

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Being and Becoming Indian: Biographical Studies of North American Frontiers. Edited by James A. Clifton.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7tb7t6gh>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 14(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Grinde, Donald A., Jr.

Publication Date

1990-06-01

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/>

resource bases (like potatoes), and wage labor were certainly much in evidence in Brown's descriptions, and he made numerous suggestions to further what he saw as an inevitable process. Nevertheless, Brown is clearly interested in seeing that the Indian story be told. It is often this side of the story that is lacking.

Daniel L. Boxberger
Western Washington University

Being and Becoming Indian: Biographical Studies of North American Frontiers. Edited by James A. Clifton. Chicago: The Dorsey Press, 1989. 337 pages. \$12.95 Paper.

Studying American Indians through the lens of Western civilization's individualistic tenets presents the scholar with some interesting insights. James A. Clifton has gathered together a thought-provoking array of biographical essays that focus on American Indians or individuals who acquired American Indian identities in the last 250 years. Clifton and the other essayists in the volume see an emerging process of cultural marginality, new ethnic identities, and changing relationships for certain American Indian and non-Indian individuals on the "North American Frontiers." Such person-centered studies are informative from a psychological and individualistic point of view, but the insights that they give us into the cultures of the North American frontiers are variable.

Comments on the cover of the book by an historian (Richard N. Current) and an anthropologist (L. L. Langness) seem to assume that such biographical studies can be useful for "those in policy making positions" and that such studies can dispel "much of our nonsense about American Indians." With that kind of use, the book could well be abusive to American Indian people. Rather than caution the reader on the limits of biography, Clifton claims that biography can be a method "to improve [our] . . . understanding of a variety of social and cultural processes" (p. ix). Clifton believes that biography also can yield "more texture and intricacy" than what emerges in other types of "anthropological and historical studies" (p. ix). With these thoughts in mind, he has gathered together an impressive collection of biographical essays that speak powerfully to us as individuals, but the

reviewer doubts that such works achieve the goals that Clifton sets for them, because most of the essays in this volume are essentially idiosyncratic in nature.

The book contains a series of excellent and moving personal stories about marginal people, bicultural individuals, ethnic poseurs, and American Indian leaders. The essays, written by an excellent group of anthropologists and historians, are concise, thoughtful, and revealing. Unfortunately, the work is marred by Clifton's grandiose and inaccurate introductory essay, "Alternate Identities and Cultural Frontiers," which contains inaccuracies, fabricated evidence, and a political agenda that can put the reader off until he or she gets to the more substantive and credible biographical essays. Perhaps Clifton recognized this problem, because he advised readers who have an aversion to social science "jargon" to "avoid the first chapter" written by him (p. xiii).

Clifton wants us to think clearly about American Indians. He points out that Euro-Americans and Native Americans have changed a great deal since initial contacts, but he also believes that since the 1920s, American Indians have been the beneficiaries of "many programs promoting cultural persistence, political separatism and—supposedly—the enhancement of their situation" (pp. 1-2). Thus, he ignores termination, relocation, and the failure of the United States government to develop a consistent and stable American Indian policy in the twentieth century. Clifton prefers images to reality. He styles himself as the ultimate arbiter of myth versus reality in the American Indian world, but, ironically, in his rush to set the record straight on popular misconceptions, he creates false images of his own and engages in the unpardonable sin of fabricating evidence.

For instance, Clifton alleges that the United States Congress contributed to popular misconceptions about the American Indian when it passed a concurrent resolution declaring that the Articles of Confederation and the United States Constitution were modeled on the principles of the Iroquois League. He believes that "this bizarre revision of constitutional history . . . was a skillful pressure campaign by the national Indian rights lobby . . ." (p. 2). Oddly enough, his footnotes give us no indication where he gets his conclusions concerning "conspiring" and politically savvy American Indians. Likewise, Clifton accuses contemporary American Indians of spoon-feeding to United States newspapers stereotypes about Native Americans who

were "close to nature [and] primal spirituality, [and were] contributors to the tap root of American democracy . . ." (p. 9). He believes that in 1987 American Indians discussing the origins of American government were engaging in a "skillfully staged media event . . . [and] were reading or quoting from the same press release issued elsewhere" (p. 9). These are specific and pointed accusations leveled at respected American Indian leaders and scholars!

One might assume that Clifton would want to present some proof of this alleged American Indian knavery! However, an examination of his footnotes yields no sources other than an essay entitled "The United States Constitution and the Iroquois League," by Elisabeth Tooker in the fall 1988 issue of *Ethnohistory*. Alas, Tooker's only reference to a press release is one issued in 1936 by the Smithsonian Institution which she admits was difficult to find. Thus, without a shred of evidence, Clifton accuses contemporary American Indians of media conspiracy. In doing so he deflects the debate away from the real evidence.

