

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The State, Removal and Indigenous Peoples in the United States and Mexico, 1620-2000. By Claudia B. Haake.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/79k7v5wq>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 33(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

McGuire, Randall H.

Publication Date

2009

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/>

play available to Thompson River Salish speakers based on the lexical suffix =*aqs*, which has a variety of meanings based on the sense of “protruding” (that is, “nose” and “end of a branch”). Thompson and Egesdal also include a small sample of contemporary written poetry by Duane Niatum (336–38) and the late Jack Iyall (335). Those selections remind us that creative traditions continue, and they continue in English in the selections presented.

This is an excellent book, and my criticisms are meant to suggest just how little we know about Salish ethnopoetics (here broadly conceived as the poetics of a given people). The book is accessible for students who are not linguists or linguistic anthropologists, and the introductions to the book and to the individual selections are uniformly well done. Focusing on a specific language family is an excellent method to highlight the similarities and the differences across traditions. I would recommend this book for classes on Native American oral literature or Native American verbal art without hesitation. One could certainly imagine putting this book in dialogue with recent collections on Algonquian verbal art (Brian Swann, *Algonquian Spirit: Contemporary Translations of the Algonquian Literatures of North America*) and Native Alaskan verbal art (Ann Fienup-Riordan, *Words of the Real People: Alaska Native Literature in Translation*). I would also recommend this book to those interested in Native American verbal art more generally. Finally, this book expands our understanding of human expressivity and creativity and the important role that language plays in such imaginative displays. It is a shame to conclude by noting that “most Salishan languages are no longer spoken actively” (xxxviii).

Anthony K. Webster

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

The State, Removal and Indigenous Peoples in the United States and Mexico, 1620–2000. By Claudia B. Haake. New York: Routledge, 2007. 293 pages. \$110.00 cloth.

Claudia Haake ends the introduction to her book by joining Tzvetan Todorov in asserting that “it is not enough to damn the conquerors and to feel sorry for the Indians . . . one has to analyze the weapons of the conquerors to stop them from using these even today” (9). She seeks to analyze the weapons of the conquerors by comparing the forced migration of the Delaware (Lenape) in the United States and the Yaqui (Yoeme) in northern Mexico. Her focus is on indigenous responses to Removal from their ancestral lands and the effects of Removal on their identities, politics, and cultures. She concludes that in both cases the nation-state sought to destroy the indigenous societies and that in each case they failed. Today the Delaware and the Yaqui maintain their identities and cultures.

There are extensive literatures about US Indian policy and about the history and anthropology of indigenous peoples in Mexico. Haake’s book stands out as a rare attempt to compare indigenous policies and experiences

across national boundaries. I am an anthropologist who has published on US Indian policy and the history of archaeology. As a current member of a US and Mexican research team carrying out a collaborative project with the Pascua Yaqui tribe of Arizona and the Eight Yaqui Pueblos of Sonora, I was eager to delve into Haake's study. Although her comparative angle is refreshing, Haake's analyses unfortunately do not live up to their potential. She damns the conqueror and feels sorry for the Indian but fails to provide nuanced and complex interpretations of the issues surrounding Removal.

Removal is the key concept in the book, and Haake assigns it a wealth of meanings. In discussions of the Delaware, she refers to the Removal Act of 1830. She also uses the term *Removal* to refer to the nineteenth-century establishment of a reservation system, forced migrations of the Delaware, and the removal of children to boarding schools. Haake further uses the term to refer to the "removal" of Indianness from people through the federal Indian policy of assimilation and through modern conflicts regarding federal recognition of tribal status. In the Yaqui case, she uses *Removal* to refer to the seventeenth-century Jesuit *reducción* of Yaqui people to mission communities, labor migrations in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the twentieth-century enslavement and deportations of the Porfiriato. In Haake's analysis, Removal becomes all of US and Mexican Indian policy and none of it.

The Delaware may have the distinction of being the most "removed" Indian nation in the United States. Haake provides a brief history of Delaware eighteenth-century movement from the Northeast to various locations in the Midwest and of the 1829 Removal to Kansas. In 1867, the federal government forced the Delaware to sign a treaty that removed them to Cherokee lands, placing them under Cherokee jurisdiction. Most of Haake's discussions focus on Delaware attempts since 1867 to regain their status as a federally recognized Indian nation. In Haake's view, US government motivations in all these cases are reducible to the simple seizure of Indian lands. There is no nuance in her work between the Removal policies or actions of Jefferson and Jackson. Internal conflicts within the Delaware are also portrayed simplistically; although some leaders pursued their own self-interests, Haake believes that in the end every side wished to preserve Delaware identity and sovereignty. She concludes that the US efforts to remove the Delaware and abolish their identity only made that identity stronger. But what beliefs, rituals, institutions, and other cultural practices did the Delaware mobilize to maintain their identity? In what ways did various efforts succeed, or fail? These processes were considerably more complex, divisive, and contested than Haake's portrayal suggests.

