

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Tonto's Revenge: Reflections on American Indian Culture and Policy. By Rennard Strickland.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7n41j6j9>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 23(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Vickers, Scott

Publication Date

1999

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/>

Johnson's world, as refracted through these writings, is indeed a complex one. Unfortunately, Murray's copious annotation and intervening commentaries sometimes add to rather than clarify the complications. While readers will appreciate the devotion evident in this effort and the wealth of information gathered here—genealogical, ethnographic, legal, and historical—the details simply become too numerous to track. Murray sets aside roughly one-third of the book for supporting materials, almost one hundred pages for her own historical and critical essays.

This editorial strategy seems especially questionable when one learns that, due to spatial constraints, only two of Joseph Johnson's nine archived sermons appear in this mostly all-inclusive volume. Initially, Murray justifies her decision by citing the omitted sermons' formulaic quality. There is, however, another critical factor at work here, something the editor tries to resolve as a matter of cultural difference. She writes:

My decision to leave out most of Joseph's sermons draws attention to the challenges of reading Joseph Johnson over distances of culture and time. Present-day readers will likely find the instances of rebellion or fracture in Johnson's writing more interesting than its sustained though sometimes strained conformity to eighteenth-century epistolary etiquette or biblical exposition. (p. 24)

How does one dissociate the provocative tensions in Johnson's writing from the cultural conditions under which he wrote? Certainly his letters' obviously imitative form was no bar to their publication. The problem, rather, seems to lie in the assumption that the sermons' overtly religious quality puts an irreconcilable gap between the texts and their imagined audiences.

Readers of early American writing have long recognized that religion comes with the territory. But caveats of "cultural distance" now appear with some regularity as it is discovered that eighteenth-century writers of color, like their white contemporaries, had something to say about God. It is an unnecessary and presumptive precaution. Some readers of *To Do Good to My Indian Brethren* will recognize Johnson's religious engagement as part of a broader, sometimes costly process of cultural adaptation and survival; some may appreciate the personal dimension of his difficult devotion. More than a few, I suspect, will wonder what those seven omitted sermons sounded like and wonder why scholarly comment took precedence over Indian writing in this otherwise commendable book.

Joanna Brooks

University of California, Los Angeles

Tonto's Revenge: Reflections on American Indian Culture and Policy. By Rennard Strickland. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997. 154 pages. \$39.95 cloth; \$17.95 paper.

Rennard Strickland is something of a Renaissance man in more ways than one: he not only has enormous expertise in the fields of Indian law, art, film

and literary studies, cultural history, biography, and philosophy, but also derives from his varied experience a forward-looking enthusiasm that all of these aspects of Native culture will constellate into a revolutionary, "reborn" future for Native Americans. Strickland, an Osage and Cherokee, is dean and Knight Professor in the School of Law at the University of Oregon and editor-in-chief of successive editions of Felix Cohen's *Handbook of Federal Indian Law*, the backbone text on the subject. As *Tonto's Revenge* aptly demonstrates, he is also an eloquent lecturer and essayist, able to integrate his overarching worldview of Indian affairs into all these fields of interest with resounding exactitude.

Although Strickland has said in an earlier essay, "Tall Visitor at the Indian Gallery," "You never know a Golden Age when you're in it" (in Edwin L. Wade, ed., *The Arts of the North American Indian: Native Traditions in Evolution*, 1986, p. 290), he strives to make us feel that we are at least approaching a golden age with regard to the stature and status of Indians, and indeed all Americans, in the coming century. In the seven lectures and afterword that comprise *Tonto's Revenge*, he approaches his subject matter with a firm grounding in history, then expands the lessons of history into personalized commentary on the way things are today in Indian country. If his analysis of the dilemmas in current Indian affairs should be familiar to most students of Native culture, it is because they come from a seasoned veteran on the scene who has authored or coauthored nearly thirty books, and thus has been a major influence on our current understanding.

