

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

How “Indians” Think: Colonial Indigenous Intellectuals and the Question of Critical Race Theory. By Gonzalo Lamana.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/85p1r0f3>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 43(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Vasquez, Kristian Emiliano

Publication Date

2019-06-01

DOI

10.17953/aicrj.43.3.reviews

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/>

in a mobile x-ray survey designed to examine every person served by the Mission Indian Agency. Experts read the films to diagnose cases and make recommendations for treatment. Native and Western beliefs and practices were combined, in this instance avoiding Southern California Indians being subjected to medical colonialism. Collective efforts of dedicated individuals led to decreased tubercular mortalities before streptomycin was widely available. Trafzer's book nicely illustrates how MIA peoples adopted Western medicine without abandoning their Indigenous beliefs and practices.

Benjamin R. Kracht

Northeastern State University

How "Indians" Think: Colonial Indigenous Intellectuals and the Question of Critical Race Theory. By Gonzalo Lamana. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018. 256 pages. \$90.00 cloth; \$35.00 paper.

After 1492, European reason, or "abstract" thinking, shaped the emerging racial order of the world. With the advent of Spanish invasion in the early sixteenth century, Indigenous people of the Americas were caught in this colonial entanglement of "reason." Exploited for their labor, resources, and knowledge of their territories, Indigenous people were considered to lack agency and to be ignorant of their ignorance. The rise of modernity through European colonialism shadowed the parallel coloniality of the Indigenous Americas. The material processes of cultural and economic transformation in the Americas by European powers produced coinciding narratives that justified, or in some cases condemned, these acts and transmutations. Casting the Indians as inferior, the Spanish were unable to comprehend Indigenous subjects as abstract thinkers and perceived them as having only "material" intelligence. This bias thus presented challenges in solving the emerging "Indian problem" in the Americas for the Spanish colonialists' colonial enterprises. For their part, Indigenous intellectuals of the Andes in South America developed a persistent and evolving response to contend with these aspects of European reason and colonialism. Scholar Gonzalo Lamana investigates this colonial world in a new book that centers an Indigenous view of its tensions and contradictions, *How "Indians" Think: Colonial Indigenous Intellectuals and the Question of Critical Race Theory*.

Extensive and wide of breadth, Lamana's archive challenges traditional studies on Indigenous people in the Americas by going beyond primarily Spanish sources and excavating and centering the colonial sources from Indigenous voices themselves. The challenge of this archive, however, is its actors—that of Indigenous people—not being able to represent a comprehensive view of the colonial system as sources were limited to specific affairs. Centralizing the Andes, particularly the lands of Perú, Lamana orients us to two Indigenous intellectuals who are central to his study because they were able to write the histories of their people and lands in Spanish: Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala and Garcilasco de la Vega, el Inca. Lamana argues that these two Indigenous thinkers are as important as Plato and Aristotle in understanding the

interconnected world post-1492: Guaman Poma and Garcilasco are central to comprehending the coloniality and colonial race-thinking of their times. Lamana was attentive to the historical texts *Comentarios reales de los Incas* (1601) and *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno* (1614) by Garcilasco and Guaman Poma, respectively. By challenging the Spanish reader to make sense of the colonial present, both of these Andean Indigenous thinkers offered alternative futures—challenging the Spanish colonial system and its racial perceptions toward Indigenous people at the turn of the seventeenth century. As such Lamana interrogates the concept of the “Indian” in the discourses of Garcilasco and Guaman Poma, by employing the frameworks of double consciousness (W. E. B. Du Bois), whiteness (James Baldwin), and postindian imaginaries (Gerald Vizenor). With this frame in mind, Lamana’s study entices its readers to consider the ways that Garcilasco and Guaman Poma challenge the Spanish gaze of the “Indian.”

