

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Reasserting "Consensus": A Somewhat Bitterly Amused Response to Kristof Haavik's "In Defense of Black Robe"

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1ns6t5c0>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 31(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Churchill, Ward

Publication Date

2007-09-01

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/>

Peer reviewed

Reasserting “Consensus”: A Somewhat Bitterly Amused Response to Kristof Haavik’s “In Defense of *Black Robe*”

WARD CHURCHILL

Out of his black robe came Kraft,
feedmills, blight, Benson Mines.
From his prayers flowed the death
of salmon and trout in mercury pools.
From letters home to his
mother settlers followed
soldiers behind hooded priests.

—Maurice Kenny

*Blackrobe: Isaac Jogues*¹

It must be said, first of all, that I find it quite humorous to be sitting here in midsummer 2007 framing a reply to a critique of a critique of a film I first published in 1992 and that was anthologized more than a decade ago.² Somehow, I just can't quite shake the eerie feeling that Miss Shively, my tight-lipped neo-Puritan of an eighth-grade teacher, will shortly be returning from her final resting place to correct the punctuation in that theme on the Black Hawk War I turned in on my way to becoming a freshly minted freshman at Elmwood High, majoring in football, small-block Chevies, and that oh-so-James-Dean-meets-Brando cool one might affect simply by firing up a Marlboro at the table outside our local Dairy Queen, smack-dab in the midst of Illinois's endless cornfields.

Fact is, I never quite managed to shake the image of the woman's grim-faced visage extolling the virtues of the Pilgrim fathers, even after I was drafted as fodder for the war in Vietnam, coming back a Students for a Democratic Society/Vietnam Veterans Against the War (SDS/VVAW) volunteer and

Ward Churchill (Keetoowah Cherokee), formerly a professor of American Indian Studies and chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder, has authored, coauthored, and edited more than twenty books on indigenous rights. Now retired from academia, he remains a full-time scholar/activist.

member of Fred Hampton's original Rainbow Coalition in Chicago before gravitating to Sangamon State University, a governor's grant magnet school for radicals situated outside Springfield, the state capitol, and, from there, being recruited into the American Indian Movement (AIM) by Clyde Bellecourt for what eventually turned out to be service in South Dakota, and later Colorado. Somehow, Miss Shively was always there, frowning at the way I saw things, the less-than-patriotic attitude I displayed, a hometown boy gone seriously wrong in her Middle American estimation. But, hey, that's another story.

Or maybe not. Returning to the matter most immediately at hand, candor requires that I just come right out and admit that what I find *most* amusing in this whole vaudeville skit is the proposition that those who vet articles for the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* actually found something so timely about the need to defend a sixteen-year-old movie against what amounts to four pages extracted from a fifteen-year-old review that never appeared under their imprimatur that they felt compelled to dedicate twenty-three pages of the journal to that purpose. One hardly knows whether to suspect that submissions to the *AICRJ* have declined to the point that they actually need filler of this sort—if so, I'll be happy to pass along an as yet unpublished term paper ghostwritten by Lynne Cheney that takes issue with Priscilla Buffalohead's 1983 article, "A Fresh Look at Ojibway Women"—or that they're simply making a fashion statement by adding their own voice to that of a currently stylish chorus of reaction to "deviant" scholarship, my own in particular.³

Either way, the journal's decision to publish Kristof Haavik's "commentary" provides me a welcome respite from the now-stale entertainment of responding to questions—posed with all due "objectivity" by an official investigating committee at the University of Colorado—such as whether the mere facts that the War Department had an official policy prohibiting the distribution of vaccine to the peoples of the Upper Missouri during the late 1830s, the Indian Office was a subpart of the War Department, agents of the Indian Office distributed annuities and "gifts" to the Upper Missouri peoples in June of 1837, and all Indian agents held field-grade military rank at the time might "really" suggest that "the Army" had a little something to do with sparking the smallpox pandemic that broke out among Indians in the region that summer.⁴

Obviously, the topics to be revisited herein are far more stimulating and enlightened than those having to do with pathogenic genocide: the position "naturally" assumed by Native females engaged in the act of copulating, for example, and the question of whether indigenous societies in the northeast comprised a ritually cannibalistic "torture complex" at the time Torquemada's gang showed up in the "New World."⁵ As a sequel, perhaps I'll be afforded an opportunity to try and prove that the Americas weren't populated by a variety of Blemmyes, Sciopods, Cynocephalus, and the occasional Cyclops, as was claimed in many of the "historical sources" produced in Europe for quite a while after 1492.⁶ Or maybe to argue that American history didn't really "begin" until that year, as the texts assigned in Miss Shively's class not-so-subtly implied.⁷ Who knows? The possibilities seem all but endless.

There's no need to indulge in idle speculation, however. Haavik's comments are at hand, demanding of rejoinder, and, now that I've quelled my initial spate of uncontrollable giggling, I will endeavor to oblige. There being "scholarly" protocols to observe when replying to such weighty issues as his, moreover, I'll even begin with the customary payment of homage to the merits, both of my critic and of his criticism (albeit, I'll refrain from carrying things so far as to pretend that I might be numbered among his "admirers," a simple token of intellectual honesty I wish he'd reciprocated in his first paragraph).⁸ My only dilemma in this regard concerns what might be the most fitting place from which to commence the bestowal of accolades. No clear answer having presented itself, I've opted to select one at random.

Hence, I hereupon announce my gratitude that Haavik has at last balanced all those "historical inaccuracies [I] allege in the film"—you know, little things like degrading misrepresentations of entire peoples and traditions—by pointing out that I misspelled the name of a priest, which should have been "Laforgue, with the *u* before the final *e* [and] not *LaForge* without the *u* and with a capital *f*," as I erroneously had it.⁹ That this is a perfect illustration of what Deborah Lipstadt has in another connection described as the drawing of "immoral equivalencies" is beside the point.¹⁰ Looking down as she undoubtedly is from her perch on the ninth cloud of Heaven, Miss Shively must be curling her toes with delight at Haavik's nifty catch, and, to show the depth of my contrition, I will forthwith set myself to inscribing Fr. LaFarge's name one hundred times upon the chalkboard, swearing most solemnly all the while to never, ever misspell something so important again.¹¹

Say, y'know what? Maybe there really *is* something to this Confession business, after all. The sublime sensation of Personal Purity I incurred while indulging in that first ritual of Penitence has left me eager for an encore. So, without further ado, allow me to say that Haavik is also right when he observes that I erred in identifying the woman in *Black Robe*'s initial sex scene as being Annuka.¹² Once again I stand quite happily corrected. After all, Beresford's having had additional Native women engaging in "doggie-style" sex—*especially* an unidentifiable "every-woman" figure such as is actually depicted in the scene—reinforces my point about Beresford's use of sexual symbolism immensely, that is that Native sexuality is *invariably* depicted in this manner, while European sex assumes the "missionary position." The symbology involved—bestial/human, savage/civilized, and so on—was clear enough to me when I first viewed the film in 1991, and it seems even clearer today.¹³

Given the undeniable utility to my argument of Beresford's having included this "every [Native] woman" scene, Haavik's suggestion that I was "playing fast and loose with the facts" rather than simply overlooking them when I (mis)identified the woman therein as Annuka is ridiculous. Reversing polarity, his contention that I "overlooked [Annuka's] motivation" when she "seduced her Mohawk captor" at a later point in the film—as if my objection was born of "moral outrage" at her having sex at all, rather than of the manner in which Beresford once again characterized her as doing so—is almost as silly. Within the framework of *my* analysis, there was nothing *to* "overlook" in

this connection: Annuka's "motivation"—as opposed to Beresford's—was and remains quite simply irrelevant.

The academic etiquette of displaying false humility hereupon beckons. Allow me therefore to concede the possibility that I really *did* miss something important in my discussion of Beresford's depiction of indigenous sexuality. Because the crux of Haavik's entire critique is that I seriously understated the degree of historical accuracy embodied in *Black Robe* at virtually every step—for example, there really *was* a "dwarfish, humpbacked" man named Mestigoit who served as a "Native sorcerer" during the period portrayed in the film—perhaps he sees this defect as pertaining to my handling of the "Doggie Question" as well.¹⁴ If so, it seems reasonable to expect that he might refer us to the place(s) in his sources where the sexual position routinely assumed by American Indian women is described, firsthand, by priestly observers and other such "experts."

