UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture. By Lee D. Baker

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4cp580hh

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 36(1)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Collins, Robert Keith

Publication Date
2012

DOI
10.17953

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

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

Daniel McCool, Susan Olson, and Jennifer Robinson (2007). The two books are organized similarly, with overviews of the history of Indian voting rights and the Voting Rights Act, case studies of specific lawsuits, and discussion of the impact of Indian electoral participation. Although McDonald primarily discusses cases brought by the ACLU, two of the three major case studies in *Native Vote* describe cases brought by the US Department of Justice, which is the other major litigator of voting-rights cases.

Neither book is framed very theoretically, but together the two provide excellent data that readers interested in legal mobilization, social movement, or critical race theories can use. McDonald is a great litigator, and great litigators tell compelling stories. Chapters 1 and 2 could stand alone for anyone seeking a solid introduction to the history of federal Indian policy or the history of the Voting Rights Act. McDonald's case studies are superb accounts of Indian experiences in the rural West, even for those not particularly interested in voting. The book definitely deserves a wide readership.

Susan Olson
University of Utah

Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture. By Lee D. Baker. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2010. 296 pages. $84.95 cloth; $23.95 paper.

Did the ways in which anthropologists studied African Americans and American Indians lead to the evasion of vital discussions and analyses of the turbulence of contact, racism, and social inequality for both peoples? How is it that anthropological ideas of culture never broke from notions of race and biology? Why did anthropology come to specialize in describing the cultures of American Indians, while sociology became the descriptor of African American cultures? To address these questions—which frame his research—anthropologist Lee Baker rigorously examines late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century anthropological scholarship, emerging conceptualizations of culture, how the concept of race gained importance during this same time period, and the roles both played in shaping federal Indian policy and public understandings of the cultural differences that African Americans and American Indians embody within the United States. Through four thematically connected essays and a substantial introduction, Baker argues that anthropological descriptions of culture among American Indians and African Americans must be understood as by-products of the ways in which different scholars applied the concept of culture to each group, and the extent to which such application explained culture in opposition to race or linked the two synonymously.

This position may seem insignificant to those who view anthropological conceptualizations of culture as devoid of racial trappings. However, Baker reminds us that such discussions can illuminate why anthropologists seem to have studied American Indians as transmitters of seemingly pure and unimpaired cultures collectively, on the one hand, and yet failed to interrogate the history of violence that contact represented for many nations, on the other. In a similar vein, African Americans have been studied as transmitters of a collective, unstable, fraudulent, amalgamated, and malignant culture, on the one hand, while discussions of race relations and racial uplift were deemed the best ways to explain variations in African American customs, beliefs, rituals, art, and reactions to social injustice, on the other. In order to understand these inconsistencies between anthropological formulations and investigations of culture, Baker asserts that the aspects of race upon which anthropological descriptions of culture were based must be examined.

Baker supports his position with thorough—context-rich—discussions. Chapters 1 and 2, "Research, Reform, and Racial Uplift" and "Fabricating the Authentic and the Politics of the Real," engage the ideas that anthropologists lent to the racial politics surrounding academic and nonacademic discussions of culture. Chapters 3 and 4, "Race, Relevance and Daniel G. Brinton's Ill-Fated Bid for Prominence" and "The Cult of Franz Boas and His 'Conspiracy' to Destroy the White Race," examine the similarities and differences—as well as strengths and weaknesses—between racialist and culturalist approaches to culture.

In chapter 1, Baker compels the reader to understand how intellectual pursuits, like those of Alice Bacon and the Hampton Folk-Lore Society, created the types of support networks needed to encourage anthropologists—particularly ethnologists—to formulate an uplift narrative for African Americans. These support networks consisted of co-authorships in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, which was produced by the American Folk-Lore Society, and fourteen guest editorships by ethnologist Elsie Clew Parsons—who was known for her fieldwork among the Zuni—on themes dedicated to African and African American folk traditions between 1917 and 1937 (34). This discussion is followed by an examination of Booker T. Washington's benefactor, General Samuel C. Armstrong, whose father—Reverend Richard Armstrong—was a missionary to Maui, convinced the Kanaka Maoli to build schools, and rose to become part of King Kamehameha III's Privy Council. Baker shows how Armstrong utilizes the philosophy of education that his father used at the Lahaina-Luna Seminary, Hilo School, and Manual Labor School to shape that of the Hampton Institute, which taught African Americans and American Indians. Armstrong's goal, like his father's, was to ensure that African American

and American Indian graduates were not only to be good teachers but also good workers who were able to earn a living.

It would be these graduates—in collaboration with and appropriating the methods of anthropologists seeking social reform—who would educate, minister, research, and ultimately write the initial scholarship challenging academic (for example, Daniel Brinton) and public arguments that African American and American Indians were inherently inferior to whites. Their research would illuminate the developing class distinctions that arose between the educated and the noneducated as a by-product of racial uplift and would become the nexus from which a New Negro identity of educational improvement would emerge and from which notions of the "civilized" American Indian would gain social meaning. Racial uplift for African Americans was seen as a direct precipitate of education, which included pedagogical practices that integrated some African folklore and appropriate ethnological rhetoric. Cultural changes for American Indians—especially for those not associated with the Hampton Institute—were to be shaped by a primary education that actively sought to separate individuals from their families and traditions. Unlike the segregation policies that limited African American integration, assimilation policies further facilitated the separation between "civilized" and "traditional" American Indians while encouraging integration. Consequently, ethnological studies (for example, those of James Mooney) documented and focused on traditional lifeways, while ignoring the dynamics of American Indian cultural changes caused by assimilation, in order to capture "authentic" Indian life before it disappeared.

