

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Native American Renaissance: Literary Imagination and Achievement. Edited by Alan R. Velie and A. Robert Lee.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4f16c6dq>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 39(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Hooley, Matt

Publication Date

2015

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/>

mentioned. There is a photograph of well-known Oaxacan archaeologist John Paddock examining the Mixteca-Puebla style wall paintings at Mitla. Mitla does appear in a list of places related to the pre-Hispanic Mixtec diaspora but not until page 228, toward the end of the book, and there is no mention of its significance. Another matter, probably not the fault of the authors, is the dark quality of many of the photographs, which not only make them less attractive but also of less value. The index, like those in many recent books, is very incomplete, and items are often not found on the pages designated. For example, there is no mention of Mitla on page 22, as the index indicates. The bibliography is adequate but necessarily highly selective. Fortunately, biases are noted in the preface and introductory materials and will be clear to those familiar with the literature on the area.

Nevertheless, the book is impressive, especially in its use of historical documents. The archives in Mexico and Spain have been thoroughly exploited, and the chapters on the late pre-Hispanic states, the colonial period, and the colonial *caciques* are its strongest features. The book also does much to clarify specific issues dealing with the relationship between colonial and pre-Hispanic settlements within the Oaxaca region, such as Cuilapan, Teposcolula, and Yanhuitlan. The authors document colonial interactions between Spaniards and Mixtecs in great detail; meticulous research shows that characteristics often thought to have been pre-Hispanic in origin were actually colonial.

Given its thorough documentation, and the longtime association of the senior author with this region—Spores has spent well over fifty years of dedicated, persistent engagement in Mixtec archaeology and ethnohistory—this book is a must for all scholars working in Mesoamerica, Oaxaca, and the Mixteca. It will be of interest to serious readers of Native American and Latin American studies as well. There is no other book of comparable scope on the topic. As are Spores' two earlier books on the Mixtecs, also published by the University of Oklahoma Press, *The Mixtecs of Oaxaca: Ancient Times to the Present* is destined to become a classic in the field.

Joseph W. Whitecotton, Emeritus
University of Oklahoma

The Native American Renaissance: Literary Imagination and Achievement. Edited by Alan R. Velie and A. Robert Lee. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013. 376 pages. \$29.95 paper.

The “renaissance” of Kenneth Lincoln’s *Native American Renaissance* (1983) has a vexing legacy. Published three decades ago, Lincoln’s study was timed to an unprecedented proliferation of Native writers in the American book market, a moment that, on the heels of Red Power, felt politically and disciplinarily significant. For Lincoln, the renaissance meant an upheaval whose valence is “not so much new . . . as regenerate” that required “tracing the connective threads between the cultural past and its expression in the present” (8, 2). For many Native literary scholars, Lincoln’s

term is not only Eurocentric, but implies a “reawakening” when in fact, as Joseph Bruchac puts it, “Native writing . . . has never been asleep” (*Returning the Gift*, 1994, xvii). We might also recognize Lincoln’s “renaissance” as a modish conceit mirrored in conservative articulations of postmodernism and postcolonialism. Kwame Anthony Appiah famously observes in his 1991 essay “Is the ‘Post’ in ‘Postcolonial’ the ‘Post’ in ‘Postmodern’?,” that in both words, “post-” functions as a “space clearing gesture”—a way of seeming to extricate critical work from an “exclusivity of insight” associated with modernism and modernity (348, 342). For Lincoln, it might be argued that “renaissance” was space clearing in an imperial sense—a way of repositioning Native writers outside of tribal epistemic and critical coordinates.

At the same time, there is something interesting about how the idea has lingered in Native studies. In *Reasoning Together* (2008) Craig Womack, one of the prominent figures to reject the term, points out “Lincoln was right, of course, in a certain sense. Something *had* happened. . . . And “the term ‘Native American Renaissance’ has been something of a floating signifier in the years since its proclamation” (16). Why do we still struggle to find the right name for this moment when novels, plays, and books of poetry became a primary theater of decolonial resistance, and when, for the first time, it became possible to tell the story of Native political struggle as a field story of Native studies? Alan Velie and A. Robert Lee are scholars whose careers are yoked to “what happened” with (or through) Native writing in the 1970s and 1980s. Their edited collection of essays, *The Native American Renaissance*, is both a recentering of the questions and assumptions that shaped Native studies during those decades, and a valuable opportunity to rethink them.

To their credit and to the benefit of the collection, it begins with a field story written by Jace Weaver, a writer who helped theorize the field’s rejoinder to Lincoln: Native literary nationalism. Weaver shows that with the appearance in 1981 of Simon Ortiz’s pathbreaking “Towards a National Indian Literature,” Native literary nationalism actually predates Lincoln’s *Renaissance*. He articulates a critical genealogy that extends a commitment to Robert Warrior’s “intellectual sovereignty” into the present, tracing it from Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, to Weaver’s collaboration with Womack, Warrior, and Lisa Brooks, to the more recent contributions of Daniel Heath Justice, Sean Teuton, and others. Weaver frames contentious debates around identity, authority, and community engagement not as a simplistic rejection of Lincoln’s multiculturalist vision for Native literary studies, but more insightfully, as a committed engagement with the very entanglements of politics and aesthetics that gave rise to Lincoln’s volume in the first place.

Weaver’s essay is a step forward for the field in that it sets the very idea of the Native American Renaissance in political and theoretical motion. Elsewhere, though, the collection sustains Lincoln’s conservative investment in canon formation in ways that mask the innovation of the essays included. The volume is overly weighted toward the novel, author studies, and canonical and male writers. These constraints mute the voices of an exciting array of scholars who are diversely positioned across the field. Not much emphasis is placed, for instance, on links between scholars and the tribal communities with which they are affiliated. And otherwise rich essays by non-Native

writers remain burdened by tired controversies about whether white critics or “continental” theory have a place in the field.

