

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Ritual and Myth in Odawa Revitalization: Reclaiming a Sovereign Place.  
By Melissa Pflug.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1r3788qp>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 24(1)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Richland, Justin

**Publication Date**

2000

**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/>

faculty (p. 4). It is with this expertise and sensitivity to culture that Whiteley gives his recommendation for further research done by anthropologists in "other" communities and argues that academia promotes its own interests if anthropology continues in the same vein.

In 1988 Whiteley wrote two other notable books or volumes on Hopi history and culture: *Deliberate Acts: Changing Hopi Culture Through the Oraibi Split* and *Bacavi: Journey to Reed Springs*. Both of these books have received impressive reviews from those who are experts in the fields of anthropology and history.

*Rethinking Hopi Ethnography* is highly recommended for community college, undergraduate, and graduate courses in American Indian studies, anthropology, sociology, and history. Whiteley challenges academia to look for further research projects that are not only inclusive of the Native voice, but are also inclusive of the local community as a viable decision-making population. It is a stellar addition to the current literature by a scholar with a life-long commitment to the Hopi and the integrated study of culture.

Carla Olson

University of California, Los Angeles

**Ritual and Myth in Odawa Revitalization: Reclaiming a Sovereign Place.** By Melissa Pflüg. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998. \$28.95 cloth.

In keeping with the central theme of ethical reciprocity that this book identifies within Odawa myth and ritual, Melissa Pflüg's work itself promises offerings both for the academic communities it seeks to enlighten and for the small community of traditionalists whose integrity and efficacy she seeks to represent. Pflüg proposes to articulate how these Odawa, an Alongkian people of the Great Lakes region, respond to contemporary threats to their culture and identity with practices that are informed by the narratives and performances of Odawa myth and ritual. She argues for the academic conceptualization of tradition not as some archaic body of abstract values and beliefs slowly slipping from the fingers of this contemporary group, but as a powerful interpretive frame that is both worked through and elaborated upon by these social actors in their revitalization efforts. By foregrounding such a model of myth and ritual as action, the full agency of Odawa traditionalists can be brought into view.

The book is divided into three sections, each generating a narrative that moves from a consideration of the context in which Odawa traditionalists engage in revitalization efforts, to the models of myth and ritual that Pflüg argues continue to inform Odawa revitalization, to a discussion of Odawa ritual and politics that constitute the contemporary practices informed by those models. The book's first section addresses the need for contemporary as well as historical and mythical considerations as they contribute to modern-day tribal activism. Thus she provides an account of the contemporary organization of Odawa bands, including groups with and without federal recognition,

and their respective relations not only to local, state, and federal governance structures, but also to other non-Indian communities that today occupy and make competing place claims within the same Great Lakes region. Additionally, she mines the historic literature on the area to describe the long line of prophetic and revitalization movements undertaken by important Indian leaders in the area—Neolin of the Delaware, Pontiac and Trout of the Odawa, and Tenskwata and Tecumseh of the Shawnee, among others—as responses to perceived moments of dire cultural crisis.

Through these accounts she argues for invocation of Odawa myth and ritual as a central strategy for traditionalist revitalization efforts in the face of continued threats from non-Indians to their economic, political, and cultural integrity, particularly in light of their status as a federally non-recognized community. By detailing the history of revitalization movements in various Indian communities in the region, she argues that traditionalist strategy may be understood as both the basis and the latest incarnation of a recurring Indian response to situations of cultural crisis resulting from contact with Euramericans.

At the end of this section and in part two of *Ritual and Myth in Odawa Revitalization*, the author elaborates on the particulars of this model, explaining that central to the Odawa ethos is the concept of *pimadaziwin*, or “a life of longevity and well-being” (p. 67). She argues that such well-being is achieved only through the enactment of moral behavior toward others or, as she puts it, through acts of “personing, gifting and empowering” (p. 69). This method helps mend social disruption that is caused by unethical selfishness by emphasizing acts of compassion, even towards those who caused the original disruption. It is this very model, the author claims, that undergirds Odawa origin myths and culture-hero narratives, such as those of Nanabozho, by which social transformation is achieved after some period of disruption through a return to “right relations” that reinstates a moral community and projects its persistence into the future. It is an invocation for ethical reciprocity that can be seen in the earlier revitalization movements of the Indian prophets and their calls for a return to the “old ways.” Hence, it is also such a call for mythic reciprocity and constructive transformation that Pflüg claims lies at the bottom of contemporary Odawa traditionalist efforts at cultural revitalization.

