UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Proud Raven, Panting Wolf: Carving Alaska's New Deal Totem Parks. By Emily L. Moore.

Permalink https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4qd9b0j7

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 43(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Jonaitis, Aldona

Publication Date

2019-03-01

DOI

10.17953/0161-6463-43.2.157

Copyright Information

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

eScholarship.org

Powered by the <u>California Digital Library</u> University of California biopolitical regimes intent on our eradication, we must think intently about how the nation-state and its attendant choreographies of domination entrap us in colonial discourses and settler futurities.

The Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty enters the conversation of Hawaiian studies at a crucial moment where there is a push for nuance that accounts for queer, diasporic, and other unthought Hawaiian subjectivities. As much as Kauanui's book advocates for the decolonization and independence of the Hawaiian people as a whole, she is particularly attendant to the ways in which the liberation of $m\bar{a}h\bar{u}$ (commonly translated as "third gender" peoples), women, and queer Kanaka Maoli must be foregrounded in discourses of decolonization in the Hawaiian Islands. Indeed, short of waiting for "after the revolution" to end the everyday state violence against LGBTQ+ and $m\bar{a}h\bar{u}$ Kanaka Maoli, Kauanui implores us to consider what demanding decolonization centered around ending violence against LGBTQ+ and $m\bar{a}h\bar{u}$ Kanaka Maoli might mean in the broader construction of colonial biopolitics and the way it reifies settler colonial control of the Hawaiian Islands.

The limitations of *The Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty* lie precisely in the opening Kauanui creates for discussions of resurgence, refusal, and decolonization. As Kauanui herself notes, her reliance on English language archives and her specific *kuleana* (relational responsibility) to Hawai'i as a diasporic subject demarcate the limitations of her writing (31). However, it is precisely through the Indigenous ethic of *kuleana*, which falls into her framing of "Indigeneity as Resurgence [that] promotes the kind of action . . . for a transformative movement that has the potential to liberate both Indigenous people and Settlers from colonialism," that she creates an opening for the next generation of Hawaiian scholars to answer her call to imagine a future that remakes "indigeneity without the reliance on juridical regimes of power" (201). Because *kuleana* delineates a responsibility or a burden that is shared, in centering Indigeneity-as-Resurgence Kauanui's project calls us to continue to work of interrogating these paradoxes, whether we encounter them in the depths of the Hawaiian language archive, or in the throes of activist-ethnographies not yet written.

Gregory Pōmaika'i Gushiken University of California, San Diego

Proud Raven, Panting Wolf: Carving Alaska's New Deal Totem Parks. By Emily L. Moore. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2018. 252 pages. \$39.95 cloth; \$29.95 paper.

Today a traveler to southeast Alaska is likely to visit at least one of the six totem pole parks constructed between 1938 and 1942 as part of the efforts of the New Deal's Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) to provide work for Native Americans, as well as to promote a United States heritage that included those of Indigenous people. This project removed decaying poles from uninhabited villages, restored or replicated them, then erected them in parks nearer to population centers. US Forest Service employees first met with clan leaders for permission to restore their poles and then employed local Native people to carve and paint. Emily L. Moore's impeccably researched and beautifully written book on the history of this project, *Proud Raven, Panting Wolf: Carving Alaska's New Deal Totem Parks*, reassesses many previous judgments of the parks and their poles. The book introduces the reader to the key players in this story and details the motivations of Natives and government officials. Offering abundant new information about interactions between the US Forest Service and the Tlingit and Haida people, Moore demonstrates that each had its own reasons to participate. *Proud Raven* tells a fascinating story of non-Native arrogance and misunderstandings and Native efforts to reclaim their territory and publicly reaffirm their cultural practices.

In response to decades of missionaries and government officials advocating abandonment of important customs, including the hosting of potlatches and matrilineal marriage, the Tlingit and Haida had become less open in their practices. Non-Natives assumed that clan knowledge had vanished and that images on poles no longer had meaning for the Tlingit and Haida. Moore demonstrates that this was, of course, completely wrong. In detailing the central role played by the Tlingit and Haida, the author first asks why these Native Alaskans agreed to participate in the first place, given that in 1902 a long, fraught relationship with the US Forest Service had begun when their lands were appropriated as part of the vast Tongass National Forest.