After nine articles on canonical novelists, however, the collection turns to six lively essays that consider developments that fall outside the parameters originally set by Lincoln’s *Renaissance*. Kimberly M. Blaeser’s piece on contemporary poetry, for example, is breathtaking in its scope, examining the work of thirty-three different Native poets as well as several oral or “traditional” song traditions. The essay reenergizes questions of “place and displacement” that are narrowly construed in Lincoln’s *Renaissance* through an exploration of tribal “bio-knowledge and place-consciousness,” layered sacred and ecological epistemologies, and emergent cartographies of indigenous political invention (245).

Drama, as Gina Valentino’s incisive “Theater Renaissance” shows, is a variety of Native literary production that captures the innovative spirit that motivated Lincoln’s book, but which has been marginalized in part because of its elision from *Native American Renaissance*. Valentino’s essay gives us new ways of thinking about where and how Native literary culture happens: rather than mimicking sanctioned Euro-American market postures (author, reader, critic), theater activates both new and existing tribal social forms. Valentino’s essay does not simply point us to playwrights or actors, but to expansive and mobile sites of cultural emergence, such as the Institute of American Indian Arts, founded in 1969 in Santa Fe; the Native American Theater Ensemble; the feminist ensemble Spiderwoman Theater; and Project HOOP at UCLA. Valentino demonstrates that Native theater works as a space of both continuity and creation: an invocation of traditional performance rhetorics in the context of indigenous nationalism, Third World feminism, and institutional decolonization.

Read together, the volume’s final two articles (a perceptive essay on First Nations writing by David Stirrup and a somewhat sermonizing epilogue by Kenneth Lincoln) are suggestive of Lincoln’s legacy and also of the field now, as it looks forward. The *Native American Renaissance* largely excluded First Nations writing, distributing value to Native writers within the United States insofar as their work could be measured against other recognized national traditions. However, First Nations women writers such as Lee Maracle have long argued “Indian women do not need liberation,” nor does their literature (313). As Stirrup’s essay shows, such recognition-based criticism becomes a means of controlling the cultural production it purports to celebrate. In comparing the *Native American Renaissance* and settler-centered feminism, Stirrup cites First Nations writer Beth Brant: “We are angry at white men for their perversions . . . We are angry at Indian men for . . . their limited vision of what constitutes a strong Nation. We are angry at the so-called ‘women’s Movement’ that always seems to forget we exist . . . We are not victims. We are organizers, freedom fighters, healers” (314). Stirrup points out that indigenous rejections of colonial borders around gender, authenticity, and nationality far predate trans/post-nationalism in the settler academy, and that centering Native voices in the field is anything but a reactionary gesture.

It is precisely this argument that Lincoln resists in the second half of his concluding essay. Decrying “tribal mossbacks,” Lincoln attacks Native scholars who question the implicit authority of the settler academy, such as Craig Womack, Leslie Marmon Silko, and Elizabeth Cook-Lynn. He worries that “[d]issed whites [will] take flight when

essentialists claim academic blood rights” and asks “Who will be left to read Native writers?” (346–47). The determination to police the borders of multiculturalism is a gesture familiar to institutional histories of ethnic studies programs across the United States. Yet the first half of Lincoln’s essay is a comparatively stirring meditation on the moment of political and disciplinary struggle out of which his *Renaissance* was born. Set against the academy’s sluggish response to antiracism and decolonization movements of the 1960s and 1970s, Lincoln recounts fruitful collaborations with individuals such as Paula Gunn Allen, Joy Harjo, Alphonso Ortiz, and bold institutional innovation around UCLA’s American Indian Studies Center.

What is exciting about Velie and Lee’s collection is how it pushes back against the forms set forth by the *Native American Renaissance*. The range and energy of the contributors to this volume and of the writers they examine proves that the value of Native writing always exceeds the terms of its disciplinary delivery. In this sense, that “renaissance” persists as a floating signifier is useful for its ambiguity: a way of prioritizing in our work as Native studies scholars precisely that sense of excess, surplus, and the indescribable beauty of Native life and art that our critical frames must always fail to control.

Matt Hooley
Texas Tech University

Native Recognition: Indigenous Cinema and the Western. By Joanna Hearne. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012. 428 pages. \$95.00 cloth; \$34.95 paper; \$95.00 electronic.

This ambitious book successfully weaves together Hollywood and independent film productions—feature films, documentaries, and experimental films as well as silent, studio-era, and contemporary works—to tell the story of indigenous participation in the cinema, with special emphasis on the broader political and cultural work of moving images. Believing that Hollywood Westerns emerged, at least in part, out of public discourses about federal Indian policy as well as the proto-cinematic visual documents that surrounded that discourse, Joanna Hearne reads the diverse range of films under study in conversation with government reports, historic photographs, periodicals, archival records, interviews with filmmakers, and reform literature. A major frame Hearne uses throughout the text to organize this diverse data is a steady focus on how indigenous audiovisual reclamation and repatriation has consistently taken place through the discursive reconstruction of familial and community images. Throughout, she challenges the Western genre’s discourse of vanishing Indians, whether through population decline or assimilation, by exploring those productions that keep images of Native families and youths obsessively in the view of film spectators.

Developing this anchoring discussion, the introduction analyzes the famous “before and after” photographs taken at Carlisle Indian Industrial School (opened in 1879) and other off-reservation boarding schools. At the school’s request, photographer John