Assuming Haavik can muster up a few citations on this score, we should all be in for some truly fascinating reading, and I, for one, readily acknowledge that I'm awaiting his revelations with bated breath. Should he prove unable to come up with anything he'd personally attest to as being a reliable reference on the matter, it would seem appropriate that he stop dissembling long enough to admit that Beresford's sexual depictions had *nothing* to do with "historical accuracy" and *everything* to do with affirming a cluster of long-established and patently racist fantasies projected by white men onto "Othered" women the world over.¹⁵ In the alternative, it seems equally fair to observe that his own attempt(s) to obscure the distinction can and should be seen as an extension of the very problem he's trying so hard to deny.¹⁶

Oops. I was losing my "collegial" sense of humor there for a moment, wasn't I? Certain of the gimmicks incorporated into Haavik's shtick are a bit shopworn, perhaps. Or maybe I'm just growing grumpier in my dotage (it happens, or so I'm told). Whatever. Because irritability has now become a factor—and because I've never been known for being especially shy when it comes to saying what's on my mind—I'll elect to simply ignore Haavik's attempts to tally laughs by addressing things I did "not say . . . directly."¹⁷ Similarly, having devoted more than half of my original review to extolling the aesthetic merits and attention to the details of material culture embodied in *Black Robe*—a matter barely acknowledged by my critic—I'll not bother to rejoin his appreciably less accurate rehash of these aspects of the film.¹⁸ Nor, beyond pointing it out, will I belabor his failure to engage the appreciable portion of my review devoted to discussing how I saw the film as fitting into broader streams of cinematic racism.¹⁹

Haavik's having opted not to rise to the occasion in the latter respect might be seen as a blessing of sorts, at least insofar as we've been collectively spared the wearisome collateral task of debating whether, apart from certain films produced by the Goebbels propaganda ministry, cinematic racism actually exists.²⁰ Although it is an all but pro forma exercise for analysts to acknowledge its pervasiveness in the abstract, it is all but impossible to identify a director, or even a significant film distributed in the United States or Canada, one or a dozen "responsible" scholars do not defend against

charges of racism. I mean, we *do* recall, don't we, that Elliot Silverstein's 1970 monstrosity, *A Man Called Horse*, was endorsed by no less than the Smithsonian Institution as "the most accurate movie ever made about Indians"?²¹ Or that it has been argued in all seriousness that the iconically racist John Ford was actually an *antiracist* for having excised a single reverse-angle camera shot from a sequence showing a Native woman being kicked down a hill in *The Searchers* (1956)?²²

Even D. W. Griffith, the director who concocted *Birth of a Nation* (1915), an epic valorization of the Ku Klux Klan emblazoned on the silver screen during a period when lynching and other forms of Klan violence were endemic, and which is credited in no small part with the Klan's explosive growth to some three million members by the mid-1920s, is largely absolved of racism by Richard Schickel, his most "authoritative" biographer.²³ Among the rationalizations most commonly employed to excuse *Birth of a Nation* and its director have been, from the moment of its release, not only the extent of its aesthetic achievements but also the supposedly astonishing degree of "accuracy" in its historical depictions.²⁴ Those purveying the latter view included noted Princeton historian *cum* President of the United States Woodrow Wilson, who declaimed that the film was "like history written in lightning," and that his "only regret [was] that it's all so true."²⁵

The similarities between Haavik's argument in defense of Beresford and *Black Robe* and that employed by Professor/President Wilson on behalf of Griffith and *Birth of a Nation* are striking. Now that I'm chuckling once again—this time at the idea of Haavik's having expended fifteen pages purporting to "correct" what was said in the barely four pages of my review devoted to what I saw/see as the historical/cultural inaccuracies with which *Black Robe* is laden—it might be useful to examine the nature of the sources on which Haavik relies to make his case that virtually everything Beresford depicts is either true or "essentially" so.²⁶

As foreground, it is worth remarking that his exposition in this regard reduces to little more than a relentless regurgitation of what "Du Creux tells" us, how "Richter views" things, what "Sagard recounts," the way "Sutton presents" an issue, what "Kenneth Morrison calls" something else, who "Isaac Jogues name[d] as his tormentors," what "Bressani's 1653 account . . . confirms," how "Radisson's account" differs, what "Parkman states," and so on. Notes 4–86 attend the material, which spans pages 98–112 of his commentary. Therein, he manages by my own hurried count to reference the *Jesuit Relations* on no fewer than twenty-seven occasions (often with whole strings of pinpoint citations), Du Creux's *History of Canada* fourteen times, Parkman's *The Jesuits in North America* thirteen times, and Richter's *Ordeal of the Longhouse* a dozen times. Radisson's *Voyages* is cited on ten occasions, Sagard's *Le grande voyage* on eight, and Brandão's *Nation Iroquois* is cited five times. Moogk's *La Nouvelle France*, Fenton's *Great Law*, and Sutton's *Introduction to Native North Americans* are cited three times apiece, while Champlain's *Voyages*, Greer's *People of New France*, and Morrison's *Solidarity of Kin* are cited twice each. Several other works—Pritchard's *No Word for Time* and White's *The Middle Ground*, for example—are also cited.²⁷

Despite their apparent diversity, Haavik's references are bound together by a rather significant common denominator: With the exception of a passing reference to Wendat historian Georges Sioui's *Huron-Wendat*, there is not a single emic (or "endogenous")—that is, *Native*—source among them.²⁸ Thus, his version of "setting the record straight" about the traditional authority of women in the Haudenosaunee confederation, for example, means turning to the *Jesuit Relations* and/or later Euro-American/Euro-Canadian interpreters without so much as a sideways glance at the recent book on that very topic by Seneca scholar Barbara Mann.²⁹ Presumably, had he deigned to acknowledge her existence, Haavik would have been willing to concede that, like me, Mann occasionally had "something of a point" —in her case, about herself—insofar as her observations occasionally coincide with those reflected in his strictly etic (or "exogenous") sources.³⁰

The same principle pertains with respect to Haavik's other "corrections," each element of which—from his "confirmation" that torture was ubiquitous in Native societies, to his explanations of the subtler shades of indigenous spiritual belief—he pronounces to be verified, or a least "verifiable," on the basis of "[v]irtually *all* sources, both primary and modern [emphasis added]," yet *none* of which happen to have originated in the societies whose traditions are supposedly "revealed" and "confirmed."³¹ To be sure, Haavik's assertion is wildly—and, one would hope, transparently—overstated. Even in terms of European/Euro-derivative material, Haavik comes nowhere near rehearsing "virtually all sources," primary *or* modern, relevant to *any* of the matters he discusses.³² It follows that, whatever his claims to the contrary, Haavik has been highly selective even with respect to which etic sources he cites.

Adapting the same technique to the context of Reconstruction—that is, relying on exclusively white Southern sources, and selectively at that—one could as easily "verify" that recently freed black slaves indulged in the wholesale rape of white women throughout the former Confederacy and were innately inclined to continue doing so, thereby creating the illusion that the Klan's "retaliatory" violence not only enjoyed a "rational" basis but also was perhaps in certain respects even "noble."³³ Similarly, by deploying a carefully selected array of exclusively gentile sources, one might create the appearance that one had "confirmed the truth" of the "blood libel legend" of Jewish ritual murder, thereby fostering the (mis)impression that the virulent anti-Judaism manifested in Europe from the Middle Ages onward, although perhaps "excessive" at times, was ultimately a "reasonable" response to an altogether sinister reality.³⁴

That this last was precisely the approach to "scholarship" taken by an uncomfortably large segment of the German professoriate during the Nazi era appears not to bother Haavik in the least.³⁵ Certainly he offers no comment on the matter, to which portions of my review plainly opened the door, and which is frequently explored in the broader body of my work with which he professes considerable familiarity.³⁶ Instead, having imposed his preferred set of primary documents and "experts" as the be-all and end-all authorities on American Indian subject matters, Haavik proceeds to wax indignant that a Native scholar might display the effrontery of turning the tables a bit: "Despite

his eagerness to point out the faults in European civilization, Churchill is less than completely knowledgeable about it."

