

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Keeping the Circle: American Indian Identity in Eastern North Carolina, 1885-2004. By Christopher Arris Oakley.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6cp9f8wq>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 30(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Lowery, Malinda Maynor

Publication Date

2006

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/>

Keeping the Circle: American Indian Identity in Eastern North Carolina, 1885–2004. By Christopher Arris Oakley. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005. 191 pages. \$50.00 cloth.

“Modern Native American identity is a dialectical process involving both internal and external factors,” writes historian Christopher Arris Oakley (147). This is a straightforward yet profound statement in a society that still discusses Indian identity in abstract, subjective terms such as *blood*, *tradition*, *homeland*, and *recognition*. Oakley explores and specifies these terms, using the social and political history of eastern North Carolina Indians as his backdrop. He examines the communal life of the state’s seven non–federally recognized tribes—Meherrin, Haliwa-Saponi, Sappony Indians of Person County, Occaneechi-Saponi, Lumbee, Waccamaw-Sioux, and Coharie—and places their stories within the context of mainstream Indian history.

Long assumed by scholars to be the exception rather than the rule, the North Carolina Indians in Oakley’s narrative contributed to every major trend of Indian history in the twentieth century, except citizenship (the state of North Carolina had considered these Indians citizens since the state’s founding). North Carolina Indians took part in the Indian New Deal, World War II service and mobilization, relocation, termination, pan-Indian movements, self-determination, and federal recognition. Like the communities described in Stephen Cornell’s *The Return of the Native*, Indians in North Carolina affirmed their tribal identities through political and social exchanges with the federal government and with other tribes. At the same time, they shared the experiences of many other Southerners, participating in the transition from agriculture to wage labor, confronting Jim Crow with their own segregated schools and churches, and gaining a political voice in the civil rights movement.

Oakley’s historiographic contribution is particularly significant because while it synthesizes the experiences of different tribes, readers do not lose the various threads of diverse tribal histories and cultures in eastern North Carolina. This book’s clear organization, accessible style, and important themes should attract attention across disciplines and with many audiences. It is a welcome addition to the published literature on eastern North Carolina Indians, most of which concerns the region’s largest tribe, the Lumbee. This publication is groundbreaking for the other tribes that have received far less attention but are no less significant to questions of Indian identity and history. The author includes a helpful section on additional reading, footnotes, and a bibliographic essay.

Oakley marshals evidence from published and unpublished secondary sources, federal reports, oral history, manuscript collections, and newspapers to engage with the literature on boundary maintenance as a part of ethnic identity formation. He argues that Indians responded to the economic and political changes of World War II by adding boundaries to their definition of Indian identity. Prior to the war, Indians “only needed to protect their identity within their own communities” (146). They marked their boundaries with kinship ties, Indian-only churches and schools, and geographic links

to certain places. World War II spurred migration, economic opportunity, and racial integration. In this context—particularly with the loss of Indian-only schools—Indian people strategically reached beyond their previous boundaries to *retribalize* or establish a tribal identity by embracing unique names and pan-Indian symbols and rituals such as powwows that would signal their distinct identity to non-Indians. By the dawn of the twenty-first century, Oakley argues that Indians' affiliations with tribes, rather than Indian families, schools, or churches, came to define their identity maintenance.

Oakley takes care to point out that *retribalization* means a “maturation in community organization,” not an invention of Native American identity (66). This distinction is important in light of the differences in federal status between Indians in North Carolina and those in other states. Oakley describes federal recognition as the “brass ring” of Indian identity. “Official government acknowledgement was a major component of [the] new definition” of Indian identity in the late twentieth century, although Oakley stresses that it was the *definition* of identity, not the identity itself, that was new (138). Within the context of his thesis, Oakley is right to remind the reader what he really means. Tribes all over the nation that seek federal recognition are usually perceived as suspect by federal and state officials and other tribes, a situation that sociologist Eva Garrouette, in her book *Real Indians: Identity, Community, and the Survival of Native America*, attributes to the double standard that pervades acknowledgment criteria. Oakley's study answers these suspicions while shedding light on the identity processes of all of these tribes and communities. His book serves as a useful indication for why Indians all over the country are pursuing acknowledgment. The notion of adding boundaries paints a picture of Indian identity that is ever-changing, situational, and difficult to stereotype.

