## UCLA American Indian Culture and Research Journal

## Title

Issues in Native American Cultural Identity. Edited by Michael K. Green.

**Permalink** https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8x521699

**Journal** American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 20(3)

**ISSN** 0161-6463

Author Churchill, Ward

Publication Date 1996-06-01

## DOI

10.17953

## **Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <u>https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/</u>

eScholarship.org

Powered by the <u>California Digital Library</u> University of California The rebirth of Northwest Coast cedar canoe travel has brought tears to the eyes of elders who never thought they would see canoes arrive on the beaches in front of their villages. David Neel has made an important contribution to First Nations people and to all who love the ocean by documenting the return of the great canoes.

*Chris B. Wooley* Chumis Cultural Resource Services Anchorage, Alaska

**Issues in Native American Cultural Identity.** Edited by Michael K. Green. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.

We live in a time period marked by a federal statute that makes it a crime, punishable by a fine of up to \$1 million and fifteen years imprisonment, to identify oneself without government sanction, "for purposes of selling arts and crafts," as an American Indian. Exceedingly marginal types such as lobbyist Suzanne Shown Harjo, federally funded professional "radical" Vernon Bellecourt, Santa Fe hobbyist David Bradley, and Colorado's jeweler *cum* Republican Senator Ben "Nightmare" Campbell, sponsor of the above legislation—each of them bearing an official pedigree slip attesting to his or her "Indianness." They have annointed themselves as a quasi-official "purity police" whose sole purpose is to impose a vaguely defined and woefully self-contradictory set of "racial/cultural standards" on Indians everywhere.

Tim Giago, partly Oglala, mostly Hispanic publisher of *Indian Country Today*, the most widely circulated native newspaper in the U.S., has devoted feature after feature to "exposing" the "fact" that any Indian writer who disagrees with his own peculiarly reactionary viewpoint is, apparently on that basis alone, an "ethnic fraud." Paul DeMain, heading up the second-ranked *News from Indian Country*, has gone Giago one better, publishing a series of his own op-ed pieces in the guise of "news reportage," insinuating that not only are his targets "imposters" but probably FBI agents provocateurs as well. As Giago editor Avis Little Eagle has put it, the ancestry of authors and activists identifying as native should be "the single most important issue" for Indians in the 1990s.

The internet has been abuzz with such trash for the past several years. Ditto the telephone lines, as the "legitimacy" of just about

any Indian—from Vine Deloria and Wendy Rose to Michael Dorris and Jimmie Durham—who has ever said or done anything of liberatory substance has been increasingly, if secretly, undermined through the circulation of rumors, innuendoes and outright falsehoods by one or a hundred who have never bestirred themselves to accomplish anything at all. At this point, we are treated to spectacles such as San Francisco's inimitable "Dakota Woman," Carole Standing Elk, who, while professing to "agree with much of what was said," has taken to standing up in public fora to denounce native rights advocates for "not being Indian enough to say it."

All this fratricidal nonsense serves mainly to reinforce the divide-and-conquer style of management long since adopted by the United States with respect to indigenous populations within its domain—as well as the virulently anti-Indian biases of the likes of anthropologist James Clifton and attorney Alan van Gestel, whose stock-in-trade has always been to "prove" that Native Americans no longer really exist at all. For this reason, thoughtful, well-argued studies of the bases of contemporary American Indian identity are, to say the least, both overdue and sorely needed. It was thus with great anticipation that I agreed to review the present volume. Unfortunately, with only a couple of exceptions, the essays contained therein fail dismally to contribute anything of value to our understanding of the topic at hand.

I may perhaps be forgiven for expecting that a book ostensibly devoted to considering "issues in Americal Indian cultural identity" might offer some kind of explanation of how it is that Indians go about identifying themselves as Indians. Instead, when the various authors actually get around to touching upon questions of identity at all—which is seldom—it is all but exclusively by way of analyzing and sometimes rebutting Euro-American conceptions of what Indians are, have been, or should be. Indeed, of the volume's 296 pages of text, 108 are devoted to examining the legal doctrines by which white jurists have rationalized the subordination of indigenous people, both here and elsewhere. Twenty pages or so are taken up with explication of assorted European mythologies of Indianness, and about forty with how Eurocentric academics conspire to preserve white supremacist orthodoxy. Still another thirty go to informing New Agers that they are not Indians.

