UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

**Title**
Invisible Indigenes: The Politics of Nonrecognition. By Bruce G. Miller.

**Permalink**
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4zc4s9dx

**Journal**
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 28(3)

**ISSN**
0161-6463

**Author**
Tolley, Sara-Larus

**Publication Date**
2004-06-01

**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

It is a matter of regret that the discussion here does not refer in any significant way to the contexts of ethnic relations within the United States or to colonial relations abroad; such a discussion could have been informative, if only to underline what the imagery specific to Amerindians brought to ideas of individuality. The years under discussion were also the years of ethnic transformations in the United States, of a growing concern for the transnationalization of America and the world, of blacks struggling for political identity, of Chinese and other Asians denied immigration, of Henry Ford's American producing machine, and of the global export of racist ideologies, including in schools abroad in institutions similar to Carlisle. A prolonged discussion might not have been feasible, but some reference would have been useful in bringing out what might have been special (and specific) to discussions of Indian identity and its relationship to individuality and Americanness. The Chinese, for instance, were frequently charged with clannishness, but not (to my knowledge) with being communist because clannish, whereas one finds this description from North America to New Zealand with indigenous peoples, which raises important social and historical questions.

*Individuality Incorporated* offers us an important and revealing study of the production of discourses of individuality, society, and culture at the beginning of the twentieth century, and the book ought to be commended especially for the psychological layer that it adds to the problem at hand. Both in the case it makes for the "incorporation" of individuality in the class structures of corporate capitalism, and in its concern for the "protomulticulturalism" of early-twentieth-century America, the work is inspired by important questions of the present and has something to say to all of us as we struggle with similar problems in new guises and a new historical context.

*Arif Dirlik*
University of Oregon

**Invisible Indigenes: The Politics of Nonrecognition.** By Bruce G. Miller. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. 248 pages. $49.95 cloth.

Bruce G. Miller's *Invisible Indigenes: The Politics of Nonrecognition* is an important text that describes the motivations of states and indigenous peoples across the globe, looking for similarities through close attention to differences. Miller's description of the indigenous peoples of Hawaii, for instance, emphasizes their struggles against the United States, first as a monarchy and now as peoples working with the question of whether to submit to the national federal acknowledgment process or to fight for the reestablishment of a Hawaiian state. Because of Miller's comparative approach, what this highlights for the reader is that federal acknowledgment does not hold all the answers, even for Natives of the continental United States. They, too, possess varied orientations to their histories and futures that make its singular definition of "tribe" untenable.

Miller has worked for North American tribes in their long-standing struggles to have their identities acknowledged by the states in which their Aboriginal territories lie, and this is the ground from which he builds his argument. Thus, unlike David Maybury-Lewis's overview of the themes and regional histories in his *Indigenous Peoples, Ethnic Groups, and the State* (2002), Miller's study focuses on how states choose and don't choose to recognize indigenous peoples and what recourse these peoples create, find, and hope for. Further differentiating his work from Maybury-Lewis's, Miller includes ample evidence from the United States. Although describing the poignant conundrums of nonrecognized peoples is not Miller's strong suit (at one point he refers to the state's reifying syllogisms of acceptable Indianness by making a strange analogy between a boy and chair), his text effectively describes why indigenous peoples persist in their struggles with states, even as it takes seriously state priorities for naming and identifying peoples for the purposes of governance. At the same time, this careful balance does not mean that Miller fails to offer a devastating critique of the various manners in which states go about strategically acknowledging indigenous peoples (or strategically ignoring them, as in the case of Japan and the Ainu). In fact, because of his balanced view Miller is able to "normalize" a critique of the US federal acknowledgment process. This is very valuable, for the only voices of critique of the system one hears in this country are typically the polemical voices—rabble-rousers with an antigaming slant or radical anthropologists and others calling for a concept of tribe that relies solely on self-identification.

Yet, unlike such polemicists, Miller isn't interested in practical intervention so much as intellectual intervention—thoughtful *description* of the global predicaments of Native peoples. He uses his case studies to point out differences among indigenous situations and to suggest that there is no one definition of *indigenous* that will work in all contexts. At the same time, Miller notes that the actions of state powers across the globe are very similar and that it might actually be useful to think about *them* monolithically. There is a tension here that is not resolved: Miller recognizes that indigenous peoples often have strong effects on state policies (even as they may not recognize this), yet he seems to say that it is the states that need to do the work of reform. What Miller hopes is that "Indigenousness, . . . if it had to be determined, [c]ould be understood [by the states] on a case-by-case basis from a larger framework that could be relevant to both insiders and outsiders" (67). Questions remain as to how nonrecognized peoples should go about cooperating with the state and how they should go about reform when they are not recognized in the first place. Also important is Miller's description of the role that theories of ethnicity play in state practices in these countries. What this suggests to me is that anthropology has a critical place in both upholding the status quo and effecting change.

