those are just old stories." The man says, "Auntie, you are the one who told me those stories" (39).

Bruchac's prose fiction is much more accessible than that of writers such as Gerald Vizenor or Leslie Marmon Silko and as such may be mistaken for children's literature. Many of his books are packaged and marketed as children's literature or juvenile fiction. But a work such as this would be more accurately characterized as "all ages" literature, similar to the old stories. There is coded sexual humor at times for the amusement of the elders. It is generally too subtle

to distract young readers or listeners, though one would not want to use some of these as bedtime stories without being willing to answer questions.

Other reasons why his work has received less critical attention than it deserves are more difficult to articulate. The genre to which this particular book belongs, which could be described as a transcribed continuation of Native oral tradition, does not lend itself to standard forms of literary criticism, which tend to focus on longer, set texts. Whenever Native book-length fiction departs too far from the features of “the novel” as invented (in the strictest sense) in eighteenth-century England, critics are unsure how to evaluate it. Here the stories are sometimes as short as three pages but are rarely discrete “stories” in the sense that they are usually variations on earlier stories, either in the oral tradition or in Bruchac’s or other storytellers’ previous works. So which version is to be evaluated? Native readers might find such a question amusing, but the multiplicity of texts makes the task challenging for those trained in contemporary graduate schools of literature.

Once you get beyond a genre classification approach, you run into a related problem: many of the texts that have driven recent developments in critical theory are simply too foreign to the worldview of Native American literature for the theoretical approaches they have produced to have much relevance. For instance, a standard “new historicist” approach would deal with the themes of political resistance in some of these stories in terms of subversion and containment. In new historicist terms, a Dickens novel might protest abysmal conditions for the working poor but—by tying up the characters’ problems in a happy ending—contain any radical discontent that might otherwise lead to true social change or revolution. However, a Bruchac story protesting land theft, environmental contamination, or the colonizing exploitation of an oppressed people will not tend to have an ending where the forces of good prevail. Supernatural forces may appear to be intervening if a person is involved who is wise enough to know how to invoke their aid, but the ultimate outcome is likely to remain unknown. The story is still in progress. Much the same can be said of Silko, where in one sense the story *is* the ceremony.

Another issue is the function and treatment of nature in Bruchac’s work. The concept of nature has been fraught with angst in postcolonial theory, which sees it in terms of the way colonizing cultures have attempted to exercise dominion over it. Donna Haraway says that those who are, “excruciatingly conscious of nature’s discursive constitution as ‘other’ in the histories of colonialism, racism, sexism, and class domination of many kinds, . . . must find another relationship to nature besides reification and possession.”

Haraway defines *nature* as “a powerful discursive construction, effected in the interactions among material-semiotic actors, human and not” and the world as a “coding trickster with whom we must learn to converse.” Later in the same essay, after a discussion of indigenous resistance in the Amazon, she critiques a question framed by naturalist/adventurer Joe Kane, “Who speaks for the jaguar?” Haraway sees this way of framing as a stripping of agency from the nonhuman: “Permanently speechless, forever requiring the services of a ventriloquist, . . . the object or ground of representation is the realization of the representative’s fondest dream” (“The Promises of Monsters,” in *Cultural Studies*, 1992).

Haraway's deconstruction of received notions of nature is consistent with Bruchac's relationship to nature. Rather than speaking *for* the jaguar, Bruchac might say, the jaguar speaks *through* the story. In "A Panther in the Attic," a story that echoes the "riding horse" stories of Maroon and African American literature, Bruchac's protagonist dreams that he is riding a leashed panther up into the closed-off attic of his old house.

While Haraway argues that "where we need to move is not 'back' to nature, but *elsewhere*," Bruchac is already there. His story of "The Growing Season" on another planet explains and validates in another incarnation the kinship between the people and the trees articulated in the creation story with which this story opens. But even his stories set in the here and now illustrate and instruct in the functional interaction of the human and the nonhuman.

This book should be on the acquisition list of every charter school, middle school, high school, and community college with a significant Native student population. But non-Native readers of all ages will enjoy it too.

Sandra Baringer

University of California, Riverside

How the Indians Lost Their Land: Law and Power on the American Frontier.

By Stuart Banner. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005. 352 pages. \$29.95 cloth.

Law professor Stuart Banner has written an important and sweeping book with a disarmingly simple title. Banner begins his story in the early seventeenth century and takes it to the beginning of the twentieth century, by which time American Indians had lost almost all the land of the lower forty-eight states to non-Indians. The subject matter of the book is land conveyances or, as the author puts it more precisely, "property in land." Banner explains at the outset that he intends to study the changing history of property in land. He carefully delineates between the concept of ownership with rights in property and the concept of sovereignty, the latter term he defines as the power to govern. Banner finds three legal approaches over the three centuries that controlled how Indians transferred ownership of their land to the Anglo-Americans. From the origins of English settlement through 1763, the English recognized at law full American Indian ownership of land and full property rights to that land, including the right to dispose of it by contractual sale. From 1763 to the years just before and after the War of 1812, the English and subsequent American law recognized only the right of Indian tribes to sell as a political body and only to sell to the Crown or to the American sovereign, the United States. Finally, from the time of the *Johnson v. McIntosh* case (1823) onward, US law recognized only an American Indian right of occupancy, not of ownership, although the president, Congress, and the courts continued to expect that tribes as political bodies would voluntarily cede their occupancy claims.

The seventeenth-century English followed other Europeans in making broad claims of sovereignty over large tracts but were far more limited in