The work is not necessarily all bad. On the contrary, several essays are quite respectable. To take one example, Stephen C.

Osborne's excursus on John Marshall, "The Voice of Law" (pp. 57–80), is an almost elegant little summary. The problem is that although the author neatly tacks down how this "first" chief justice of the Supreme Court (actually Marshall was the second, John Jay having been first) inverted the legal/political status of indigenous nations within territory claimed by the U.S., he says nothing of who it was that Marshall understood to be member/ citizens of these nations, or why. Still less does he speak to the manner by which Indians themselves established the parameters of their polities.

Nor can anything different be said of the next essay, "Judicial Masks," a rather more extensive—87 pages, 311 endnotes—overview of federal Indian law contributed by Lumbee political scientist David Wilkins. After all that, this author, like his predecessor, concentrates exclusively on the nuances of how Euro-America's juridical tradition lends a varnish of propriety to the ongoing usurpation of indigenous national sovereignty. Never once does he take up the question of how these nations determine the nature of their constituencies. Ultimately, both efforts are useful—Osborne's piece might fit nicely into a primer on legal philosophy, Wilkins's into one or another law journal—but neither has any place in a volume taking as its purpose the clarification of the criteria by which the nature of American Indian identity can be understood.

One way of beginning to get at the matter of who Indians are, of course, is by process of elimination (that is, by delineating who or what they are not). This task is undertaken by Thomas C. Fiddick in his "Noble Savage, Savage Nobles" (pp. 39–56), an overly succint tracing of the contours of Europe's discourse on imaginary Indians and "revolutionary" meanings of these fables from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries. While his economizing leads him to leave unmentioned a wealth of material that might have amplified his theme, however, Fiddick frequently loses focus, drifting off into hints of what native societies/people were actually like, as when he quotes missionary accounts on page 43. The result is that neither real Indians nor invented ones are sufficiently developed that we might truly appreciate the difference.

Thomas C. Pencak takes the opposite tack from Fiddick, claiming he will use his "Placing Indians at the Center" (pp. 167–200) to delve into various indigenous cultural revitalization movements, mainly of the nineteenth century. Since this is the first essay promising to emphasize an emic sense of what it means to be Indian, rather than European thinking on "The Indian Question," one approaches it with a certain degree of hope, only to experience yet another disappointment. More than one-third of it is devoted not to Indians but to other oppositional tendencies in U.S. society ranging from "Women"—a category reserved for white women, presumably, since it is juxtaposed to that of "African/Americans," as if half of all Blacks were not female—to "Utopian Reformers" and former southern slaveholders.

Where Pencak does deal with native movements, it is in an unremittingly distortive manner. Both general and particular types of historical inaccuracy abound. As an example of the former, he classifies those fierce cultural nationalists, the Creek Red Sticks, as a prototype of "Pan-Indianism" (p. 176). In the latter connection, he mysteriously moves Sitting Bull's practice of the Ghost Dance from the Standing Rock Reservation in North Dakota to "the Pine Ridge Reservation," hundreds of miles away "in South Dakota" (p. 179). Overall, it seems the author is inattentive to such details, since his objective is not so much an accurate rendering of his subject matter as an enunciation of a thesis of intercultural political commonality. If round (native) pegs must be driven into square (non-Indian) holes to make the script work, so be it. Pencak proves himself perfectly capable of fitting the facts to his formula.

Such shoddy "scholarship" is worsened considerably when Pencak elects to plunge full-tilt into the kind of New Age psychobabble one might expect from Starhawk or Michael McClure. On pages 179 to 180, for example, he informs readers that, during the 1973 seige of Wounded Knee, "Wallace Black Elk, a shaman, reintroduced the peyote-smoking ceremony, which had been a major rite of the Native American Church." He then has the "shaman" explain, quoting at length from an uncited source, how peyote is smoked in the Sacred Pipe of the Lakota.