This snide observation was prompted by a comparison I supposedly made of what Haavik refers to as *The Protocol of the Elders of Zion*—actually, it's *Protocols* (plural; take *that*, Mr. Spellchecker)—to *Black Robe*. The "Protocol," an "infamous work of anti-Semitism, was originally written not in Tsarist Russia as [Churchill] claims," he sniffs in note 68, "but in France during the time of Napoleon III, from where it was later copied by the Tsarist police." Once again, a fit of giggles threatens to take hold, not so much because of the near-record number of inaccuracies Haavik manages to compress into a mere pair of sentences but due to the haughty tone of condescension in which he delivers them. Really, had he *meant* to impersonate Miss Shively—or engage in some other bizarre form of self-parody—he could hardly have done a better job.

For openers, I didn't compare *Black Robe* to the *Protocols*; the comparison was to some of the sources on which Beresford based the film.³⁷ Nor, although my phrasing might have been crisper, did I claim the *Protocols* were "originally written in Tsarist Russia." What I said was that the document was "fabricated . . . by the Czarist political police," then disseminated by said police "in Russia during the early-20th century."³⁸ It gets better. Although I have no idea where Haavik got *his* information—he cites no references in this instance—the source I cited states:

1897–1899

Most likely date for fabrication of the *Protocols* in Paris, supervised by Pytor Ivanovich Rachtovsky, the head of the Russian secret police (*Okhrana*) abroad [emphasis added].³⁹

On the same page, it is indicated that initial distribution of an abbreviated version of the *Protocols* occurred in Russia through Pavolachi Krushevan, a suspected Okhrana cutout, in 1903, and that the full text was initially published in 1905, again in Russia and again by an Okhrana collaborator (or operative), Sergei Nilus.⁴⁰ Although this sketch of actors and events is more detailed than that in my review, there is nothing in the least inconsistent with what I wrote in the first place. Unlike Haavik, I even got the title right. Hence, although it is undoubtedly true that I'm "less than completely knowledgeable about . . . European civilization"—actually, I'm unaware of having ever claimed to be *completely* knowledgeable about *anything*—it seems fair to observe that I am, in some respects at least, noticeably more knowledgeable than my critic.

Alright, enough already. We've arrived at the moment when I'm supposed to ask what we are to make of all this. As in, why was Haavik so eager to demonstrate that I know nothing of European history that he would go rushing off so-clearly marked a factual cliff? And, like any good trial attorney, it is to be expected that I'd never pose such questions unless I already knew the answers (or believe I did). But first I must be coy, offering possibilities leading toward the answers rather than the answers themselves so that, when I bear down,

the jury will be convinced that I'm merely affirming conclusions they reached on their own. Ah, the games we scholars are forced to play (all in pursuit of "knowledge," to be sure).

At any rate, here goes: Could it be that Haavik's aforementioned eagerness was born of the same reasons that rendered him so hell-bent on proving that Beresford faithfully adhered to the "history" set forth in the *Jesuit Relations* and the like, even though that was a substantial part of *my* point from the outset?⁴¹ Could it be, therefore, that his commentary was never really intended as a "defense of *Black Robe*" at all—after all, the film requires no defense in that respect, or at least not from me—but, rather, that the "defense" more accurately serves as a vehicle on which to assert that the "history" embodied in the *Jesuit Relations*, and other such sources, *is itself true*? That his purpose is to show that *any* sort of historical/cultural understanding diverging from *that* "record"—including those of the grassroots American Indians who Haavik obliquely acknowledges in his first note as having participated in the "national outcry" that was "almost triggered" when *Black Robe* was released in Canada—are, by definition, "false"?⁴²

Put another way, could it be that Haavik actually agrees with the view expressed by one of the "scholarly authorities" on whom he relies most heavily, that is, that "Indian traditions of historical events are usually almost worthless"?⁴³ Could it thus be that, in substance, what Haavik is actually peddling is a return to those glorious days when self-anointed Great White Experts such as himself could expect to evoke no appreciable dissonance when asserting that although Native people knew nothing beyond the immediacy of their own circumstances, the Experts know—and have *always* known—"more about Indians than Indians know about themselves"; even that what little Indians might know about themselves is "owed" to the Experts who have studied and "documented" them?⁴⁴ Could it possibly be? It is time to dredge a little deeper.

Far from being aberrant or exceptional, the virulently Eurocentric construction of scholarly propriety just described has been the normative standard of the American historical profession since its mid-nineteenth-century inception in the triumphalist narratives of Francis Parkman, obviously one of the "authorities" most preferred by Haavik (to say nothing of Miss Shively, who, as I recall, had committed several of ol' Frank's screeds more or less to memory). This being so, it seems quite appropriate to quote the assessment of Parkman and his work by prominent ethnohistorian Francis Jennings, one of numerous Euro-American scholars whose work was conspicuously absent from Haavik's supposedly all-encompassing roster: "Parkman was a racist of the venomous type who did not hesitate to falsify his source materials to make them support his Social Darwinist conceptions."⁴⁵

According to Jennings, it was Parkman, whose purpose was to "show that the Iroquois were the 'highest type' of Indian only in order to condemn that height for being so irredeemably low," who, plagiarizing Cadwallader Colden, popularized the "gothically lurid tale of Iroquois ferocity and terrorism [although] there was hardly a word of verifiable truth in the whole frenzied outcry."⁴⁶ Despite the fraudulence of his work—or perhaps because

of it—Parkman's outsized reputation was grounded on "the pretensions of Boston's Brahmins to omniscience in history."⁴⁷ His associates trumpeted Bostonian Parkman as America's greatest historian—and this nonsense is still maintained by persons who do not compare his writings with their sources.⁴⁸

Although more respectable scholars challenged the validity of Parkman's ugly fables even at the time, it was to no avail.⁴⁹ By the early twentieth century, such fare had congealed into what analyst Peter Charles Hoffer has recently described as a form of "consensus history," the myriad "fabrications, falsehoods, and plagiarism"—not to mention the utility—of which essentially "immunized it from criticism in [the] elite and learned circles" of American society.⁵⁰ It became dogma, in effect, a vital hegemonic component of the explicitly white supremacist US status quo.⁵¹ So it remained until the second half of the 1960s, when a unique combination of circumstances—the civil rights movement's successful abolition of apartheid in the Deep South, a whole series of spectacular rebellions by African Americans in cities across the country, the emergence of a mass movement opposing the war in Indochina (and the looming US defeat in that region), and an increasingly demonstrated willingness of students to literally shut down the universities rather than allow the process of indoctrination as usual to continue—laid the foundation on which an "academic revolution" of sorts was accomplished.⁵²

It was against this backdrop, especially the protracted and highly confrontational "Third World Strike" by students at San Francisco State College during the 1968–69 academic year, an outright revolt mounted by African American historians like Vincent Harding and Sterling Stuckey during the annual meeting of the Organization of American Historians (OAH) in 1969, and a comparable insurgency mounted by radical historians at the American Historical Association (AHA) meeting the same year, that previously voiceless/invisible constituencies were finally able to begin the process of freeing themselves from the suffocating domination of the Great White Experts, establishing entire disciplines and/or vectors within disciplines devoted to the critical interrogation, deconstruction, and transcendence of orthodoxy.⁵³

"In all, perhaps as many as five hundred colleges and universities had established Black Studies programs by the early 1970s," with other components of what soon became known as "Ethnic Studies" following in the wake.⁵⁴ When, in March 1970, the First Convocation of American Indian Scholars was held at Princeton, there were only two hundred participants (including thirty-six students and "ten non-Indian scholars representing various disciplines") and only seven American Indian Studies (AIS) Programs in the United States.⁵⁵ Fifteen years later, according to Susan Guyette and Charlotte Heth, there were roughly one hundred AIS programs operating in twenty-four states.⁵⁶ Although these varied tremendously in terms of quality and of purpose, the gains had been sufficient to unleash a wave of increasingly autochthonous Native scholarship.⁵⁷

By now that initial wave has long since crested, forming in its wake a maturing body of explicitly anticolonialist research intended to facilitate the consolidation of a libratory indigenous intelligentsia functioning on the basis of what Elizabeth Cook-Lynn has recently—and rather bombastically—

described as “an ethno-endogenous epistemological empowerment model.”⁵⁸ This process of intellectually “clearing a path” to liberation by thoroughly “decolonizing the mind” of those claiming the mantle of American Indian Studies has been as hard-fought as it has been tentatively successful, but the latter is a circumstance that can by no means be taken for granted.⁵⁹ The important but nonetheless rather modest gains achieved by those who built AIS over the past forty years are and have always been subject to repeal.⁶⁰

Since the outset, there has been no shortage of Great White Experts eager to reassert their dominion over American Indian subject matters, mainly by seeking to discredit the scholarly integrity of the Native scholars who displaced them. Witness, for example, the attacks mounted by the Smithsonian’s then-ranking scribbler of “American Indianist” history, Wilcomb E. Washburn, on (re)interpretations undertaken by Indians. These began during the early 1970s, when Colonel Washburn pronounced himself appalled by the affront to the “traditions of Western scholarship” embodied in Nez Perce tribal historian Allen Slickpoo’s assertion while recounting his people’s past that, “It is our culture and history and we don’t have to prove it to anyone by footnoting.”⁶¹ By the end of the decade, Washburn’s complaints had become far more strident.