But there is another context for Oakley's thesis that he does not address and that shapes the interpretation of his work. In the light of writings on sovereignty by scholars such as Vine Deloria, Jr. and David E. Wilkins, the stress that *Keeping the Circle* places on the distinction between the definition of identity and identity itself is actually unnecessary. Oakley's assertion that eastern North Carolina Indians developed political structures relatively recently does not hold up to centuries-old evidence of their political organization, which centered on kinship duties and affiliation with ancient settlements. The fact that Indians in North Carolina pursued state and federal recognition as early as the 1880s, and the way they pursued it (through community-wide petitions generated by kinship ties and selection of community leaders to carry the message), would indicate that their political organization prior to World War II was more mature than Oakley's thesis implies. Oakley acknowledges that kinship was an important part of Indian identity, but he doesn't engage Wilkins, who has argued that kinship bonds and an obvious collective sense of identity make Indian groups like those in eastern North Carolina *de facto* nations. The state of North Carolina's recognition of that collective identity, which happened for the Lumbees in the 1880s and later for other tribes, resulted in *de jure* recognition of Indians' inherent sovereignty. Sovereign nations have governments, whether they resemble the US government or not.

Wilkins's argument flows from his article "The Lumbee Tribe and its Quest for Federal Recognition," in *A Good Cherokee, a Good Anthropologist*, Steve Pavlik's 1998 edited volume about Cherokee anthropologist Robert K. Thomas. Wilkins's writing complicates Oakley's assertion that recognition is the "brass ring" of Indian identity—how important should the Bureau of Indian Affairs' (BIA's) process of federal acknowledgment be to Indian identity maintenance, when these tribes have already been legally recognized as sovereigns? What remains is for these nations to assert their sovereignty, which is no small feat in the current political and legal climate, but scholars can help by asking the right questions about recognition and identity.

Keeping the Circle provides scholars and general audiences with the narrative and evidence to push recognition and other identity boundaries forward into the next stage of inquiry. Oakley's argument, and his detailed treatment of Indians' social and political history, offers a great deal to future scholarship in Native studies.

Malinda Maynor Lowery
Harvard University

Lt. Charles Gatewood and His Apache Wars Memoir. By Charles B. Gatewood. Edited and with additional text by Louis Kraft. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005. 283 pages. \$39.95 cloth.

Arizona territorial history, particularly as it applies to Native Americans, plagues researchers with thorny issues from the past. Not insignificantly, Indian opposition to white American expansion—particularly, but by no means exclusively, Apache resistance—subverted the territory's bid for statehood until 1912, marking Arizona as the last territory in the lower forty-eight states.

Throughout the long struggle between Indians and whites for control of Arizona, Army officers not only substantially influenced the general outcome of the territory's history, but kept records of their experiences as well, or at least recorded their memoirs after the dust had once again settled across the desert. While the Arizona historical canon is not limited to military recollections, some of the most indicative, albeit witty and entertaining, works from the era are found within the military genre. The long struggle began smoldering with the US acquisition of Arizona from Mexico in 1848, spontaneously combusted in the 1860s with Cochise's mistaken role in the captivity of Mickey Free, spread throughout the 1870s among central Arizona's Yavapais in the 1870s, erupted into a firestorm in the early 1880s with brutal Chiricahua raids across southern New Mexico and Arizona, and was not snuffed out until the deportation of Geronimo's Chiricahuas in 1886, followed by the final flickers of resistance from Massai and Apache Kid well into the twentieth century.

The old, imperialist voices of the army's officers—men who claimed to understand Indians but didn't, and others who did understand but self-censured their own empathetic perspectives to conform to American rhetoric—still echo in the not-so-hallowed halls of history. In the dimly lit