UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Edward P. Dozier: The Paradox of the American Indian Anthropologist. By Marilyn Norcini.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0xh0v28q

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 31(3)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Willard, Willliam

Publication Date
2007-06-01

DOI
10.17953

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

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

drinking and sobriety. For example, adapting to drinking is a must as it serves to "level" people who otherwise might have a severe status differential. In other cases drinking can be destructive to the family because it goes against the values of Lakota culture.

It is the emphasis on the simple and uncluttered description of drinking among the Lakota using composite case studies and the insightful and detailed culturally rich interpretation of the meanings of drinking in these people's lives that makes this book invaluable. A book of this type is of immense value because the drinking process among the Lakota is changing in today's world, this research was carried out throughout the period 1960–2000, and Bea Medicine was a unique person and scholar. Its elaborate cultural detail lends itself to use in the undergraduate classroom or graduate school setting to educate all aspiring scholars about the importance of emic worldviews in understanding behavior. Furthermore, it is a book which has taken a stereotyped and negative topic that has fueled misunderstanding of Indians and discrimination for centuries and provided an accurate human context and meaning that shines through and speaks to our common humanity. It answers the frequently asked question in western America: how and why do Indians drink like that? The book explains the seemingly illogical, irrational, and impossible to understand behavior of Plains Indians who drink.

I recommend this book to anyone who seeks to comprehend the lives of American Plains Indians. This book will help one appreciate not only the dynamics of drinking as viewed from within the Lakota social context but also the complexity of Lakota culture. It will lead one to understand that Plains Indian drinking patterns are not fully or accurately described by mainstream concepts of alcoholism and mental disease and, therefore, by much of the contemporary academic literature on Indian drinking. The latter point is an important one for anyone to grasp before they venture to read the current body of articles written on Indian "alcoholism."

Philip A. May
University of New Mexico

Edward P. Dozier: The Paradox of the American Indian Anthropologist. By Marilyn Norcini. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2007. 208 pages. $45.00 cloth.

Norcini presents *Edward P. Dozier: The Paradox of the American Indian Anthropologist* as an intellectual biography of a man who established a career as an academic anthropologist laboring under the double paradox of being an American Indian and becoming an academic anthropologist. Norcini states that this book is a critical study of the conflicting contexts that surrounded American Indian anthropologists at mid-twentieth century. I do not think so. Having written that negative line I want to present an explanation.

I was present at many of the times and places mentioned in this book. Therefore my viewpoint is like that in the film *Rashomon*, where the viewpoint

of every witness is valid but may not be the same. I became acquainted with Edward Dozier while a graduate student in the Anthropology Department of the University of Arizona. At that time socialization among faculty and graduate students was emphasized. It was almost like a family; there were clusters of student majors around their faculty major professors. I had two major professors I came to know both as a student and outside the department's structure, Edward Dozier and Edward Spicer. The two epitomized the paradox that is the focus of this book.

Dozier was this paradox. A person could not be an American Indian and an anthropologist at mid-twentieth century. Why? He could not be an objective scholar. Why? He was not from a nonindigenous European-origin society. The concept is the central theme for this book and therefore must be dealt with by the reader on just about every page. The concept's basic premise is that of the Other as a specific social group to which the nonindigenous do not belong: outsiders, whose language and culture the nonindigenous do not understand, so foreign that they are not always willing to admit that they belong to the same species. The concept's roots are in the colonial relations of power and domination, which have evolved in the centuries following the European conquest of the Americas.

Spicer could be defined as an objective scholar from a nonindigenous society; he was the anthropologist as a stranger investigating alien Other cultures for the purpose of collecting data to be used to write academic literature for an academic readership. It needs to be said that, once past the initial fieldwork and the rite of the dissertation, some scholars had set down roots in their dissertation's place of study. They became at least partially assimilated. Thus every indigenous community had its own anthropologist. I became aware of this phenomenon through association with Spicer. He was the best-informed historian of the Yaqui people, as evidenced by his bibliography. The question that the author is asking is how is it that a man who as a native of a Rio Grande Pueblo can also become an established internationally recognized anthropologist?

This book is about the structure and meaning of Edward Dozier's relationship with indigenous and nonindigenous communities. The paradox is really about the relationship of the nonindigenous academic to the indigenous academic person, within the structure of an academic discipline. The situation is now postcolonial, but the thought patterns of power and domination have not changed. There were some other postcolonial Others that Norcini could have mentioned a bit more. I am thinking primarily of the Boasian Indians: William Jones, Ella Deloria, and Archie Phinney. They were a triad, who preceded Dozier, in the twentieth century. True Ella Deloria didn't have a PhD. But she had more than enough fieldwork and written work to qualify for that degree, if Boas had thought outside the double outsider categories of gender and ethnicity. William Jones had done everything called for, except his first employment was out on a colonial frontier where the resident Others fancied head hunting. Phinney had a PhD equivalent from Leningrad University. He chose to be an applied anthropologist, within the federal bureaucracy, and to focus on the development of his own Nez Perce

tribe. Ella Deloria and Archie Phinney were part of that mid-twentieth-century confusion that Norcini briefly mentioned. Both were people who knew Dozier and were fellow participants in that mid-century period, which Norcini incorrectly described as a time of confusion.