Journals like *Akwesasne Notes* would publish historical accounts purporting to be scholarly to show that the elective process was a trick foisted upon unwilling and unknowing tribal societies to prevent the true leaders from emerging. Such articles would be published even when the authors were aware of their falsity. Such is the account of Hopi history published in *Akwesasne Notes* in serial form, in the issues of Spring, Summer, and Winter 1979, that had been produced by Tim Coulter’s Indian Law Resource Center. . . . When I personally pointed out to Mr. Coulter prior to publication that his facts were all wrong about the numbers voting in Hopi elections in the 1930s, and gave him a copy of my article, “On the Trail of the Activist Anthropologist” (1979), Coulter nonetheless allowed the [Hopi piece] to run without even calling attention to my article, much less refuting it. . . . It is this sort of casual ignoring of truth that I find all too common among those propagandists—I will not call them historians—who struggle to convince readers of their particular views of Indian history.⁶²

Although Washburn never quite managed to summon the same degree of outrage—or *any* that was discernible in his published work—over the lies peddled so systematically by Francis Parkman and others for more than a century, by 1981 he was busily assailing the “lack of balance” evident in the work of American Indian historians Jack Forbes and Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz.⁶³ The colonel has had plenty of help over the years since then, not least from his protégé, James Axtell, who devoted an entire essay to rebutting the notion that Indians might not have invented scalping, and, like his mentor, has been at great pains to deny that genocide has been perpetrated against North America’s indigenous peoples.⁶⁴ By the 1990s, this had become something of

a chorus, as, among others, both Steven Katz and Guenter Lewy took time out from "proving" that *nobody* other than Jews under the nazis had ever suffered "true" genocide to pay special attention to "The Indian Question."⁶⁵

Then there's Paul Martin, who discovered that "paleoindians" were responsible for the extinction of the woolly mammoth and the saber-toothed cat (apparently using rocks and sticks to beat these hugely fearsome beasts into oblivion).⁶⁶ He was followed by Shepard Krech, who, contrary to Indians' conception of their traditional cultures as having been/being environmentally enlightened and sustainable, has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the usual cast of anonymous peer reviewers (which may or may not have included the ghost of Miss Shively, although I'm betting pretty heavily that it did) that Native peoples had instead initiated a full-fledged ecological catastrophe long before the first European boat washed up on a beach half-a-world away from where they thought they were (and were thus bestowed with titles like "Great Navigator").⁶⁷

Were one inclined to accept such fables, or perhaps the recent and lavishly produced demonstration of indigenous cannibalism penned by University of Arizona Regents Professor of Anthropology Christy G. Turner II and his late wife Jacqueline, one must first confront the fact that American Indians are, according to another anthropologist, James A. Clifton, whose views on the matter have been heartily endorsed by a journalist named Fergus Bordewich, merely a "cultural fiction," "invented" by imaginative white men for reasons left somewhat less than clear.⁶⁸ Such Great Mysteries aside, there would seem to be something to the Clifton/Bordewich thesis, given that perfectly "reputable" scientists like the University of Arizona's redoubtable Vance Haynes, reverting to nineteenth-century methods of skull measurement coupled with theories of migration drawn from the same period, have lately determined that "paleoindians" weren't really Indians at all, but rather "proto-Caucasians"—read, white guys—all of them endowed with a schnozz rivaling that of Gérard Depardieu.⁶⁹ Maybe that's how Europeans managed to pass along to Indians the concept of "Mother Earth."⁷⁰

It should be emphasized that although a lot of this should be funny—as in, utterly absurd—I'm no longer laughing. I'm not even cracking a smile at this point. That's because this persistent undertow of white supremacist irredentism has been gathering mass and momentum over the past few years, to the point that, to steal a line from Michael Herr's overdub narrative in *Apocalypse Now*, one now "needs wings to stay above it" (or in front of it, as the case may be). Less amusing still has been the response of all too many purported AIS practitioners in the face of the burgeoning campaign by the Great White Experts to reassert their dominion and, with it, the primacy of their self-celebratory narrative.⁷¹

A decade after Cook-Lynn asked "Who Stole Native American Studies?" the answer has become all too abundantly clear. It will be found in the ever-increasing premium placed on *professionalism*—a term meaning to "fit in" with, and thus be accepted by, the very "institutional culture" AIS and its counterparts were originally meant to displace, transform, or at least offset—on the part of those now heading or finding berths in the remaining

AIS programs and “concentrations.”⁷² In turn, this has led to the formation of “American Indian Scholars Associations” and the like, the main activity of which has been passing resolutions concerning who is/isn’t entitled to enjoy the exalted status of membership rather than engaging in the sort of straightforward challenge(s) to “consensus” scholarship that gave rise to AIS in the first place.⁷³

To conclude, I should perhaps offer a humble proposal on how we might go about initiating something of a return to the first principles of our rapidly disappearing discipline. How about the critiques of Great White Expert wannabes like Kristof Haavik being published in the preeminent *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* at a rate identical to that at which even the most senior AIS scholars are published in, say, the *American Historical Review* (which is to say, virtually never)?⁷⁴ Too “radical”? Perhaps. And perhaps, to paraphrase a paraphrase of T. S. Elliot by Russell Thornton, American Indian Studies, after all the struggle and sacrifice it took to create, it is destined to go out “not with a bang but with a whimper.”⁷⁵ Once again, we will have allowed ourselves to become “slaves of the white myth.”⁷⁶ If so, the punch line to Haavik’s rather clumsy little joke will be that it has been on us, with all the Miss Shivelys of this world gleefully looking on.

NOTES

1. Maurice Kenny, *Blackrobe: Isaac Jogues* (Saranac Lake, NY: North Country Community College Press, 1982), 61.

2. Ward Churchill, “And They Did It Like Dogs in the Dirt,” *Z Magazine* 5, no. 12 (December 1992): 20–24; collected in Ward Churchill, *From a Native Son: Selected Essays in Indigenism, 1985–1995* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1996), 423–87.

3. Jeez, guys, I was only being sarcastic. Before I’m accused of “fabricating an historical incident” here, be it known that although Priscilla Buffalohead’s “Farmers, Warriors, Traders: A Fresh Look at Ojibway Women” is quite real—it was published in *Minnesota History* 48, no. 6 (Summer 1983): 236–44—I’m aware of nothing to indicate that Lynne Cheney ever wrote a critique of it, or even that Lynne Cheney knows how to write.

For background on this case, see my essay, “The Myth of Academic Freedom: Personal Experiences of a Liberal Principle in a Neoconservative Era (Fragments of a Work in Progress),” *Social Text* 25, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 17–40. More broadly, see John K. Wilson, *The Myth of Political Correctness: The Conservative Attack on Higher Education* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995); Henry Giroux, *Against the New Authoritarianism: Politics after Abu Ghraib* (Winnipeg, MB: Arbiter Ring, 2005); Beshara Doumani, ed., *Academic Freedom after September 11* (New York: Zone Books, 2006).

4. Given its exposure in forty-one consecutive installments of *The O’Reilly Factor* during the spring of 2005 and more than five hundred major articles in the print media, to say nothing of virtually endless coverage in the blogosphere, I won’t bother to explain the “issues” supposedly involved. For those interested, however, my responses to the investigating committee on the “Fort Clark smallpox question” will be released in book form by the end of 2008.