Today the Yaqui are unique among indigenous peoples of Mexico because they maintain a degree of sovereignty and self-governance possessed by no other Indian group in the nation-state. In part, this uniqueness springs from the spatial and temporal place of the Yaqui in Mexican history. In the north of Mexico, Indians make up a small minority of the population, generally live in isolated pockets, and rarely intermarry. The Spanish and Mexican governments used different tools of oppression in the north. The mission-presidio system reduced northern aboriginal groups to small areas controlled by the Mendicant orders and secluded them from Spanish-speaking settlers. In most

of the rest of Mexico, by contrast, Spanish *hidalgos* established great estates or *encomiendas* with rights to the labor, and Indians made up the majority of the population until well into the twentieth century. The struggles of the Nahuatl speakers of Morelos to maintain their lands and identity, for example, have been quite different from those of the Yaqui in Sonora.

Haake makes only slight reference to the Yaqui's unique position in Mexico. In her discussion of Spanish Indian policy she lumps together *encomiendas* and missions—quite different institutions—because both sought to deprive Indian people of land. She begins her history of the Yaqui with the Jesuit missionization that reorganized the Yaqui into eight pueblos and established the system of government, religious institutions, and ritual practices that exist today. She documents the Yaqui's nineteenth- and twentieth-century struggles to maintain their lands and sovereignty, giving most of her attention to the early-twentieth-century Yaqui war and deportation to the Yucatan and Oaxaca. Her treatment of the Yaqui in the Yucatan is thin, based on transcripts of a handful of court cases. She concludes with a discussion of the Yaqui after their return to Sonora. As with the Delaware, she damns the conquerors but does not give the reader a nuanced understanding of their actions. For example, did President Lázaro Cárdenas reinstate the Yaquis' lands in Sonora and grant them the unique political status that they have today because he was the great Mexican social reformer of the twentieth century, as Haake suggests, or because it was a way to undermine the power and wealth of his political rivals in Sonora? As with the Delaware, Haake sees internal strife and political struggles among the Yaqui as having little significance because in the end all sides supported a Yaqui identity and the preservation of Yaqui land. Again the reader gets little sense of the culture and the economic, political, and social mechanisms that the Yaqui have mobilized to maintain their land and identity.

Haake's comparisons of the two cases focus on generalized similarities: each group experienced missionization, was moved around, and maintained their identity in the face of oppression. She does little to contrast the two experiences. If Haake's goal was to compare Removal in the two national contexts, her choice of the Delaware for the United State makes sense, as they epitomize the North American experience of Removal, but her choice of the Yaqui is problematic because of their unique position in Mexico. Her conclusions—that nation-states sought to destroy the indigenous societies, that in each case they failed, and that the Delaware and Yaqui survive and continue the struggle today—are already well-known and irrefutable.

The book is not well written nor is it well produced. The study appears to have been Haake's dissertation at the Universitat Bielefeld in Germany. The book is replete with redundancies. Several sentences appear virtually verbatim two, three, or even four times in the text, and entire paragraphs are slightly rephrased multiple times. Removal of redundant text and topics would probably have reduced the book's length by 20 to 25 percent. It is the responsibility of the press and the professional copy editor employed by the press to help an author convert their prose into clear, well-written English. This is especially the case with an author whose first language is not English. In this case,

Routledge failed to live up to this responsibility. Countless grammatical errors and convoluted sentences mar the text, making reading difficult or even painful. The index in the book is sparse and spotty. The publisher produced a cheap book with low-quality paper, a generic cover, and only two illustrations. It is difficult to see how Routledge can justify charging \$110 for the volume.

In her acknowledgments, Haake states “I also need to extend my gratitude to the *Yoeme* and the *Lenape*, for enduring so that I could come along and write about them” (xi). The endurance of indigenous peoples in the face of great oppression is a struggle that scholars should certainly support. At our research team’s first meeting with the Yaqui governors in Sonora, they made this point quite clearly. If we would help them preserve their land, water, and culture, then they welcomed our work. If not, then we should go away. If Haake’s goal is to “analyze the weapons of the conquerors to stop them from using these even today,” then she needs an in-depth understanding of the historical processes involved (9). Her comparison of the Delaware and Yaqui begins such an analysis.

Randall H. McGuire
Binghamton University

The Tupac Amaru and Catarista Rebellions: An Anthology of Sources. Edited and translated by Ward Stavig and Ella Schmidt with an introduction by Charles Walker. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 2008. 288 pages. \$39.95 cloth; \$14.95 paper.

It is perhaps not generally known that the Latin American independence movements historically highlighted by the figures of Simón Bolívar and José de San Martín were prefaced by several major indigenous rebellions that shook the Spanish dominions to the core.

The two renowned South American *libertadores* were yet to be born or in infancy when José Gabriel Túpac Amaru and his wife Micaela Bastidas led the first and most pronounced rebellion in what is present-day Peru, taking up arms against the Spanish colony and raising armies of thousands of Indian men and women. The central Andean region, including Peru and Bolivia (Alto Peru at the time) witnessed a repopularization of Inca identity as several direct descendants of the Inca sovereigns reclaimed their heritage in the line of nobility that had greeted and been subjugated by the Spanish conquest.

A new volume of original materials, *The Tupac Amaru and Catarista Rebellions: An Anthology of Sources*, does excellent justice to the historical sidelining suffered by the aforementioned indigenous rebels who attempted to throw off the yoke of servitude in the 1780s as conditions under Spanish authorities became increasingly intolerable. The selection and translation of original sources from the period include court claims, letters, and proclamations of the rebel leaders as well as testimonies of other witnesses and official documents, including confessions and court sentences condemning the defeated to horrible torture and execution. The volume provides English translation to