

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The American Indian and the Problem of History. Edited by Calvin Martin.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4sv5j69c>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 11(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Thorne, Tanis C.

Publication Date

1987

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/>

Royal B. Hassrick in his chapter on "Culture of the Sioux," reveals the same approach as DeMallie, although, his piece is better organized and does go "from here to there."

But Hassrick, too, has the same misconceptions about "gods" and a "hierarchy of gods." And he says, "Warfare for the Plains Indian was the reason for life." That is, of course, stretching a point.

One of the Lakota beliefs was that the future of The People rested in the beings of the women and of the children. A threat to the lives of women and children was a threat to the life of the people and their future. Strategically speaking, the Lakota adopted the tactic that the best defense was an offense. So it was that they earned the reputation as Warriors of The Plains. In the minds of most Americans today, and certainly in the minds of the movie moguls, the Lakota are the prototype of the people called "Indian" by the whites.

Hassrick closes his arguments (P. 77) with: "Only a hollow vestige remained of what was once a vibrant life style."

And I respond: Being a Lakota comes from within and that inner vibrancy vibrates ever stronger in this day.

Art Raymond
University of North Dakota

The American Indian and the Problem of History. Edited by Calvin Martin. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. 232 pp. \$9.95 Paper.

As the title of *The American Indian and the Problem of History* suggests, this work has a historiographic emphasis. In the wake of revisionist trends of the 1970s, Indian historians face a number of knotty problems as they endeavor to avoid ethnocentric biases and to incorporate Native American sources and perspectives. Collectively, the papers in this volume assess the achievements and pitfalls of revisionist history and consider methods and goals for future scholarship. For Martin and many of the contributors, a principal concern is the need to integrate an understanding of the interplay between religion and the environment in writing Indian history. "What was *their* metaphysics? Everything we write about [Native Americans]," says Martin, "should follow from this seminal question" (p. 216). Having circulated copies

of his article, "The Metaphysics of Writing Indian History" (reprinted here as Chapter 1), Martin asked for the "large contours" of Indian and white history and "what it all means" (p. 5). He evoked a variety of searching responses from his eighteen distinguished contributors, including veteran historians Robert Berkhofer, Jr., Wilcolm Washburn, Cornelius Jaenen, Mary Young, Henry Dobyns, Vine Deloria, Jr., and a number of equally impressive, younger scholars. The essays range in style and content from Berkhofer's excellent essay, "Cultural Pluralism Versus Ethnocentrism in the New Indian History," to Neil Salisbury's useful overview of Indian prehistory, to Gerald Vizenor's mythic satire, "Socioacupuncture: Mythic Reversals and Striptease in Four Scenes," making provocative reading.

By conscious design, Martin's own ideas on the proper approach to writing Indian history tend to dominate the book and purport to give it thematic unity and purpose. Drawing on the work of Mircea Eliade and Loren Eiseley in his introduction and lengthy epilogue, Martin advances a dialectical analysis: Native American peoples embrace a worldview or philosophy which is fundamentally antagonistic to that held by those in the Judeo-Christian cultural tradition; each worldview involves different conceptions of time, and hence history. The Native American "biological" worldview assumes the interconnectedness of nature; time is mythic and eternal; history is sacred. Westerners' "anthropological" philosophy, on the other hand, is dualistic, assuming the polarity between spirituality and the natural world; time is finite and linear; history is progressive and profane. Amid "the maelstrom of white conquest and domination," North American Indians "refused to surrender" their "biological orientation and commitment," Martin asserts (p. 212). The writing of Indian history thus becomes an epistemological issue. Can we write about North American Indians "while adhering to canons of formal western history," and if so, how? (Martin, p. 16) Having accepted cultural pluralism as a moral ideal, how *do* we write history synthesizing a plurality of realities, as Berkhofer asks? "From whose viewpoints should the narrative be cast? From whose categories of realities should the facts of history be derived." If we do try to write Indian history from an Indian perspective (i.e. sacred history), are we in danger of throwing out the "baby of history" with the "ethnocentric bathwater"? (pp. 40, 44).

No stranger to controversy, Calvin Martin seems bent on shak-

ing the foundations of "academic orthodoxy" with his argument. To avoid the biases of the "anthropological" worldview in assessing the "biological" world of the Indians, historians must abandon "anthropological" terms and historic time. A creative synthesis can only be achieved under the biological, mythic paradigm. Identifying the historian's "true and best role" in restoring and recreating cosmic unity, Martin often appears to be a man bent on a religious crusade as he advises Indian historians to embark upon a quest for "timeless wisdom," the eternal truths of Native American's "sacred history" (p. 207). "Sacred history" is best defined by Henrietta Whiteman in her essay, "White Buffalo Woman," as a "spiritual history with the sacred mission of keeping the Earth Grandmother alive" (p. 170). Several of the other contributors similarly criticize the "anthropological" premises upon which history is written and call for a radical reorientation in scholarship (and in our society as a whole), emphasizing the spiritual benefits of studying Indian philosophy and endorsing a history premised on spiritual renewal. Richard Drinnon, for example, advises that we adopt the Sioux truth: "We are all related" (p. 112), while Frederick Turner sees an activist role for revisionist historians in promoting the Indian philosophy of interconnectedness (pp. 116, 118).