5. The sexuality of “Others,” and/or the assignment of it, seems to be a stan-

dard preoccupation in colonialist constructions. For a genuinely brilliant exposition and analysis, see Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995), esp. 75–131.

My reference here is to Kenneth M. Morrison’s description on p. 95 of his *The Solidarity of Kin: Ethnohistory, Religious Studies, and the Algonkian-French Encounter* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), quoted approvingly by Haavik at p. 102 of this commentary. In note 29 of my original review, I discussed the implications I drew from a then-recent visit to an exhibition of the Torture Museum in Amsterdam, where I had an opportunity to view the full array of grotesque devices, the wholesale use of which became socially ubiquitous under the system emblemized by Grand Inquisitor Tomàs Torquemada. For a good overview of a bona fide societal “torture complex,” see Miroslav Hroch and Anna Skybová, *Ecclesia Militans: The Inquisition* (New York: Dorset Press, 1988).

6. See, e.g., John Block Friedman, *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 197–207.

7. This, too, appears to be standard in all colonialist constructions. See generally, Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982). Or, to approach the matter from another angle, see Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), 90–118.

8. This might be construed as a tip, not only to Haavik but also to “Professor Walter Fleming of Montana State University,” per chance he has occasion to provide “indispensable . . . guidance and advice” to another “scholar of French and Francophone African literature”—or perhaps of Mongolian throat singing—writing on American Indian subject matters while she/he is busily “shaping [her/his] study into its final form”; Haavik commentary, 97, 115.

9. Note 69 in Haavik’s commentary.

10. Deborah Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* (New York: Free Press, 1993), 212–13.

11. Yes, I’ve once again, and this time intentionally, misspelled Fr. Laforgue’s name. In the process, I mean not to be flip—or snotty—but rather to register a bitter chuckle over the premium Haavik so obviously places on precision in the handling of *European* languages, even as he ignores the fact that although it has been claimed that the sole significant “historical departure” in *Black Robe* is that “the actors playing French characters . . . speak English,” most of the “authentic” Native verbiage heard in the film is Cree, a language spoken by *none* of the peoples portrayed therein. This was brought up in my original review—see Churchill, *From a Native Son*, 426—and, in my estimation, the fact that Haavik leaves the matter entirely unmentioned speaks volumes.

12. Haavik commentary, 99.

13. On the use of sexual symbolism by the Church to connote degeneracy/inferiority in “Others,” see, e.g., Friedman, *Monstrous Races*, 204–6. For secular colonialist adaptations, see, e.g., McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 22–23. For the broader paradigm of interpretation, see, e.g., Roy Harvey Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), esp. 76–104.

14. I readily acknowledge that, as Haavik says in his note 71 someone on the *AICRJ* staff pointed out to him, the station occupied by Mestigoit *could* be taken as

indicating the extent to which indigenous societies honored rather than scorned the physically exceptional. I would argue that this is exactly what the real-life historical example *does* indicate. However, to expect that such an appreciation might somehow be imparted to a general audience, all but completely unversed in the nuances of Native tradition, through the medium of *Beresford's* representation, borders on delusion. Actually, Haavik appears by and large to agree with me in this instance, observing how, in *Beresford's* depiction, "Mestigoit does seem repugnant or simply silly" (Haavik commentary, 106).

15. McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 181–203. For a study specifically focused on the manner in which such dynamics have played out in North America, see Rebecca Blevins Faery, *Cartographies of Desire: Captivity, Race, and Sex in the Shaping of the American Nation* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), esp. 8–18, 176–90.

16. Here, I'm using the word *deny* in the clinical sense explained by Léon Wurmser in his "Cultural Paradigms of Denial," in eds. E. L. Edelstein, Donald L. Nathanson, and Andrew M. Stone, *Denial: A Clarification of Concepts and Research* (New York: Plenum Press, 1989), 277–86. More accessibly, see Stanley Cohen, *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), esp. 37–41, 124–39.

17. Haavik commentary, 99.

18. As is shown in the citation in note 1, the review takes up fourteen pages of my *From a Native Son*—roughly the same page size and format as *AICRJ*—including more than three pages of notes. Of the slightly less than eleven pages of text, six (423–29) are devoted all but exclusively to this purpose, including rather more extensive quotation of favorable reviews than Haavik offers.

"Even Churchill concedes that it is 'a truly magnificent achievement' in terms of the physical realism of the scenery, sets, and costumes" (Haavik commentary, 98).

One problem with Haavik's analysis is that, as he makes abundantly clear in his first note, he adopts a pose of "scholarly neutrality"—i.e., "objectivity"—wherein the perpetrator society's assessments of the facts/meaning embodied in the genocidal processes to which American Indians have been subjected are treated as being of a validity equal to those of the target societies. Anyone endorsing this as a "reasonable" approach would, if they were to avoid subscribing to the most blatant of double standards, be logically/ethically required to follow the same procedure when considering the facts/meaning of the nazi Judeo-cide. For analysis in the latter context, see Michael Burleigh, ed., *Confronting the Nazi Past: New Debates on Modern German History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996). For a broad, detailed, and utterly devastating exposure of the pretensions of orthodox historiography in the United States, see Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

19. In Churchill, *From a Native Son*, 433–34, I discuss the function of nazi films, such as *The Eternal Jew*, in conditioning the German public to accept a genocide of which it was intended they not become aware until after the fact, arguing that films like *Black Robe* fulfill a similar purpose in North America. About this, Haavik says nothing at all. Similarly, although I twice quote Vincent Canby for purposes of placing him among the openly—and viciously—anti-Indian critics who enthusiastically endorsed *Black Robe* as a "powerful antidote" to the "hopelessly . . . pro-Indian romanticism" of films like *Dances with Wolves* (*From a Native Son*, 427–28), Haavik blandly lists Canby's

review in his first note as being among the "more positive" assessments of Beresford's film. It should be emphasized—again, for purposes of clarity—that my own position should not be equated with an endorsement of the Costner film; for my critique of *that*, see "Lawrence of South Dakota: *Dances with Wolves* and the Maintenance of American Empire," *From a Native Son*, 419–22. And, just to make the record complete, I've endorsed neither *The Mission* (1986) nor *Last of the Mohicans* (1992), as Haavik implies in his note 15.

20. See Eric Rentschler, *The Ministry of Illusion: Nazi Cinema and Its Afterlife* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), esp. 215–23. Also see David Stewart Hull, *Film in the Third Reich: Art and Propaganda in Nazi Germany* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969), esp. 157–77; Linda Schulte-Sasse, *Entertaining the Third Reich: Illusions of Wholeness in Nazi Cinema* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996), esp. 268–73.

21. See Jacquelyn Kilpatrick, *Celluloid Indians: Native Americans and Film* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 81–82; Ward Churchill, "American Indians in Film: Thematic Contours of Cinematic Colonization," in *Reversing the Lens: Ethnicity, Race, Gender, and Sexuality Through Film*, eds. Jun Xing and Lane Ryo Hirabayashi (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2003), 78–80.

22. Peter Lehman, "Looking at Look's Missing Reverse Shot: Psychoanalysis and Style in John Ford's *The Searchers*," in *The Western Reader*, eds. Jim Kitses and Gregg Rickman (New York: Limelight Editions, 1998), 259–68. *The Searchers*, by the way, gets my vote for being one of the three most grotesquely anti-Indian films ever made.

23. Instead, Griffith is presented as being "at some pains to stress the unconscious cruelty of the times"; Richard Schickel, *D. W. Griffith: An American Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), 88; also see 234–37, 282–300, 384, 390. On the rate/nature of Klan atrocities during the period, see Stewart E. Tolnay and E. M. Beck, *A Festival of Violence: An Analysis of Southern Lynchings, 1882–1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), esp. 166–201. On the Klan's peak membership during the mid-1920s, see David M. Chalmers, *Hooded Americanism: The History of the Ku Klux Klan* (1965; repr., Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1981), 291. On the role of *Birth of a Nation* in stimulating the Klan's tremendous surge in membership between 1915 and 1920, see Wyn Craig Wade, *The Fiery Cross: The Ku Klux Klan in America* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), 119–39.

24. On the aesthetic side of things, see, e.g., Tom Gunning, *D. W. Griffith and the Origins of American Narrative Film: The Early Years at Biograph* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994).