Strickland's tone modulates from the professorial seriousness of the need for changes in Indian law to the high comedy of arguments about the nature of Indian art. The title essay, "Tonto's Revenge, Or, Who Is That Indian in the Sioux Warbonnet?" is a comprehensive lesson on how the media have helped shape and promulgate both negative and positive stereotypes of the Indian—both of which, it should be noted, are an insult to Indian people. Here, Strickland calls up the onerous history of Hollywood's refusal, even today, to give Indians laudable roles, either as actors and writers or as characters, in its immense library of film *about* Indians, but seldom *by* Indians. This treatment, argues Strickland, is symptomatic of the way Washington policymakers and even casual moviegoers think of Indian people. The Hollywood stereotypes are ubiquitous, manifesting the Indian in the public imagination as blood-lusting savage, virile barbarian, heathenish anti-Christ, vanishing nobleman of the forest, or servile my-man-Friday or Tonto figure, to mention only a few of the many types that have devolved from the real Indians of prehistory. As Strickland emphasizes, film images are not the innocuous entertainments they seem to be on the surface; they are, instead, powerful messages that help form a concept of the Indian as "other" or, more exactly, as a psychological projection of the ills of white society itself. "For millions of people [who know little else of Indian life]," he argues, "these [Hollywood stereotypes] are the only images seen," and thus become central to a common (mis)conception (p. 19). Typically, Strickland then proceeds to the present to discover ways in which things are changing, citing the influx of Indian writers, producers, actors, and directors into the film industry of recent years. The noted

Spokane-Cœur d'Alene writer Sherman Alexie, for example, has now produced and directed a film version of his short story "This Is What It Means to Say Phoenix, Arizona" (the film's title is *Smoke Signals*) that premiered at the 1998 Sundance Film Festival. Creek Indian Bob Hicks produced and directed the satirical film *Return of the Country* in 1982, in which he turns the tables on white-Indian history by making whites the conquered "other," living in the clichéd shadow world of the "Bureau of Caucasian Affairs." Strickland also cites the successes of *Powwow Highway* (1989) and the 1996 HBO presentation of Pomo-Miwok author Greg Sarris' *Grand Avenue*, a landmark mixed-blood novel. Indeed, there is some hope that wider audiences will become interested in and sensitized to the reversal of Indian stereotypes in film, and thus in society at large.

Strickland's expertise as an Indian art connoisseur is evident in his discussion of the renaissance in Native art since the Santa Fe studio days of the 1930s. Titled "Beyond the Ethnic Umbrella and the Blue Deer," this lecture is a distillation of the author's extensive writings about the evolution of Indian studio painting and sculpture, and captures the ambiguities surrounding the Indian art market. Patrons, critics, gallery owners, artists, the Anglo art establishment, the Indian Arts and Crafts Board (IACB), tribal elders, and the public at large all have their say when it comes to identifying "authentic" Indian art from among the thousands of producing Indian artists. Each faction, claims Strickland, has its own criteria, and "seize[s] on bits and pieces of the whole artistic tradition [to] create canons, rules, and tenets for Indian painting" (p. 65). While the basic conflict seems to be between so-called traditionalists and non- or neotraditionalists, there are also substantial conflicts between Indian artists "certified" by blood quantum and the IACB and those who are not (a volatile topic that Strickland unfortunately avoids). His overview of the period in Indian art from World War II to the present, however, should be (and often is) required reading for art historians and collectors, and this most recent version is invaluable for its distillation of the major debates.

The five lectures on Indian law provide the real meat of *Tonto's Revenge*, and in these Strickland calls upon the most profound ambiguities of Indians' legal status to get at the heart of the matter: "the Indian could never depend upon the government itself to behave in a civilized manner" (p. 9). As the major biographer of John Rollin Ridge (Yellow Bird; 1827-1867), the first Native American licensed to practice law in a state jurisdiction, Strickland expands on Ridge's turbulent life to extract topical lessons in how the Indian has been manipulated and betrayed by the law since the time of Jefferson. Certainly, the historical treachery of the Cherokee Removal of 1836-1839 is a textbook case in why Indians cannot expect the government to behave in a civilized manner. Denouncing a Supreme Court decision that practically established an independent Cherokee state within the boundaries of the state of Georgia, and ignoring more than a million petitions from white Americans, President Andrew Jackson instead forced Ridge's father, John, and grandfather, Major, into signing the agreement to move the tribe to Oklahoma Territory. Both John Sr. and Major Ridge were later assassinated by their own

people for violating the laws of the tribe, and Ridge spent the rest of his brief life seeking revenge against the system that had made this tragic episode in Indian jurisprudence possible. Up to the present day, as Strickland makes clear, the Indian has been, in Ridge's words, "a stranger in a strange land" when it comes to dealing with the treacheries of a national legal system that is based more on BIA policy, politics, and economics than on the bedrock of international law regarding "sovereign nations."