It was the beginning of evolution away from the asset-stripping colonialism of earlier federal Indian policy as exemplified by what the Bursum Bill would have done to Santa Clara Pueblo and the other Pueblos in New Mexico. The bill would have awarded Pueblo land and water rights to a hoard of squatters if it had not been reversed. Norcini's account of the ins and outs of the establishment of an American Indian Studies Department at the University of Arizona is particularly interesting to me. Once again I have a Rashomon viewpoint on this subject. I came to Washington State University to develop an American Indian Studies program and have that disheartening experience to compare to the Arizona case. I also had discussions with Vine Deloria Jr. as he moved along at Arizona. Based on those discussions, after reading Norcini's text I came away with the impression that she had a great deal more material from her interviews with Vine than she used in this little book.

The Arizona University American Indian Studies program originally was to be funded by a Ford Foundation grant. When an award was finally made the grant was through the Anthropology Department, and the money was used to hire non-Indian faculty. Norcini suggests that there were few Indian scholars who were qualified to meet the Ford grant's hiring standards. I again disagree. There were, but they were not contacted. The interview with Vine bears this out.

Norcini has the story of what happened and didn't happen lightly concealed under fairly neutral verbiage. But anyone with a modicum of information about the *via dolorosa* of American Indian Studies in American universities (since 1960 when Dozier was hired) cannot be at all impressed by the way things have gone. The possibility that the situation may be corrected now has another chance. A new department chairman has been hired who is a former student of Vine Deloria, sometime chair of American Indian Studies, successor to Dozier in department development, and well aware of how Vine (and Dozier) wanted to see the department develop. We shall see.

The brevity of this book disappoints me. It is as though about a quarter of what should have been discussed is here. The narrative is missing the complete backstory regarding what was going on in Indian Country. The mid-twentieth-century confusion Norcini mentions was not confusion at all. What happened were the changes that came in with the Indian Reorganization Act federal Indian policy of the New Deal years. The division of American Indian anthropologists between academic and nonacademic does not play well either. Both categories were well acquainted with each other. I do not want to be totally negative. It is clear to me that Norcini has the skills to do the relevant research and has gone to the archives to find the information needed. I wonder if there were constraining features against doing the larger book in less veiled language? Perhaps this small book is preparation for a major book on the career of this important man. Although I have expressed irritation on some points, she has displayed the skills and certainly has the access to do it.

The archaeology of Dozier's wake as Fontana described it, is a statement of the cultural history of Santa Clara and all Rio Grande Pueblos. It all began with a rosary being said in English in the mortuary chapel. Then five penitents led a rosary in Spanish. "And everywhere in the room one heard Spanish, English, and Tewa being spoken" (Fontana's letter to the late William Sturtevant). Dave Warren's eulogy celebrated the end of Edward Dozier's personal odyssey and the return to the place where he had begun it. And so it should be for us all.

William Willard
Washington State University

Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America, 1492–1830. By J. H. Elliott. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006. 560 pages. $50.00 cloth; $22.00 paper.

As historians, we need constant reminders that just about everything in the past was the product of a million human choices and decisions that could have been made another way. Immersed in our often-narrow fields of inquiry, it is all too easy to accept certain historical realities—from the mundane to the monumental—as natural or inevitable, to forget their essential contingency, or to fail to notice them at all. At its best, comparative history can be the best way to reinforce our awareness that things could have been different, that the past is the product of choices and circumstances that could have gone in another way in another context. J. H. Elliott's new book is a *tour de force* of historical synthesis and analysis, and one that will become essential reading for historians of British and Spanish colonization in the Atlantic world. With massive erudition and lively comparisons, Elliott provides new insights on every page about the natures of Spanish and British colonization from the discovery of the New World to the independence movements that ended both empires.

This is a large book, and Elliott frames it in grand terms, referencing Herbert Bolton's long-ago challenge to write the "epic of Greater America." Yet anyone looking for a concise thesis or pithy characterization of colonial styles—a la Francis Parkman's famous quip that the Spanish Empire enslaved the Indian, the French embraced him, and the British shunned him—should look elsewhere. Much stems from a basic contrast between an urban Spanish empire and a dispersed English one, but Elliott admits that this is not a book that will result in simple or essential formulae of British and Spanish imperialism. Rather than producing generalities, this book drives at fascinating and illuminating particularities. The book's real value is in its use of comparisons to illuminate the empires' myriad characteristics, both subtle and essential. For readers of this journal, one of the book's strengths is certainly in its constant attention to the place of indigenous peoples within the two imperial cultures under investigation. Still, it must be said that the book's focus is mostly on Europeans and their plight; a highly illuminating chapter on identity gives almost no consideration to indigenous identities.