25. Quoted in Wade, *Fiery Cross*, 126. For a useful counterpoint, see Thomas R. Cripps, "The Reaction of the Negro to the Motion Picture *Birth of a Nation*," *Historian* 25, no. 3 (May 1963): 344–62, esp. 347. For insight into the extent to which important aspects of the relevant history were falsified by Griffith, Wilson, and the press, see Herbert Shapiro, *White Violence and Black Response: From Reconstruction to Montgomery* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), esp. 5–63, 97.

26. The four pages include my discussion of how Beresford represented Native sexuality (Churchill, *From a Native Son*, 429–33). Haavik's "rebuttal" spans pp. 98–108 of his commentary.

27. In the interest of space, readers are referred to the full citations contained in Haavik's annotation.

28. The book at issue is Georges E. Sioui, *Huron-Wendat: The Heritage of the Circle*

(Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1999). Haavik quotes a phrase from it at p. 108 of his commentary, and cites it in his notes 76 and 88.

The term *emic*, used mainly in anthropology, refers to those situated within a culture. For usage, see, e.g., Beatrice Medicine, "Ella Deloria: The Emic Voice," *Melus* 7, no. 4 (Winter 1980): 23–30. More lately, it has become fashionable to employ the more esoteric-sounding term *endogenous*, which means the same thing. According to one observer, although she cites a publication dated 1998, Russell Thornton first employed the term to describe American Indian scholarship "thirty years ago." See Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, *New Indians, Old Wars* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2007), 117; citing Thornton's "Institutional and Intellectual Histories of Native American Studies," in *Studying Native America: Problems and Prospects*, ed. Russell Thornton (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998), page number omitted.

29. Barbara Alice Mann, *Iroquoian Women: The Gantowisas* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000). See esp. the sections "Distortions in the Sources," "The Origins of Distortion," and "Resistance to Correction," 22–28.

30. Haavik commentary, 100, 103. The meanings of these terms are exactly the opposite of those explained in note 28.

31. Haavik commentary, 104. The entirely predictable response is that the emic view is absent because the Native peoples involved were not literate and oral histories are "unreliable" and "inaccessible." To the former, I reply that they are certainly less unreliable than the inaccuracies and outright lies often committed to paper. In rebutting the latter, I would point out that appreciable portions of oral tradition—i.e., what Indians *said*, not what Europeans thought of them—were recorded in writing at least as far back as the early 1600s and retrievable in that form by any scholar finding such material important enough to do the archival work necessary to dig it out; see, e.g., Barbara Alice Mann, ed., *Native American Speakers of the Eastern Woodlands: Selected Speeches and Critical Analyses* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001). I would also point out that oral history is an ongoing, living process among Native peoples, one that is always accessible to *us*. Custodians of the traditional histories *could* be treated as credible sources any time non-Indian historians decided to treat them as such. The form assumed is not always verbal. The custodians can, and sometimes do, elect to make their knowledge available in written form, albeit on their own terms. An excellent example of this is *Noon nee-me-poo (We, the Nez Percés): Culture and History of the Nez Percés* (Lapwai, ID: Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, 1972), written by Nez Perce tribal historian Allen P. Slickpoo Sr., in collaboration with Deward E. Walker Jr.

32. In this regard, among the contemporary sources most conspicuously omitted by Haavik are Anthony F. C. Wallace, *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969); Bruce G. Trigger, *The Children of Aataentsic: A History of the Huron People to 1660*, 2 vols. (Montréal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1976); and Francis Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from its Beginnings to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1984), all three of which provide historical/cultural interpretations sharply at odds with Haavik's (see, e.g., notes 46–49 and attendant text).

33. Faery, *Cartographies of Desire*, 180, 206; Angela Y. Davis, "Rape, Racism, and the Myth of the Black Rapist," in *Women, Race, and Class* (New York: Random House, 1981), 172–201. Also see Stephen J. Whitfield, ed., "The Ideology of Lynching," in *A Death in the Delta: The Story of Emmett Till* (New York: Free Press, 1988), 1–14.

34. See Ernest A. Rappaport, *Anti-Judaism: A Psychohistory* (Chicago: Perspectives Press, 1975); Alan Dundes, ed., *The Blood Libel Legend: A Casebook in Anti-Semitic Folklore* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991). It will be noted that I, like Rappaport, employ the term *anti-Judaism* rather than the far more common *anti-Semitic*. This is because Arabs, no less than Jews, are Semitic peoples. To restrict application of the term exclusively to Jews, as is customary, is thus a de facto denial of Arab identity and has resulted in such absurdities as Arab opposition to Israeli policies as being characterized as anti-Semitic. The problem is especially acute in its effects on Palestinians. See generally, Rashid Khalidi, *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).

35. For an early, and in some respects still unexcelled, survey, see Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes against the Jewish People* (New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute, 1946). There are also several recent studies focusing on specific disciplines. See, e.g., James R. Dow and Hannjost Lixfeld, eds., *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline: Folklore in the Third Reich* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994); Gretchen E. Schafft, *From Racism to Genocide: Anthropology in the Third Reich* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004); Alan E. Steinweis, *Studying the Jew: Scholarly Antisemitism in Nazi Germany* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), esp. 64–91.

36. See again the first paragraph of Haavik's commentary (97).

37. Churchill, *From a Native Son*, 433. What I *did* compare the film to, at least in terms of its depiction of Native sexuality, was Ruth Beebe Hill's notorious *Hanta Yo: An American Saga* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979), citing Bea Medicine's critique in support ("Hanta Yo: A New Phenomenon," *The Indian Historian* 12, no. 2 [1979]: 2–5). On this, Haavik maintains a discrete silence, however. See Churchill, *From a Native Son*, 435n38.

38. Churchill, *From a Native Son*, 437n40.

39. Binjamin W. Segel, *A Lie and a Libel: The History of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995 [trans. of 1926 original *Welt-Kreig, Welt-Revolution, Welt-Verschwörung, Welt-Oberregierung*]), xi. Also see Norman Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide: The Myth of the Jewish World Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, 2nd ed. (London: Serif, 1996), 85, 90, 94–95, 116–17.

40. Segel, *A Lie and a Libel*, xi. On Nilus's connection to Rachtovsky, and thus to Okhrana, see Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide*, 90, 94–95; on Krushevan, see *ibid.*, 118–20.

41. See the context of my own reference to the *Jesuit Relations* in Churchill, *From a Native Son*, 429, 436n31. In this connection, I also referenced George M. Wrong's two-volume *The Rise and Fall of New France* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1928), a work that would fit quite comfortably within what I take to be Haavik's paradigm of "proper" sources.

42. Quoting Angela Aleiss, *Making the White Man's Indian: Native Americans and Hollywood Movies* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2005), 156.

43. Francis Parkman, *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1909), 164.

44. See, e.g., Wendy Rose, "The Great Pretenders: Further Reflections on Whitemaniamism," in *The State of Native America: Colonization, Genocide, and Resistance*, ed. M. Annette Jaimes (Boston: South End Press, 1992), 406. To be fair, Rose is referring to anthropologists rather than historians, although the distinction is often of little consequence to Native people. See, e.g., Thomas Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman,

eds., *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997). For further background, see David Hurst Thomas, *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity* (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

45. Jennings, *Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, 19; citing John Fiske, "Francis Parkman," *Atlantic Monthly* 73 (1894), 664–74; reprinted as the introductory essay in Francis Parkman, *The Works of Francis Parkman*, 20 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1897), 1:xi–xli. More broadly, see Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), esp. 1–20, 73–78, 151–53.

46. Jennings, *Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, 18–19. The material Jennings contends Parkman plagiarized—correctly, in my estimation—will be found in Colden's multi-volume *History of the Five Indian Nations of Indians in Canada Depending on the Province of New-York in America* (1727–47; repr., Ithaca, NY: Great Seal Books, 1958).

47. Jennings, *Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, 22.

48. *Ibid.*

49. See, e.g., Edward Manning Ruttenber, *History of the Tribes of the Hudson's River: Their Origin, Manners and Customs* (1872; repr., Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1971).

50. Peter Charles Hoffer, *Past Imperfect: Facts, Fictions, Fraud—American History from Bancroft and Parkman to Ambrose, Bellesiles, Ellis, and Goodman* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004), 17–31. It should be mentioned that Hoffer uses the term *consensus history* in a peculiar way. It is usually employed to describe the triumphalist school centering on the likes of Samuel Eliot Morison, Louis Hartz, and Daniel Boorstein in the cold war context of the 1950s; see, e.g., Gary B. Nash, Charlotte Crabtree, and Ross E. Dunn, *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), 56–8. Hoffer, *Past Imperfect*, 30.