My particular interest is in ways of transforming the US government's federal acknowledgment process so as to release its stranglehold on the roughly 250 tribes queued up at the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Branch of Acknowledgment and Research (BAR). Miller's analysis of BAR is smart, succinct, and devastating. He writes that BAR currently plays a quasi-juridical role

in the analysis of tribal "petitions" or cases, even though it only purports to make nondiscretionary, administrative decisions. What this perspective encourages the reader to question is the fundamental, deeply seated national belief that the federal acknowledgment system is apolitical. This simply cannot be, Miller argues, because the system relies on legal precedent and ethnocentric understandings of Indianness, and it is built on nonindigenous forms of evidence and record keeping. Miller also points out that it is a difference between *defining* indigenousness and identifying it. These practices are often what one finds at the root of injustice. At the heart of this critique, for Miller, is the story of several Northwest Coast tribes. His detailed examination of their histories and their work to represent themselves to the BAR forms the emotional core of this book. Part of his message is about how there is not often consensus among indigenes as to who is legitimately indigenous. This, too, fits his understanding of the tangles of identity that have long been built between and around state structures. Miller's best and favorite examples follow similar contours: for instance, the case of Martinez in *Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez*. Born of a mother whose tribe reckoned descent patrilineally and a father whose tribe reckoned it matrilineally, Martinez was considered a member of neither tribe, by both tribal and US law. To Miller, who keeps his eyes on the excluded, such cases point out the potential *usefulness* of state definitions in the struggle for justice, if they can be rehabilitated.

Rehabilitation offers liberal democracies the ultimate challenge, for it demands uprooting the deep-seated cultural biases of government. Looking again to the US case, Miller carefully dissects the cultural biases that are built into the federal acknowledgment process: the idea that every tribe must have a political head, or chief; that every tribe must prove to be its own self-sufficient economy linked to a particular piece of land; that Native peoples' rights are linked to their identity, which should be frozen in the past tense. The reader will find that much light is shed on these biases by the comparative perspective.

Yet from the angle of my hopes for a global assault on state practices related to indigenous peoples, I wanted to find more detail about the apparatuses of "acknowledgment" (in its various guises) than I did in Miller's book. I also wanted to find conclusions that brought the comparisons together in a more cohesive and critical analysis. In particular, I was intrigued by the potential comparison between the federal acknowledgment process in the United States and Stalin's manner of permitting only one hundred of the USSR's "estimated 300–800 distinct ethnic groups" (176) to express their cultural identity, while maintaining central control over it in Moscow. The fallout from this disenfranchisement of so many peoples is sorted out today, Miller tells us, by the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Science, much as the federal acknowledgment process in the United States relies heavily on anthropological expertise. Yet, as in his description of contemporary manners of adjudicating identity in Canada, Taiwan, Malaysia, Scotland, and other countries, Miller leaves the details fuzzy.

In sum, what does *Invisible Indigenes* offer tribal activists? Miller's work makes clear the strategies that states employ to harmonize and control their populations. Indigenous activists have choices to make based on their local

histories, choices about whether to work for local, regional, and/or national recognition—and the latter, Miller suggests, is not always the best solution. Indeed, Miller's work confirms Elizabeth Povinelli's articulation of the situation of Aboriginal Australians (*The Cunning of Recognition* [2002]): they end up having to perform their alterity in a way that is just different enough but not too culturally abhorrent as to be unacceptable to the state. Miller has put together an impressive descriptive array of various scenarios throughout the world, and the devil, as they say, is in the details—details that, as I've said, remain a tad out of focus. But Miller's ultimate point is simply that the story of the invisible indigenes deserves attention—and more comparative research and analysis. Indigenous peoples "test our understandings of what an ethnic group or indigenous group is, and it is [such groups] that most clearly reveal the limits of state authority and state capacity and will to contribute to its citizenry" (219). And this, of course, has implications for every citizen of every nation in the world.

*Sara-Larus Tolley*
University of California, Berkeley

**Mining, the Environment, and Indigenous Development Conflicts.** By Saleem H. Ali. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2003. 254 pages. $50.00 cloth.

Saleem H. Ali's *Mining, the Environment, and Indigenous Development Conflicts* makes an important contribution to the literature on mineral development, indigenous peoples' sovereignty, the environmental movement on indigenous lands, and national policies on Native peoples in Canada and the United States. There are other books, academic journal articles, and visual and print media productions on mineral development, but none, to my knowledge, has the breadth of subject matters and analysis contained in this volume. Ali states, "To understand why resistance arises, [and] conversely, why it may not arise despite provocative circumstances, I am arguing for an approach that transcends scientific or economic determinism about environmental factors in understanding tribal resistance. Rather, my argument focuses on the effectuation of sovereignty as the prime frame of reference for understanding contemporary resistance movements among native communities in North America" (173).

Ali has several goals: to help stakeholders plan for development projects in remote communities in an environmentally sound and economically efficient way, to explain why there is resistance from indigenous people to mineral development on their lands, to account for the role of indigenous sovereignty in the resistance from indigenous people, and to examine the indigenous people's concern for environmental protection in their resistance to mineral development. He is careful to conduct his analyses with a conscious effort to avoid ideological bias. He succeeds in this goal.

Ali analyzes four case studies (two in the United States and two in Canada): coal mining in the Four Corners region on Black Mesa, involving the Hopi and Navajo tribes; the Crandon mine in Wisconsin, where the Mole