Clifton ignores the admonitions of John Adams in his *Defence of the Constitutions . . . of America* (1787). On the eve of the Constitutional Convention, Adams urged the Founding Fathers to investigate the "form of government of the . . . modern Indians," because their division of "power is marked with a precision that excludes all controversy." Adams's *Defence* was one of the handbooks used at the Constitutional Convention and thus was very influential. In the *Defence*, Adams said he believed that in Indian councils "real sovereignty resided in the body of the people" (quotes from C. F. Adams, ed., *Works of John Adams* [1851]). Adams also discussed the "individual independence of the Mohawks" and the sachemship system of the Iroquois with "fifty families governed by all authority in one centre" (ibid.). In his analysis of the political sentiment of the times, he stated that "philosophers and politicians of the age [Turgot and Franklin]" want to "set up governments of . . . modern Indians" (ibid.).

Clifton, peering into Indian society, has evolved a critical analysis of "political Indians," people with a small amount of Indian blood, and people choosing alternate identities. Like any "expert," he pretends to speak with authority and objectivity on the subject of who is "Indian" and who has "become" Indian for convenience and opportunity.

In analyzing the images that children form of Indians at an

early age, Clifton asserts that non-Indian American children, by the age of six, draw pictures of Indians in a natural environment with "feathers, . . . moccasins, leggings . . ." (p. 7) and fringe jackets. He believes that children who identify as Indians "are little different, except they sometimes have access to more information and better wardrobes" (p. 7). As an American Indian parent, I am appalled at this generalization. My children have always been angry about the identity that white society seeks to put upon them and have always asserted their own unique tribal background proudly.

When all is said and done, the message is clear from Clifton: There are no more "real Indians" in his eyes. The only surviving Indians are detribalized and are clever manipulators of the stereotypical images of American Indians for self-serving ends. Clifton's neoconservative scholarship is a rationale for termination in the twenty-first century. By looking at "successful" Indian individuals and downplaying the importance of their group identity, Clifton provides a rationale for the devastating policies of the United States government. He uses the present conservative strategy of shouting loud and long with simplistic theories, and his words strike responsive chords in this conservative era. Claiming objectivity, Clifton has formulated a political agenda that discredits Indians and what they stand for in a way that will point to ultimate termination of federal treaty relations with Native Americans. Obviously, he does not understand that for many Indians, the survival of a group identity is as important as the survival of the individual and his identity.

In the final analysis, Clifton's book may tell us more about American society in the twilight of the twentieth century than it does about American Indians. By focusing on individuals who were mostly successful in the non-Indian world, the work ignores successful people within the Indian world. By implication, the assumption is that the only people meriting study are those persons who do well in the white world. Similarly, ethnic poseurs and Caucasians assuming American Indian identities are interesting anomalies, but they do not give us a great deal of insight into Native American societies or identity creation within them. In fact, that is the problem with this collection of essays: We are mostly exposed to individuals who have had some success and visibility in the dominant society.

Are these biographies a good cross-section of the identities and societies that are needed to draw the kinds of sweeping conclusions that Clifton insists upon making? The study of identity is tough enough through the process of psychoanalysis, but Clifton ignores the obvious pitfalls of vicarious psychoanalysis and, instead, plays fast and loose with a group that he only dimly perceives. His facile generalizations and insensitivity to the sacredness of self-determination have sullied an excellent collection of informative and provocative biographical essays.

Donald A. Grinde, Jr.
University of California, Riverside

Native American Architecture. By Peter Nabokov and Robert Easton. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989. 431 pages. \$50.00 Cloth.

It is with great trepidation that one starts a book titled *Native American Architecture*, simply because the devastation of population, culture, building, and artifact in the Native American population has been so great that the task of gathering data, interpreting such, and presenting a cohesive picture seems impossible. The authors have overcome the seemingly impossible. This book succeeds in its intent, because the authors have systematically collected the information from varied and disparate sources, and because they have taken an anthropological perspective in the assimilation and summation of the evidence collected. The combination of secondhand source, firsthand experience, and thoroughness allows the authors to present a complete typology of Native American architecture. The organization by type and region was a neat little device to bring order and cohesiveness to data that are quite varied. The combination of anecdotal, visual, and research material creates a thorough picture of major tribes and their architecture in nine regions of North America.

Each region is covered quite thoroughly through historical photographs and an explanation of the critical interactions of people, buildings, and settings. The issue of change over time is the least addressed; there appears to be an assumption on the authors' part that the reader understands that this culture has