51. My use of terminology is by no means rhetorical; see, e.g., George M. Frederickson, *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study in American and South African History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981). At a broader and more theoretical level, see Robert Young, *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West* (New York: Routledge, 1990). In the specific context of the First Nations of North America, see Richard M. Wheelock, "'The American Story': The Impact of Myth on American Indian Policy," in *Destroying Dogma: Vine Deloria Jr. and His Influence on American Society*, eds. Steve Pavlik and Daniel R. Wildcat (Boulder, CO: Fulcrum, 2006), 105–30.

52. There are a number of studies available. For a standard overview, see Robert Weisbrodt, *Freedom Bound: A History of America's Civil Rights Movement* (New York: Plume, 1990). On particular organizations, see David J. Garrow, *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference 1955–1968* (New York: William Morrow, 1986); August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, *CORE: A Study in the Civil Rights Movement, 1942–1968* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973); Clayborne Carson, *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981); Timothy B. Tyson, *Radio Free Dixie: Robert F. Williams and the Roots of Black Power* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); Lance Hill, *The Deacons for Defense: Armed Resistance and the Civil Rights Movement* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

See generally, Otto Kerner et al., *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1968); David Boesel and Peter H. Rossi, eds., *Cities*

under Siege: An Anatomy of the Ghetto Riots, 1964–1968 (New York: Basic Books, 1971).

There is a rather vast literature on the antiwar movement. Although quite succinct, one of the best pieces is the chapter "The Antiwar Movement We're Supposed to Forget," in H. Bruce Franklin, *Vietnam and Other American Fantasies* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000), 47–70. For more particularized analyses, see W. J. Rorabaugh, *Berkeley at War: The 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Tom Bates, *Rads: The 1970 Bombing of the Army Math Research Center at the University of Wisconsin and Its Aftermath* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1992); Ron Jacobs, *The Way the Wind Blew: A History of the Weather Underground* (New York: Verso, 1997); Andrew E. Hunt, *The Turning: A History of Vietnam Veterans against the War* (New York: New York University Press, 1999).

Again, there are numerous studies. See generally, Irving Louis Horowitz, *The Knowledge Factory: Student Power and Academic Politics in America* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972); Carl Davidson, *The New Radicals in the Multiversity and Other SDS Writings on Student Syndicalism* (1967; repr., Chicago: Charles Kerr, 1990). For good case studies, see Jerry L. Avorn, with Andrew Crane et al., *Up against the Ivy Wall: A History of the Columbia Crisis* (New York: Atheneum Press, 1969); David Lance Goines, *The Free Speech Movement: Coming of Age in the 1960s* (Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press, 1993).

Probably the best overview remains Mitchell Goodman's *The Movement toward a New America: The Beginning of a Long Revolution* (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1970).

53. See Kay Boyle, *The Long Walk at San Francisco State* (New York: Grove Press, 1970).

See August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, *Black History and the Historical Profession, 1915–1980* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 289–98.

On the insurgency at the 1969 AHA meeting, see Jesse Lemisch, "Radicals, Marxists, and Gentlemen: A Memoir of Twenty Years Ago," *Radical Historians Newsletter* 59 (November 1989), 1, 7–8. More broadly, "We should not be surprised . . . at the volatile demonstrations for black studies programs which began around 1967–68, or for the creation of . . . new courses based on radical critiques of American society. Students demanding relevance in scholarship began to be joined in 1968–69 by professors dissenting at the annual ceremonials called Scholarly Meetings: at the American Philosophical Association a resolution denouncing US policy in Vietnam; at the American Political Science Association a new radical caucus making changes in the program; at the American Historical Association, a successful campaign removing the 1968 meeting from Chicago to protest Mayor Daley's hooliganism; at the Modern Language Association, the election of a young radical English teacher to the presidential succession"; Howard Zinn, *The Politics of History*, 2nd ed. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 8.

This proceeded on a variety of fronts. A selection of key texts includes Henry A. Giroux, *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey, 1983); Molefi Kete Asante, *The Afrocentric Idea* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987); Immanuel Wallerstein, *Unthinking Social Science: The Limits of Nineteenth-Century Paradigms* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991); Donald E. Pease, ed., *Revisionary Interventions in the Americanist Canon* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994); Bell Hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Peter McLaren, ed., *Revolutionary Multiculturalism:*

Pedagogies of Dissent for the New Millennium (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997); Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, ed., *Teaching Asian America: Diversity and the Problem of Community* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998); Stanley Aronowitz, *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000).

54. Novick, *That Noble Dream*, 477.

55. American Indian Historical Society, *Indian Voices: The First Convocation of American Indian Scholars* (San Francisco: Indian Historian Press, 1970), vii.

These had “evolved in the past couple of years . . . from the movement of Black and Mexican American studies,” i.e., they were “carved out of a larger and more encompassing program called Ethnic Studies”; W. Roger Buffalohead, “Review and Evaluation: Native American Studies Programs,” in American Indian Historical Society, *Indian Voices*, 162–63. For further background, see Jack Forbes, “Traditional Native American Philosophy and Multicultural Education,” in *Multicultural Education and the American Indian* (Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center, 1979), 3–14.

56. Susan Guyette and Charlotte Heth, *Issues for the Future of American Indian Studies: A Needs Assessment and Program Guide* (Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center, 1985), 113–16.

57. For a comprehensive survey, see *ibid.*, 117–267.

First use of the term *autochthonous* in this connection should probably be attributed to the late John Mohawk. Among the better overviews are Robert Allen Warrior’s *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995); Jace Weaver’s *That the People Might Live: Native American Literatures and Native American Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). On the nature of the struggle for attainment, see, e.g., Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz, “The Context of Colonialism in Writing Native American History,” in *American Indian Issues in Higher Education* (Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center, 1981), 159–66; Vine Deloria Jr., “Revision and Reversion,” in *The American Indian and the Problem of History*, ed. Calvin Martin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 84–90; Angela Cavender Wilson, “American Indian History or Non-Indian Perceptions of History,” in *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians*, ed. Devon A. Mihesuah (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 23–26.

58. First use of the term *intelligentsia* in this context should once again be attributed to John Mohawk. The exemplar of articulation is not an American Indian but rather an indigenous Maori from Aotearoa (New Zealand); see Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1999). For the phrase quoted, see Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, “Defensive, Regulatory, and Transformative Functions of Indian Studies,” in *New Indians, Old Wars*, 116.

59. For the context of the phrases quoted, see Nancy Shoemaker, ed., *Clearing a Path: Theorizing the Past in Native American Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong’o, *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* (London: James Currey, 1986).

60. A recent survey conducted by Professor Robert M. Nelson found that only seventy-nine AIS programs continue to exist in the United States and that two dozen of these were only “concentrations” within other disciplines; Clara Sue Kidwell and Alan Velie, *Native American Studies* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 133.

61. Wilcomb E. Washburn, "Distinguishing History from Moral Philosophy and Public Advocacy," in Martin, *American Indian and the Problem of History*, 96. The offending passage will be found in Slickpoo with Walker, *Noon nee-mee-poo*, 1:viii.

62. Washburn, "Distinguishing History from Moral Philosophy," 94. His self-citation was to his "On the Trail of the Activist Anthropologist: A Response to Jorgensen and Clemmer," *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 7, no. 1 (Spring 1979): 89–99. The "article" upsetting him so badly was the two-hundred-page "Report to the Kikmongwi and Other Traditional Hopi Leaders on Docket 196 and the Continuing Threat to Hopi Land and Sovereignty" (Washington, DC: Indian Law Resource Center, March 1979); retitled "U.S. Colonialism and the Hopi Nation" and serialized in three parts, without annotation as "A History of Dishonor," pt. 1, *Akwesasne Notes* 11, no. 1 (1979): 13–17; "The Creation of the Hopi Tribal Council," pt. 2, *Akwesasne Notes* 11, no. 3 (1979): 17–21; "The Erosion of the Hopi Land Rights," pt. 3, *Akwesasne Notes* 11, no. 5 (1979): 29–30. As it turned out, Washburn's own numbers were wrong.