In the final section, Pflüg turns more fully to the activities of contemporary traditionalists, taking up a description of the ritual and political practices that she claims lie at the heart of their Odawa renewal and revitalization efforts. Turning first to ritual, Pflüg recounts how personal prayer and collective ceremony fundamentally turn on bringing into action the Odawa ethos of ethical reciprocity to afford a “dramatic transformation” that diminishes disruption and distance between individuals and groups. The author focuses on the *gi-be wiikonge*, a contemporary interpretation of the Odawa Feast of the Dead ritual, in which the Odawa community comes together to decorate the gravestones of their ancestors and feast with them. Relying primarily on George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), the author uses a theoretical model of metaphor as speech that “structure[s] everyday life” (p. 179). Pflüg argues that despite changes in the form of its performance, what remains is the central ritual practice of sharing among and

between the living and the dead, metaphorically affirming the fundamental Odawa ethos of ethical reciprocity. The author argues that such practices reveal important ways in which the Odawa operate with agency in maintaining the meaning of their traditions by reconstituting their form to fit changing social circumstances. Thus, she claims it is in just this way that Odawa traditionalists are constantly at work invigorating Odawa culture and identity in the present, and projecting its presence into the future by generating a viable continuity with the Odawa past.

The author then considers legal actions taken by traditionalists as another critical site where these Odawa are working toward a public articulation and revitalization of Odawa culture and identity. Despite a perception of federal law as primarily serving non-Indian interests and conflicting with their fundamental ethos of ethical reciprocity, many Odawa traditionalists have begun to publicly press their legal claims, particularly those to land and natural resources, as they recognize that sovereignty and the maintenance of culture and tradition is impossible without it. The author gives some attention to one Odawa band's effort to secure a parcel of land, currently claimed by the Catholic Diocese of Michigan, that contains Odawa burials. Recent claims by a local township to have contracted to purchase the land from the church conflicts directly with earlier promises made by church officials to notify Odawa prior to any intent to sell the property. Pflüg explains that this band of traditionalists took action by preparing a report on the traditional use of the land and submitting it to state agencies, asking that they protect the cemetery as an historical site. Pflüg reports that the state ultimately rejected the traditionalists' claim. The author then paints a bleak picture for this community that seems unlikely to receive a decision in its favor should it pursue its claim under current federal legislation and case law.

It is in the very face of these contemporary challenges from non-Odawa forces that these Odawa traditionalists have taken it upon themselves to engage in sociopolitical and cultural action for the purpose of revitalizing and preserving Odawa culture and identity. And as Pflüg attempts to reveal in her analysis, these efforts are fundamentally informed by mythic and ritual form and content, as well as the deeply held conceptions of ethical reciprocity—gifting, personing, and empowering, or *pimadaziwin*—that have always undergirded the Odawa ethos. In so doing she promises to this traditionalist community the gift of a representation that portrays them as true agents, actively and forcefully engaging the world fully possessed with their rich and viable traditions.

This is however a promise that in some critical ways remains unfulfilled. While Pflüg's analysis goes a long way toward providing an enlightening and empowering vision of this community and its practices, she comes up short in providing an adequate account of the practices and situations that constitute the sites of Odawa revitalization. Throughout her entire work, conclusions regarding the character and force of Odawa myth, ritual, and contemporary traditionalist action are based primarily on information gathered through interviews and earlier ethnographies as read through various theoretical models drawn from social anthropology and philosophy of religion. While it often proves helpful to consider these types of data and academic interpretive

frames, to rely solely on them as Pflüg does here is to, at best, fundamentally ignore the force that these revitalization practices have for the Odawa actors themselves. The reader gets no clear sense of the ways in which Odawa traditionalists actively engage their world by and through myth and ritual or of the reconstituting effect that such engagement has upon Odawa myth and ritual itself.

Pflüg does represent the voices of traditionalists both in her interviews with them and in their telling of mythic narratives, which can be important sources of information regarding how these practitioners orient toward their own circumstances and their roles in it. In almost every chapter there are quotes from various traditionalists speaking, for example, to the violence perpetrated against Odawa identity and culture by federal policies or to the particulars of the *gi-be wiikonge* ritual or the seventh fire myth as they are performed by traditionalists today. But such data alone cannot afford a picture of how myth and ritual become the vehicles or frameworks through which traditionalists actively engage others, Odawa and non-Odawa alike, in combating challenges to their cultural and communal integrity. Insofar as they are comments elicited by the author herself, they are the products of self-conscious, artificial reflection on myth, ritual, and revitalization by these consultants. In essence, they reveal nothing of the sundry ways in which tradition informs the practices that contribute to and constitute contemporary traditionalist myth, ritual, and revitalization activity.

