

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

...From Time Immemorial: Indigenous Peoples and State Systems. By Richard J. Perry.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/325220rc>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 22(3)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Baker, Brian Alan

**Publication Date**

1998-06-01

**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/>

1815, 1991). But Hinderaker's signal contribution lies in his extensive analysis of how the conquest of Indian lands not only facilitated the integration of potentially recalcitrant regions into the revolutionary movement and the nation, but also extended the bounds of "republican" liberty. Although "republican" ideology taught that imperialism corroded liberty, the United States, by reserving the full benefits of citizenship for whites, hit upon a formula by which it could simultaneously expand its borders, widen its freedoms, and strengthen its sense of community. Virtually every aspect of frontier life, including even the evangelical religion that came to dominate "middle" America, was shaped by violence and the repression of Native peoples.

Like Edmund Morgan's classic study of colonial Virginia (*American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*, 1975), Hinderaker argues that the new nation was able to extend tremendous economic and political freedoms to ordinary white men only because it systematically subordinated racial "others" and stripped them of any claim to comparable rights or protections. It might have been interesting had Hinderaker pursued his subject into the early national period, examining how the Ohio Valley's early experiences shaped its antebellum politics, but this is a minor quibble in relation to a book that is so all-encompassing in scope. In his exposition of how freedom and racial subordination proceeded together in the Ohio Valley, Hinderaker helps us to understand the tragic "paradox" that, as Morgan argued so many years ago, resides at the heart of American history.

Louise A. Breen  
Kansas State University

**...From Time Immemorial: Indigenous Peoples and State Systems.** By Richard J. Perry. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996. 302 pages. \$37.50 cloth; \$16.95 paper.

Anyone interested in comparative indigenous politics in a global perspective should take the time to read *...From Time Immemorial*. This book will provide students and scholars with a conceptual foundation and general knowledge base concerning indigenous peoples within state systems around the world in a historical and contemporary context. After reading this

book, one should learn something about the overall history of indigenous people in the United States, Canada, Mexico, and Australia. In addition, one should have a greater awareness of a general pattern common to state systems with respect to the process of indigenous incorporation. While scholars have tended to research and write about indigenous people around the world as isolated cases, very few have attempted to relate different cases to one another in order to identify a common pattern.

The strength of Perry's book lies with his objective, stated in two of his opening questions: "Are the various episodes of state incorporation nothing more than a multitude of discrete events with little in common, or are there underlying patterns that human action have followed over and over again, regardless of who the actors were or where and when they acted? ... Do individuals make any difference in the flow of events, or do impersonal forces sweep them along?" (p. xi). These questions reflect the problem of agency versus structure, a debate that has a long history in social science: "The relationship between human action and socio-political structure is one of the most fundamental and nagging issues in the social sciences" (p. 37). In the past decade, other social scientists have addressed this problem by comparing and contrasting different Indian tribes at the regional level: Duane Champagne, *Social Order and Political Change* (1992); and Tom Hall, *Social Change in the Southwest* (1989).

In the first two chapters of *...From Time Immemorial*, Perry develops the theoretical perspective that structures his analysis. He seems to take the position that groups enact their agency within the particular sociopolitical structures that encapsulate them. And, regardless of differences in sociopolitical structures, the historical pattern of indigenous incorporation across state systems will be the same. In fact, he identifies seven "general conclusions" with respect to the incorporation of indigenous peoples by state systems and six "ways in which indigenous peoples have reacted to [state] initiatives" (pp. 226-227). While downplaying the effects of sociopolitical structure, he conceptualizes indigenous peoples as "interest groups" acting within state systems. In his perspective, the state is "an arena of competing interest groups" (p. 38). While Perry acknowledges that some interest groups are more powerful than others, he seems to think that the state is neutral: "In general, the state's pose as an entity that exists over and above special interests is an essential aspect of its capacity to mediate and

balance these interests or to broker the interests of some over others" (p. 7). While the state is a complicated arena in which different groups compete for power and advantage, many scholars have argued that the state generally represents the interests of the more powerful groups.

While I am knowledgeable about the political, economic, and cultural issues that have affected the lives of Indians in the United States and Canada, my background on indigenous people in Australia and Mexico is somewhat limited. However, despite this, I am certain that the overall scope of this book is too broad, especially with the time period covered. Because of this, and while I am certain that Perry has provided us with some background on indigenous people in the four countries, I have concerns about the depth of his analysis. For example, in chapter three on Mexico, Perry gives a sweeping overview of the major political events of Mexico that begins before arrival of Cortes in 1521 and concludes with the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Zapatista Army of National Liberation movement in Chiapas in 1994. Amid these two points in time is the Spanish conquest of Mexico and the Inquisition, mining and the development of the *hacienda* economy, the emergence of divisions between *peninsulares* and *criollos* in New Spain, the birth of *mestizos* culture, Mexican independence, the Mexican and American War, the Mexican Revolution, and the expansion of American economic interests in Mexico. These are some of the events that he covers, and the problem here has to do with the fact that Perry dances through more than five hundred years of history in thirty-nine pages. In this particular chapter, indigenous people almost disappear, and he makes sweeping generalizations about all indigenous people throughout Mexico. This is problematic due to the regional, cultural, and other variations existing among indigenous societies in Mexico.

In his discussion of indigenous people in the other three state systems, Perry covers five hundred years of history for the United States in thirty-eight pages; five hundred years for Canada in thirty-six pages; and three hundred years for Australia in thirty-nine pages. Thus, overall, for all four countries, we get 1,800 years of historical events that include the lives of countless indigenous peoples in 152 pages. Because of the book's magnitude, Perry is unable to focus on certain events and points in time in order to draw out a more concrete and informed analysis. In fact, Perry recognizes this problem,

and suggests that the "reader must look elsewhere for a fine-focused analysis" (p. xiv). Thus, while it is an ambitious work, the major shortcoming of *...From Time Immemorial* has to do with the fact that the analysis of indigenous people in state systems is largely superficial.