63. Washburn, "Distinguishing History from Moral Philosophy," 93. The targets of his ire were Jack D. Forbes's *Native Americans and Nixon: Presidential Politics and Minority Self-Determination, 1969–1972* (Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center, 1981), and something by Dunbar Ortiz identified only as "1981:22." (There is no bibliographic entry on the item, whatever it was.)

64. See Axtell's essay, "The Unkindest Cut, or Who Invented Scalping?" in his *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 16–35. At 17–20, Axtell observes that his aim was to directly disprove the understandings enunciated, circa 1820, by the Seneca leader Cornplanter and, subsequently, by Omaha activist/historian Susette La Fleshe, which had been "normalized" by scholars like Ray Fadden, Vine Deloria Jr., Alvin M. Josephy Jr., Leslie Fiedler, and Peter Farb beginning in the late 1960s.

"American policy was not to sterilize Indian women or to carry out a policy of genocide toward the Native American," Washburn, "Distinguishing History from Moral Philosophy," 93. "[We] can stop flogging ourselves with our 'imperialistic' origins and tarring ourselves with the broad brush of 'genocide.' As a huge nation of law and order and increasingly refined sensibility, we are not guilty of murdering Indian women and babies, or branding slaves on the forehead, or claiming any real estate in the world we happen to fancy," says Axtell in his essay, "Moral Reflections on the Columbian Legacy," in *Beyond 1492: Encounters in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 263.

65. At p. 20 of his magnum opus, *The Holocaust in Historical Context, Vol. 1: The Holocaust and Mass Death before the Modern Age* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), Katz flatly denies that American Indians were ever subjected to genocide, describing Native population reduction in the 90th percentile range as the result of an "unintended tragedy." Similarly, in his essay, "The Pequot War Reconsidered" (*New England Quarterly* 64, no. 2 [June 1991], 206–24), he argues that the First Nation in question, although it was slated to be—and long thought to *have been*—totally exterminated, didn't "really" suffer genocide because "the number killed probably totaled less than half the tribe." Indians are hardly alone in being targeted for such analytical manipulation; in *The Holocaust in Historical Context*, Katz also denies that "The Armenian Tragedy of 1915–1917" added up to genocide (84–87), or that the fate of the Gypsies, who died in the same camps, in the same manner, and under the

same decrees as the Jews, did either (24–25). Like Katz, Lewy has made a career of this sort of “scholarship,” devoting entire books to arguing that neither the Gypsies, the Armenians, nor anyone else other than Jews has been subjected to “actual” genocide. His finding that American Indians, too, have led a genocide-free existence (see the unannotated essay “Were the American Indians the Victims of Genocide?” *Commentary* 118, no. 2 [September 2004]: 55–63) is therefore not a surprise. Also see Guenter Lewy, *The Nazi Persecution of the Gypsies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); *The Armenian Massacres in Ottoman Turkey: A Disputed Genocide* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2005). For a superb analysis of this sort of scholarly fraud, see David E. Stannard, “Uniqueness as Denial: The Politics of Genocide Scholarship,” in *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Comparative Genocide*, ed. Alan S. Rosenbaum (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996), 163–212.

66. The idea was forcefully advanced in Paul Martin and Herbert Edgar’s co-edited volume, *Pleistocene Extinctions: The Search for Cause* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967), and, again, in a volume he co-edited with Richard G. Klein, *Quaternary Extinctions: A Prehistoric Revolution* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1989). He’s still at it; see Paul S. Martin, *Twilight of the Mammoths: Ice Age Extinctions and the Rewilding of America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007).

67. See Shepard Krech III, *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999). For Native points of view, see Christopher Vecsey and Robert W. Venables, eds., *American Indian Environments: Ecological Issues in Native American History* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1980); J. Donald Hughes, *American Indian Ecology* (El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1987).

68. Christy G. Turner II and Jacqueline A. Turner, *Man Corn: Cannibalism and Violence in the Prehistoric Southwest* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1999). For rebuttal, see Ward Churchill, review of *Man Corn Cannibalism and Violence in the Prehistoric Southwest*, by Christy G. Turner and Jacqueline A. Turner, *North American Archaeologist* 21, no. 3 (2000): 268–88.

James A. Clifton, ed., *The Invented Indian: Cultural Fictions and Government Policies* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1990); Fergus M. Bordewich, *Killing the White Man’s Indian: Reinventing Native Americans at the End of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Doubleday, 1996). For an exceptionally powerful rejoinder to Clifton, see Vine Deloria Jr., “Comfortable Fictions and the Struggle for Turf: An Essay Review of *The Invented Indian: Cultural Fictions and Government Policies*,” in *Natives and Academics*, Mihesuah, 65–83. On Bordewich, see Cook-Lynn, *New Indians, Old Wars*, 166–67.

69. See generally, Thomas, *Skull Wars*, xvii–xxiv. On the methods employed, see Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1981), 73–112; Sven Lindqvist, *The Skull Measurer’s Mistake, and Other Portraits of Men and Women Who Spoke Out against Racism* (New York: New Press, 1997), 42–47. On the broader theoretical backdrop, see Barbara Alice Mann, *Native Americans, Archaeologists, and the Mounds* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), 5–50.

70. Nope, I’m not kidding about this one either. See Sam D. Gill, *Mother Earth: An American Story* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987). For response, see my comment, “Sam Gill’s *Mother Earth*: Colonialism, Genocide and the Expropriation of Indigenous Spiritual Tradition in Contemporary Academia,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 12, no. 3 (Summer 1988), 49–67.

71. This is part of a much broader pattern. For analyses of comparable

phenomena in other vectors of historical scholarship, see Edward T. Linenthal and Tom Engelhardt, eds., *History Wars: The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1996); Gary B. Nash et al., *History on Trial*; Ellen Schrecker, ed., *Cold War Triumphalism: The Misuse of History after the Fall of Communism* (New York: New Press, 2004). More theoretically, see Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995).

72. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, "Who Stole Native American Studies?" *Wicazo Sa Review* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 9–28.

"Have we drifted away—no, been driven away from our original intent? We've been driven away by America's secret war against us, and we've been drifting away by our own apathy and failure. Do we still remember that our constituents are the Native nations of America? Often, the answer is no. It is difficult to remember that, when we are stationed in universities in isolation from everyone who cares and everything that has meaning. We in these educational stations often get to thinking that we serve the institutions, we serve the university, we serve the students, we serve our faculties, we serve other disciplines. We serve ourselves. We serve the American Dream." Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, "Native Studies Is Politics: The Responsibility of Native American Studies in an Academic Setting," in *Anti-Indianism in Modern America: A Voice from Tatekeya's Earth* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2007), 153–54.

73. How, given her in many ways well-deserved influence in the field, Cook-Lynn's logically circular/contradictory, contrafactual, and ultimately self-defeating views in this connection have shaped the discourse in AIS associations is amply reflected in her writing. See, e.g., *New Indians, Old Wars*, 118, 124–25; Elizabeth Cook-Lynn and Craig Howe, "The Dialectics of Ethnicity in America: A View from American Indian Studies," in *Color-Line to Borderlands: The Matrix of American Ethnic Studies*, ed. Johnella E. Butler (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001), 150–68. (I will not discuss the matter further herein, as the nature and significance of the political/conceptual issues involved is deserving of an essay in its own right and is forthcoming).

74. The "AHR published no essays on Native Americans during the first ten years of its existence" (1895–1905), one ten-page essay in 1906, a somewhat longer piece in 1908, and a third in 1917. Then, over "the four decades between 1920 and 1960 . . . the AHR published only four articles on Native America subjects." Thereafter, Wilbur Jacobs in 1975, Charles Gibson in 1978, Alden T. Vaughan in 1982, and Melissa L. Meyer in 1991 published an essay. Counting the article from which this information derives, that's a total of twelve articles on Indian "themes" in one hundred years. By one or another definition, only Jacobs, and perhaps Meyer, may be considered an AIS scholar, and only Meyer is Native. See R. David Edmunds, "Native Americans, New Voices: American Indian History, 1895–1995," *American Historical Review* 100, no. 3 (June 1995): 720–21, 740.

75. Russell Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History since 1492* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 239.

76. Thomas Gladwin with Ahmad Sahdin, *Slaves of the White Myth: The Psychology of Neocolonialism* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1980).