It is only through rich and detailed description of these everyday activities of revitalization and their contexts that the true agency of traditionalists can be revealed. The proper questions must be multiple: What are the details of place and social relation of those local town meetings in which the fate of the Odawa gravesite was determined? Did the Odawa traditionalists speak at such meetings? Did they invoke mythic models of ethical reciprocity and the life of Nanabozho to justify their claims to that land? Did they talk about “gifting, personing, and empowering” to suggest ways in which the gravesite could be reserved for their use? What were the responses of other townspeople? Did traditionalists perform *gi-be wiikonge* rituals in order to build solidarity and unity of mind within their own ranks prior to meeting with local non-Indian leadership? Without asking such questions, any insight into the manner in which ritual and myth become interpretive frames through which traditionalists engage in revitalization remains unavailable. By failing to incorporate such aspects of the traditionalist’s “lived” revitalization efforts, Pflüg’s analysis, no matter how it is dressed up, treats ritual and myth as abstractions that can be adequately conceptualized outside the contexts of their (re)constitution and with no sense of the traditionalist agents who live by and through them. Her own analysis thus falls to her own critique.

Despite these shortcomings, the importance of understanding tradition as Pflüg does here, as a dynamic interpretive frame, cannot be overstated. This is true not only if academia is to adequately portray the richly lived worlds of American Indian peoples in these often silenced communities, but is also significant for the Odawa themselves as they work to elaborate their place within a non-Indian nation-state that regularly conditions recognition on a showing of

cultural continuity with the communities and groups that preceded them. Insofar as Pflüg's effort has at least pointed us in the direction of working with such a conception of tradition, she has achieved something considerable in this book. Indeed, as the Odawa recognize, so much of the ethics of giving lie not in the actual receipt of the gift, but in the willingness of the giver to offer it. In this way Pflüg has graciously fulfilled her promise.

*Justin Richland*

University of California, Los Angeles

**To Show Heart: Native American Self-Determination and Federal Indian Policy, 1960–1975.** By George Pierre Castile. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1998. 216 pages. \$35.00 cloth; \$16.95 paper.

I began reading this book with my usual hesitance toward Indian policy commentary by a non-Indian anthropologist. Because I always hope to encounter a non-biased overview of this policy as described by a non-Native, however, I investigated *To Show Heart: Native American Self-Determination and Federal Indian Policy*. I wish I could say that my hopes were fulfilled. I hate to be critical of this book because it is well-researched and -written. Unfortunately, the book also is exceedingly biased and often insulting to Indian leaders who were pivotal in changing Indian policy.

The premise of the book is to give an “insider’s” view of Indian policy from 1960 to 1975. George Castile worked for the Office of Economic Opportunity’s (OEO) Community Action Program (CAP), which was important in that it allowed tribal communities to submit grant proposals for community development programs in the early 1960s. Castile’s thesis is that the CAP program was the model for the Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act, which allows tribes today to contract for tribal control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs’ (BIA) programs. Along the way, however, Castile takes aim at tribal leaders, the American Indian Movement (AIM), and the Democratic Party. The result is a somewhat narrow contribution to the body of work on Indian policy that focuses on the strength of Richard Nixon and his vision for Natives in America.

Castile is intensely harsh on tribal leaders such as Vine Deloria, Jr., who was president of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) at the time. For example, he writes that Deloria’s claims were “doubtful” or “impossible” whenever Deloria made a statement that conflicted with Castile’s opinion (see pp. 49, 59, 87). In other instances, he cites Deloria to support his ideas (see pp. 41, 48). The most frustrating example of Castile’s competition with Deloria pertains to his mention of Deloria’s contention that NCAI coined *self-determination* at one of their meetings in 1966. Castile then refers back to this statement to “prove” that the term was first used not by the NCAI, but by Woodrow Wilson in 1919, by Robert Yellowtail of the Crow, by the OEO, and by Sargent Shriver. I don’t think that it matters who spoke the term first, for the idea is that Indians desired to govern themselves since first contact. What