A second shortcoming is that, although Perry is concerned with state systems and how they have absorbed indigenous peoples, he does not tell us anything about the political structure of the four state systems. We do not know how they operate. What are the powers of the national government? How are laws created and passed? How is the relationship between the federal government and indigenous peoples structured? While these particular questions may or may not be immediately pertinent to Perry's work, it is evident that there needs to be some sort of discussion about how the Mexican, American, Canadian, and Australian state systems work. In fact, to some extent, this is what Guntram Werther does in *Self-Determination in Western Democracies: Aboriginal Politics in a Comparative Perspective* (1992). Werther finds differences between "reserve" and "non-reserve" based indigenous peoples when it comes to how they respond to larger state systems. I will apply these two problems to examples of two snapshots Perry takes of Canadian Indians in the contemporary period.

In his chapter on indigenous people in Canada, Perry discusses the white paper (pp. 149-151) and briefly mentions the Constitution Act of 1982 (p. 152) as two important political events that affected Indians in the contemporary period. He begins his discussion on the white paper by stating: "In 1969, after extensive consultation with indigenous leaders, the Liberal government under Pierre Elliot Trudeau and Minister of Indian Affairs Jean Chretien prepared a government position paper. Called the white paper (perhaps unfortunately), it stated government's views regarding indigenous peoples" (p. 149). There are two main problems with this statement as well as shortcomings to his overall discussion of the white paper. First, while it is true that the government did consult with some Indian political organizations throughout Canada, it is also evident that this consultation was not extensive. Further, in *Out of Irrelevance*, Ponting and Gibbons point out that the government received the stamp of approval by a few vocal Indian leaders (1980:28). This fact is important to Perry's vision of the state as a system, an arena of interests groups and co-optation where "elites cultivate the leaders of disadvantaged

groups" (p. 6). However, Perry neglects to draw this more explicitly. Because some Indian leaders accepted the terms of the white paper, this cannot be regarded as "extensive consultation."

A second problem has to do with Perry's role in creating a misunderstanding with respect to the role of a white paper in the Canadian political system. This is where a discussion about how the political system works would contribute to our understanding of important political events. Periodically, the Canadian government will release a white paper as a vehicle to inform Parliament and the public about a federal policy that has already been decided upon in order to stimulate public debate. In *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens*, Miller states that it is a "position paper" issued by the federal government "after a series of consultations and prior to cabinet adoption of a plan for legislation" (1989:225). In this particular case, the specific paper to which Perry is referring was not "unfortunately" called the "White Paper." In fact, its actual title was *Statement of the Government on Canada on Indian Policy*. In Canada, when scholars on Canadian Indians write about this, they simply refer to it as the "White Paper of 1969." Perry goes on to state that Canada developed the policy because the government did not want to acknowledge "any significant degree of sovereignty for indigenous peoples" (p. 150). Simply put, this is not correct. The major objective of the policy was to redefine Indians as individuals and Indian reserves as municipalities that would be subject to provincial jurisdiction (rather than federal jurisdiction). The issue here is that many important facts about the workings of Canada's state system need to be addressed. This becomes even more problematic in his brief discussion of the Constitution Act of 1982.

Perry mentions that he included events in his analysis if they "represent major shifts in policy or epitomize ongoing tendencies" (p. xiv). The two paragraphs that are devoted to the Constitution Act of 1982 hardly reflect the importance of this event and the role that Indian political actors played in driving constitutional debate and reform. It is true that the Constitution Act of 1982 recognized "existing aboriginal and treaty rights" (p. 152). But this is about all that Perry tells us. What were the different types of interests behind this constitutional amendment? How did the state balance or broker competing interests (p. 7)? Constitutional reform

actually began in 1971, and between 1978 and 1982, this process absorbed the attention and resources of most Indian political organizations throughout Canada. In 1981, due to the pressures from a vocal and powerful Indian alliance, a provision recognizing "aboriginal and treaty rights" was included in a constitutional proposal. However, there was also a complicated approval process that included the First Ministers—who removed this provision due to perceived threats relative to the interests of provincial governments. After litigation was pursued, the amendment was passed, and the indigenous people became the first status group in Canadian history to have delegates present at a Constitutional Conference convened by the First Ministers in 1984 and 1987. There is no mention of the second amendment or the constitutional conferences that took place afterward.

In the two chapters on the United States and Canada, I found many problems with Perry's analysis having to do with his coverage of a vast amount of historical information with regard to many different indigenous populations within four state systems. In doing so, he trivializes important historical and political events affecting indigenous peoples in these countries. I am not simply stating that trivial facts, events, or "sources and issues that [I] would have included are missing" from the analysis (p. xiv). In the case of the white paper and the Constitution Act of 1982, as covered by Perry, both are incomplete and don't really say anything about the "ways in which indigenous peoples have reacted to [state] initiatives" (pp. 226-227).

I think that the book could have been stronger if the author would have narrowed his focus to three cases and shortened or divided the span of time into periods. By doing so, Perry could have addressed specific issues and events more thoroughly in order to make his case for a common pattern with respect to state systems and their relationships with indigenous peoples, and how indigenous people respond to those state systems. Despite these criticisms, I did find Perry's book interesting because of its comparative approach. It will serve as a foundation to stimulate further debate and scholarship.

*Brian Alan Baker*  
*Connecticut College*