Though there is substantial agreement about the inherent cultural conflict between Indians and Whites, some of the contributors have reservations about the usefulness of the dialectic Martin has proposed and express hesitancy about tossing out the "baby of history." Young, Jaenen, and Salisbury warn against underestimating the complexity and diversity of Indian responses to differing European cultural groups. Since contact, much cultural information has been exchanged; hybridization has occurred. It is therefore oversimplistic and inaccurate to contrast White and Indian worldviews (Martin's so-called "forgivable generalization"). Dobyns and Washburn are openly hostile to Martin's metaphysical approach, insisting on a more scientific, empirical, historical methodology. All Indian history is "contact history" and "for good or ill, shaped by the white presence," writes Washburn (p. 92). Perhaps Mary Young was right, and Calvin Martin dodges the "big issue": "European contact is a process of hybridization" (p. 212).

One of the strengths of this book is the variety of candid, personal reflections about the merits and pitfalls of revisionist trends in history. Washburn, Deloria, and Peter Nabokov, for example,

assess their responses to the polemical legacy of revisionist history. Moral judgments of "White" motives and values infused historical writing during the 1970s. Washburn takes the position that revisionist historians who cast Indian history as a "resistance movement" and use such terms as "exploitation" and "colonialism," are "propagandists" (pp. 92, 94). Scholarship and political activism are incompatible, says Washburn; our first obligation as historians is seeking empirically-verifiable "truth" (p. 95). Vine Deloria agrees, but finds fault with both liberals and conservatives who fall back on standardized, safe interpretations without doing adequate research, labeling them "reversionists." In his compelling essay, "Present Memories, Past History," Peter Nabokov's recounts his moral and emotional overreaction in the 1970s. Ethnic awareness programs in those years, he writes, were informed by "expiatory history and exotic primitivism." Nabokov's Indian friends were puzzled by his repudiation of his own culture and kin, thinking it a "strange bird that defecates in his own nest." While his appreciation and admiration for Indian culture continued to grow ("It was within the Indian world where I was finding ways that made sense"), Nabokov gradually became alarmed at the symptoms of a "true believer" within himself. Reflecting on the danger this mind-set does to scholarship, he writes, "Like many others I was in danger of idealizing the trappings of Indian culture and contorting my research to conform to that ideal" (pp. 150, 151, 153).

Romanticizing Native Americans and viewing their experience through a narrow ideological filter are problems that continue to plague revisionist scholarship. In our present era of ecological crisis, there is a natural tendency to make the Indian a symbol of ecology, and thus succumb to presentism, as Jaenen points out. Gerald Vizenor observes that the Indian has always been used "to resolve the insecurities and inhibitions of the dominant culture" (p. 181). Recognizing that he is vulnerable to this line of criticism, Martin appropriately asks: "are we inventing a 'biological' Indian?" (p. 24) Martin denies this is so.

Formidable, perhaps insurmountable, conceptual and methodological issues face those attempting to write a balanced, carefully researched, bicultural history of Indian-White relations, but the quest continues. The story of the "people of history" and the "people of myth trying to comprehend and adjust" to one another (p. 195) continues to intrigue us as historians, and

perhaps more importantly, as Americans. Our goal as historians is to discover what understandings were exchanged (or should have been exchanged) in the past. Peter Nabokov coins an apt metaphor, describing himself as a "mixed-blood . . . searching to reinhabit the land," reminiscent of Gerald Visenor's "mixed-blood earthdiver . . . seeking a few honest words upon which to build a new urban turtle island." (*Earthdivers*, 1981: 81). Reflecting on his attempt to merge past, present, and future in writing Indian history, Peter Iverson quotes a poem by an Navajo woman (pp. 142, 143):

i must be like a bridge
 for my people
 i may connect time; yesterday
 today and tomorrow—for my people
 who are in transition, also.

Irene Nakai

Tanis C. Thorne

University of California, Los Angeles

After Removal: The Choctaws in Mississippi. Edited by Samuel J. Wells and Roseanna Tubby. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press and Choctaw Heritage Press, 1986. 200 pp., photos, maps, drawings, charts, introduction, contributors, select bibliography. \$22.50 Cloth.

This collection of eight essays attempts to tell the story of the Choctaw Indians who remained in Mississippi after the removal era of the 1830's. This is a valuable topic and its story needs to be told. Unfortunately, this brief volume is not as complete as it wishes to be, and, as a result, leaves the reader with more questions than answers.

In a brief introduction, Samuel J. Wells gives the setting for the book and explains its purpose: to tell the story of several thousand Choctaws who remained in Mississippi after the larger part of the tribe was removed to "Indian Territory." The following essays are narrative and some demonstrate a major weakness of the study, that is it covers too broad a time frame, 1830-1986, in too few brief essays. In addition, there are no essays covering the