The book is organized by four parts with corresponding chapters that illuminate the main theme of the particular section. Part 1 of the book examines Spanish ideas of the “Indian” in the Andes in the late sixteenth century—mainly the gross characterization of the sole material intelligence of the “Indian.” The chapter titled “Material Intelligence” analyzes Spanish discourse from theological treatises and fiction to explicate the early Spanish colonial perception of Indigenous people in the Andes. Focused on the primary text *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno* by Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala and Garcilasco de la Vega, el Inca’s *Comentarios reales de los Incas*, part two and three is a concentrated study on the nature of oppositional Indigenous discourses divergent to the Spanish gaze. Particularly, these two parts of the book unfold how Indigenous intellectuals such as Garcilasco and Guaman Poma are able to challenge racial thinking and coloniality—offering a postindian future. The concluding fourth part of the text poses questions that consider the early stages of Western global expansion, and of the Spanish proto-racism that developed in the colonial process in the Andes. This conclusion also serves as Lamana’s main contributions to various fields of scholarship such as critical race theory, Indigenous studies, and Spanish colonial literatures. *How “Indians” Think* provides us a space to theorize in our respective frames of reference the historical intellectual discourses of the Spanish colonial period. It prompts the reader to think through the questions of race in its differential development throughout the Indigenous Americas with the advent of colonial systems.

Lamana’s *How “Indians” Think* is a timely contribution to the studies of hemispheric Indigenous intellectual traditions after 1492. This book makes provoking interventions in American Indian and Indigenous Studies, particularly its centralization in understanding challenges to European reason from the standpoint of Indigenous theories of race in the colonial context in South America. This regional study has implications for larger frames of Indigenous intellectual defiance to European colonialism, offering an opening toward other rigorous studies of the voices of Indigenous intellectuals and/or everyday people. This study is on par with the recent publication of Camilla Townsend’s *Fifth Sun: A New History of the Aztecs* (2019), a study of Indigenous Mexican history, specifically of the Mexica, from central Mexico from the point-of-view of the Mexica themselves. Spanish colonial history is full of Spanish colonial archives and sources. American Indian and Indigenous Studies as a field

is challenged to continue to unveil and push forward the historical narratives and Indigenous voices from Indigenous sources and archives. Tracing the intellectual production by Guaman Poma and Garcilasco invites us to consider the various ways Indigenous people rhetorically counteract coloniality, but also how the Indigenous archive can serve as a method for resisting colonial perceptions. It is the Indigenous intellectuals—such as the contemporary Gerald Vizenor and Vine Deloria Jr.—who will shape future Indigenous histories of our own times, just as Guaman Poma and Garcilasco shaped their present and aspirations of a postindian imaginary.

Kristian Emiliano Vasquez
University of California, Santa Barbara

Implicating the System: Judicial Discourses in the Sentencing of Indigenous Women. By Elspeth Kaiser-Derrick. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2019. 408 pages. \$70.00 cloth and electronic; \$34.95 paper.

Elspeth Kaiser-Derrick's *Implicating the System* reviews 175 cases involving the sentencing of 177 Indigenous women in Canadian courts from 1999 to 2015 (3). This meticulous study was undertaken to assess whether and how judges consider histories of victimization and the impact of colonialism as systemic factors informing sentencing determinations. Specifically, Kaiser-Derrick examines the extent to which section 718.2 (e) of the Criminal Code is upheld on sentencing. Enacted through a 1996 legislative amendment, section 718.2 outlines that relevant aggravating or mitigating factors should be considered in sentencing criminalized persons, and 718.2 (e) directs judges to pay particular attention to the unique circumstances of Indigenous offenders while weighing all reasonable sanctions other than imprisonment. This legislative amendment is considered in conjunction with judicial directives issued through the 1999 Supreme Court decision in *R. v. Gladue*, which clarified that the intention of s.718.2 (e) is to reduce overreliance on incarceration for Indigenous peoples, expand the usage of restorative justice principles, and promote sentencing that is more appropriate and meaningful to Indigenous persons (22). In 2012, *R. v. Ipeelee* reiterated that courts must consider how a history of colonialism, displacement, and residential schools often translates into lower educational attainment, lower incomes, higher unemployment and rates of substance abuse, and higher incarceration rates for Indigenous peoples (25).

Kaiser-Derrick finds that many judges maintain a rigid and dichotomous understanding of what constitutes a victim and offender, despite s.718.2 (e) and the directives of *Gladue* and *Ipeelee*, and sometimes overlook or lack access to “Gladue reports,” which consider Indigenous circumstances and offer alternatives to incarceration. Judges also pathologize Indigenous women, their families, and communities, who may “individually and collectively internalize the violence of colonialism” or see themselves “only as victim” (93, 279). Even when a more “sensitive” exploration of victimization and Gladue factors takes place, this sometimes results in the view that Indigenous women are in need of therapeutic intervention (287), with some judges viewing