Strickland believes that the vagaries of Indian law (that is, law formulated by whites concerning Indians) constitute an intolerable dilemma for Indian peoples, who must be eternally vigilant against the seemingly endless efforts of white exploiters and corrupt Indian governments to erode Native treaty rights and reverse hard-won legal battles. He cites three legal cases from as recently as 1987–1990—*Duro v. Reina*, *Brendale v. Confederated Tribes & Bands of the Yakima Nation*, and *Department of Human Resources of Oregon v. Smith*—that illustrate the uneducated and disinterested mindset that still dominates even the "sophisticated" chambers of the Supreme Court of the United States. The majority opinions drawn from these cases, reasoned as they are from ages-old stereotypes of Indians, should embarrass even the most cynical of legal minds, and constitute a national disgrace. The deeper reasons for the white hegemony's continued reliance on stereotyped Indian figures in formulating Indian policy and law seem to reside in the neurotic instabilities of white society, itself tragically unable to come to grips with an ever more menacing technocracy that, no matter how obscene, is the lynchpin of its own worldview. If Anglos cannot officially apologize to black Americans for slavery, or once and for all time codify in law the treated rights of Native Americans, it may be because the latter represent the antithesis to that technocracy—what Strickland calls "axiology" or a system of intrinsic human values, the present erosion of which proves the fallacy of the ideals of progress and industry. As a historian, Strickland knows that the so-called Columbian Exchange, in which the disintegrating feudal states of Europe exchanged ideology for technology (or the "cross" for the "test tube," to use Will and Ariel Durant's terms), spawned the stereotypes of aboriginal peoples worldwide as "savages," technologically (and thus legally) inferior to their European "masters." Surely this era of "discovery," marked in the present by the Clinton administration's recently failed efforts at "fast-track" globalization, must be near an end, and the pendulum must swing the other way: toward human-centered values, the preservation of nature, and the equitable distribution of goods and services. Strickland believes that the embedded value systems of Native cultures will have a large impact on the "pre-Columbian" future he believes will transpire as technology exhausts its resources and even the most exploitive humans begin to suffer.

Perhaps the most memorable lesson to be derived from *Tonto's Revenge* is that, while Native American rights and the ubiquitous "Indian problem" loom large in the minds of Indians and concerned white Americans, the issues herein ultimately concern only about one percent of the national population, at least on the surface, and seem miniscule to a government beset by worldwide chaos. Although many believe that the resolution of the "Indian problem" should be a top priority of any administration, Indians are still often rel-

egated to low-priority status when it comes to legislating change. As Strickland rightly exhorts, now more than ever the “price of freedom is eternal vigilance,” and no individuals are better equipped to monitor and induce change than are the new generation of Indian lawyers who, unlike John Ridge, are no longer strangers in a strange land of legal imperatives.

Scott Vickers

The Bloomsbury Review

White Man’s Medicine: Government Doctors and the Navajo, 1863-1955. By Robert A. Trennert. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998. 290 pages. \$39.95 cloth.

In *White Man’s Medicine*, Robert A. Trennert—a historian at Arizona State University—traces the history of federal health care services for the Navajos (or Diné) over a ninety-two-year period. Trennert explores changes in health services and connects these changes to larger shifts in federal Indian policy and other developments. While federal health care services improved over time, the author persuasively argues that such services remained inadequate and that most policymakers saw medicine as a means of assimilating American Indians. He also examines how the Diné accepted some aspects of the “white man’s medicine” while remaining loyal to traditional medical beliefs and practices. Although Trennert might have explored some questions more thoroughly, his work stands out as an important one.

Proceeding chronologically, Trennert details the relevant personalities and events, beginning with a brief pre-1860s overview contrasting Navajo and Anglo-American health conditions and medical knowledge. He then discusses the Navajos’ first major exposure to the white man’s medicine during their forced relocation to the Bosque Redondo Reservation from 1863–1868. After the Navajos returned to a newly created reservation in the Four Corners Region, missionaries and government officials provided federally sponsored health care for the Natives as part of the “Peace Policy” of the late 1860s and 1870s. This policy sought to “civilize” American Indians, and federally funded health care constituted a prerequisite to such civilization. Once white physicians, the argument went, improved health levels on the reservation, the Navajos would accept Western medicine and other aspects of white society as well.

Such assumptions about the connection between health care and assimilation continued in the 1880s—and for many decades after that—as the federal government’s Indian Office (the forerunner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs) began selecting physicians for the Navajos through a patronage system. Since political party loyalty, not medical competence, determined appointments, the Navajos had to put up with underqualified and incompetent doctors. One of the worst was William Olmstead. He spent more time scheming, stealing government property, drinking, and using opium than he did providing care for the Indians. Trennert and contemporary observers blamed Olmstead for several Navajo children’s deaths.