Baker encourages readers, for example, to engage Zitkala-Ša's critique of Richard Pratt and the Carlisle boarding school system, and the scrutiny with which graduates examined their former institutions of education and experiences. This discussion underscores the sources of Zitkala-Ša's open resistance to the "civilizing mission" of Pratt's boarding school system and why she challenged ethnologists like Mooney whose approaches to American Indian communities were seemingly nonaltruistic and static. Readers are led—in subsequent chapters examining the works of Daniel Brinton, Franz Boas, and others—into the trajectory of Mooney's career, his marginalization by public institutions, the nature of support he received from John Wesley Powell, the positives and negatives of Mooney's approach and research, the nature and source of his critiques of Christian civilization, his passion for American Indians who resisted assimilation, the enemies that his field methods (for example, detailed analysis coupled with occasional outright theft) created, the liberty with which he felt justified in devising a rubric to determine American Indian authenticity, his life at the Smithsonian, and the specific aspects of Mooney's works (for example, a dismissive attitude toward the concerns of

educated American Indians who questioned his approach to tribal communities and the static manner in which he presented the people in his research and at expositions (for instance, the 1893 World's Fair). Baker discusses how Mooney's attitude shaped Zitkala-Ša's belief that he was abusing his position at the Smithsonian to advocate for authentic traditional practices, such as peyote use, which were socially viewed as barriers to assimilation. This belief prompted an appeal to General R. H. Pratt—and her fiancée, Pratt protégé Carlos Montezuma—and his dislike of ethnology and Mooney in an effort to have Mooney removed (66).

Throughout *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture*, Baker highlights the linkages among scholarly motives, the anthropological focal point of analysis that scholars employ, and the diverse realities of African American and American Indian lives that are ignored due to the narrowness of this focal point. Attention to these linkages reveals how racial perspectives shape understandings of culture and vice versa. By the closing chapter, readers may find themselves pondering the extent to which anthropological approaches facilitated and inhibited social justice for African Americans and American Indians. Here Baker poses an intriguing question to the reader: given the previous discussions, what was it about Boasian anthropology that angered—and continues to anger—racialists, white supremacists, and anti-Semites? This closing chapter describes the reach of Boasian arguments on race within and outside the academy, including his influence on actions leading to social change, such as *Brown v. Board of Education*, the end of Jim Crow, and the articulation of diasporic cultures (218). Unlike his predecessors, Boas's arguments for the equality of cultures and cultural relativism challenged Brintonian arguments about racial determinism; generated a narrative-based record of race, class, sexuality, and culture; questioned Mooney's misplaced notions of authenticity; and reshaped anthropology in the United States and the parameters of anthropological investigations. However, as Baker points out, Boas's arguments on culture—like the relationships between text and context and how the public has used anthropology—remain problematically unquestioned and open areas of inquiry for future scholars.

The publication of *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture* is particularly timely. First, for scholars comparatively investigating the diversity of racial attitudes held by late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century anthropologists and how they shaped discussions of American Indian cultures, Baker's book is an incredible resource. His arguments underscore exactly when, where, and in which contexts of scholars' lives and research endeavors racial attitudes influenced cultural analyses. Second, through such discussions, Baker sheds light on the individual and collective academic motives and racial expectations behind anthropological focal points of analysis that led to African American cultures

being ignored for the sake of racial discussions and American Indian cultures studied extensively, yet racial uplift—key in current discussions of self-determination—being ignored for the sake of establishing "real" Indians. Scholars of American Indian studies should find this book tremendously useful in courses and comparative research—with non-Native populations—that examine the strengths and weakness of historical anthropological approaches to American Indian cultures and the roles that race has played in anthropological understandings of culture.

Robert Keith Collins
San Francisco State University

The Color of the Land: Race, Nation, and the Politics of Landownership in Oklahoma, 1832–1929. By David A. Chang. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010. 312 pages. $59.95 cloth; $22.95 paper.

The Color of the Land examines the central role of land—its ownership and use—in the history of Indian Territory and, subsequently, during the early decades of Oklahoma statehood. Although David Chang has crafted a deft "regionally focused study of land tenure," his aims are far broader (4). By studying the ways that Creek Indians, African Americans (both Creek and non-Creek), and whites organized and conceived of themselves with respect to land, Chang seeks to provide a fresh understanding of larger historical themes, including the conquering of the American West, the rise and fall of radical social movements, and "the making of black and white and Indian peoples" (4).

The strengths of Chang's approach are many. By focusing on land, for example, he demonstrates how Creek communities in Indian Territory were shaped by the traditions and history of Creek towns in the American Southeast, where tribal members lived prior to the dispossession of their homes and forced removal westward during the early nineteenth century. *The Color of the Land* teases out the fault lines existing within Creek society before Removal and makes clear that these divisions persisted in the reconstituted Creek towns of Indian Territory. Whereas some Creeks had favored usufruct, or common ownership that rewarded those who worked or improved the land, others used slave labor on more extensive holdings in order to produce commodities for the market. Transplanted to Indian Territory, many Creeks continued to practice usufruct while others knitted together vast stretches of acreage in order to take advantage of a rising cattle industry that required routes through the region as well as booming markets for money-crop cultivation. In this, developments among the Creeks mirrored those in other parts