The CCC pole restoration project offered the people needed jobs, but that was a relatively minimal incentive for cooperation. Far more importantly, the Tlingit and Haida recognized this was their opportunity to memorialize the deceased, acknowledge their original villages, invigorate clan practices, and openly demonstrate appropriate clan protocols. Moreover, the poles serve as indicators of clan identity as well as title to the land: thus, by restoring and erecting them, the Haida and Tlingit were claiming their aboriginal rights to lands the government had stolen. These were acts of sovereignty, as well as politics. Although it would take decades for the passage in 1971 of the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA), those involved with the totem pole project contributed to the momentum leading towards the passage of that historic law.

Moore provides the cultural biographies of several poles to demonstrate the complexities of Indigenous rights, responsibilities, and protocol. Each pole had a story, clan ownership, and history that sometimes, Forest Service employees misunderstood. For example, non-Natives erroneously identified the Tlingit Proud Raven of the Tongass Village as the "Lincoln pole" because the uppermost carving strongly resembled Abraham Lincoln. According to the Gaanax.adi clan, the image refers to their first sighting of a white man and the carver copied Lincoln's image from a photograph when he needed a model. In the 1920s, however, a judge by the name of James Wickersham completely disregarded the clan history embodied in the pole and invented a tale that the clan honored Lincoln because he prevented them from being enslaved. Until relatively recently, this was the "official" story of the pole, one in which a non-Native American hero takes center stage. In truth not only was the carving not Lincoln, the pole itself claimed as the clan's territory the surrounding land.

0 0 0

Perhaps the most public demonstration of Indigenous authority occurred in 1940 in Wrangell, when the replica of Chief Shakes's house was dedicated before 1,500 out-of-town guests, both Native and non-Native. Over the years, a series of powerful men had held the high-ranking Shakes name, inherited, as was appropriate in this matrilineal society, from their maternal uncles. The original house had held abundant carvings and fine regalia, similarly inherited through matrilineal descent. Unfortunately, however, with the interference of clergy, the wife of the last Chief Shakes appropriated his property and rights, sold many treasured heirlooms, and insisted her son be invested as chief. This represented a scandal to those who adhered to the old rules and needed to be rectified, which actually happened. The opening of the rebuilt house became the opportunity-interestingly supported and endorsed by the Forest Service and the community of Wrangell-for a major potlatch naming 76-year-old Charlie Jones of the Naanyaa.aayi clan as Chief Shakes VII. For the Tlingit, who were said to have "lost their culture," this dazzling presentation of regalia, clan identity and interclan protocol was remarkable to those who had not understood this cultural endurance.

Totem poles have fascinated non-Natives since the first explorers and traders to the Northwest Coast admired them. During the so-called "classic" period of the nineteenth century, Native artists refined and perfected on these monuments the northern Northwest Coast carving and painting canons. By the early twentieth century, artists abandoned many of those canons, entering what connoisseurs identified as a "dark age" of Northwest Coast art. It was asserted that Native carvers and painters had "lost" their great artistic tradition which was only rediscovered in the 1960s. Such colonialist judgments completely ignore both the aesthetic evaluations of the art by their communities and the survival of cultural knowledge. Moore convincingly reconsiders the restored totem poles' aesthetic qualities and by doing so, demolishes arrogant criticisms of those adhering to the stereotype of the "vanishing Indian".

I judge academic books by how much I learn, and even though I've written on totem poles, just about every page of *Proud Raven Panting Wolf* offered new information and perceptive analyses. Moore offers insights into the agreements and conflicts between the Indigenous and federal participants in this project, introduces several individual participating artists and investigates the arrangement of restored poles in the parks and, most notably, contributes to the new paradigm of Northwest Coast art scholarship—and Native American art scholarship in general. With this important book, the colonialist notion that once settlement occurred, Indigenous people of Southeast Alaska abandoned their past has been firmly and permanently demolished. The Haida and Tlingit had *not* forgotten the meaning and purpose of the totem poles and their art was *not* acculturated and of no aesthetic value as they enthusiastically strengthened their communities and asserted their sovereignty.

Aldona Jonaitis

University of Alaska Museum of the North