One hardly knows where to begin to respond to such absurdity, but a good start might be to observe that a smokable form of peyote no more exists than do Carlos Castaneda's famous smokable mushrooms. Smoking peyote was thus never a rite of the Native American Church, the real ceremonies of which—including the *ingestion* of peyote—are as alive today as ever and cannot therefore be accurately referenced in the past tense as of 1973. Wallace Black Elk, for his part, was never a *shaman*—a Siberian term having no genuine applicability to Native American cultures—at Wounded Knee or anywhere else. Instead, he was at the time an apprentice to Secungu (Brûlé) Lakota spiritual leader Leonard Crow Dog, whose father, Henry, had introduced peyote ceremonialism to the Rosebud/Pine Ridge area a half-century earlier and continued it thereafter. Finally, the Pipe ceremony Black Elk describes in the quoted passage utilizes nothing more exotic than tobacco (loading it with anything else would be considered a desecration).

Laurie Anne Whitt does a first-rate job of countering Pencak's kind of offal in her contribution, "Indigenous People and the Cultural Problem of Knowledge" (pp. 223–71), along the way demonstrating in compelling fashion the genocidally ethnocentric implications of the mindset that attends it. Probably the only thing marring this otherwise superb effort is a peculiar insistence on occasionally crediting volume editors with coauthorship of their contributors' submissions, a grossly misleading convention which, if Whitt applied it to herself, would mean she would have to cite her present essay as "Whitt and Green, 1995." And for all its power, the piece consists overwhelmingly of a critique of Eurocentric cultural/academic practices, rather than an elaboration of the ingredients of indigenous cultural identity.

It is left, finally, to Yamasee historian Don Grinde to provide the first glimpses of these ingredients in his "Historical Narratives of Nationhood and the Semiotic Construction of Social Identity" (pp. 201–22). Although he, too, allots more text than seems necessary to displaying the obvious continuities between the "old" colonialist historiography of Wilcomb Washburn and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and the "new" variety offered by James Axtell and others, Grinde's examination of contemporary tribalist/ ethnonationalist/mininationalist phenomena begins to lay a solid groundwork for apprehending the basis of modern Indian identity. By the same token, it provides a few basic analytical tools with which to begin winnowing out those who do not fill the bill by any criterion other than a mere accident of birth.

What would have been wonderful might have been for its final essay, M.A. Jaimes's "Native American Identity and Survival" (pp. 273–96), to have capitalized on the good beginning belatedly established by Grinde, thus serving as a capstone to the volume. The piece is a disaster, however, bogged down irretrievably in its own disorganization and clotted prose. Jaimes seems to lose track of whatever points she could have made in a blind rush to assert herself as a heavy thinker, "going beyond" the indigenist or "Fourth World" paradigm she is supposedly explaining to posit a "Fifth World" of "biodiversity"—a weighty concept to which she commits an entire paragraph—as if this were not a fundament of indigenism itself. May we next expect her to trot out a "Sixth World" of pure energy states? It is an altogether bewildering performance from a woman whose earlier work was often tightly written, carefully thought out, and directly to the point.

This brings up a final, overarching problem with *Issues in Native American Cultural Survival*. Not only did Michael Green, as volume editor, not bother to pull together a coherent collection of materials, treating the project more like a periodical than a book; he also did not bother to give these essays even a cursory copy edit, or, in the last case, a rewrite. But, then, what can we expect from a guy who plays it so loose with his own writing that he manages to miss the fact that he ended three consecutive sentences in the third paragraph of his own introduction with the phrase *within its borders?* Somebody needs to explain to him that there is more responsibility involved in this kind of publishing than simply acquiring another résumé blip. Before this volume was released, we were in need of a solid work on cultural identity. Plainly, we still are.

Ward Churchill

University of Colorado at Boulder

The Lightning Stick: Arrows, Wounds, and Indian Legends. By H. Henrietta Stockel. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1995. 131 pages. \$24.95 cloth.

At first glance, readers might not recognize several important aspects of this work. Indeed, it is a brief book written in an informal—perhaps too informal—style. Nevertheless, upon careful examination, students of United States and Indian military history, particularly those with an interest in the study of bows and arrows, will find this book useful in explaining various details about this effective Indian weapon.

H. Henrietta Stockel, a special projects bibliographer with a concentration in Indian health at the University of New Mexico School of Medicine Library and author of other works on Native Americans, describes the relationship of the bow and arrow to certain tribes and tribespeople and to their religious ceremonies.