

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians. Edited by Devon A. Mihesuah.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/542189j9>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 23(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Arnold, David

Publication Date

1999-03-01

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/>

cepts in their own language; furthermore, some Native words have no easily rendered English equivalent.

The above discussion is not intended to imply that change is necessarily negative. All religions and cultures undergo change. The continual tension between the continuity that tradition supplies and the change that enables a group to adjust to social circumstances exists in every culture. The history of the Sun Dance is a prime example of the interaction of such forces. As scholars more fully understand traditional ways, more meaningful analysis and comparative study can be made in order to explain further the relationship between Indian and non-Indian cultures. More importantly, as Indian scholars such as Phillip White continue to engage in American Indian religious and cultural scholarship, the voices of the indigenous people of North America will remain strong and independent. And those of us who are non-Indian will gain further opportunities to learn from their wisdom.

Overall, White's bibliography is an important contribution to American Indian studies, for it allows the non-specialist and the specialist a useful tool for beginning or furthering his or her research. White states that the intended audience of the book is tribal teachers, college and high school students, and advanced researchers. His diligently and thoughtfully annotated compilation is sure to aid all students in furthering their understanding of and appreciation for American Indian religion and ceremony.

Scott J. Howard

Black Hills State University

Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians.

Edited by Devon A. Mihesuah. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998. 213 pages. \$15.00 paper.

In this book, Elizabeth Cook-Lynn tells us that "bad art has a harmful effect on society." What is bad and what is good when we are talking about Native American artistic production? Cook-Lynn has a clear idea. Good art, like Momaday's *House Made of Dawn*, communicates "traditional values" and speaks from the perspective of "tribal realism." Good art leaves Indian readers optimistic and ready to "affirm their lives as Indian people." Bad art is self-serving, "personal, invented, appropriated, and irrelevant to First Nation status in the United States" (pp. 130–132). It is also, she explains, usually penned by whites or urban mixed-blood Indian intellectuals who have abdicated their moral stance on Indian sovereignty and become cynical, individualized, and disengaged. Sherman Alexie? His work is popular, but it does not seek to advance tribal rights. Therefore, in Cook-Lynn's opinion, it is art that does not deserve status as Native American any more than Disney's *Pocahontas*.

Who decides what is legitimate art or scholarship? Who decides what is publishable? Who determines who can speak for whom? Such questions frame the debate in *Natives and Academics*, the most recent entry in an ongoing debate over scholarly sensitivity, accountability, and ethics in writing about

American Indian culture and history. The present book, consisting of previously published articles by top Native American scholars, emerged from the winter 1996 issue of the *American Indian Quarterly* devoted to "Writing about (Writing about) American Indians." Most of the articles here are reprinted from the journal in unrevised form.

This is no simple debate, and no singular voice emerges from this collection. However, all the articles focus on the economy of knowledge, on who controls the rights to intellectual property and who controls access to the marketplace of ideas. All the articles are welded together by three primary questions: who controls scholarly (and popular) representations of Native Americans; who benefits from such representations; and who *should* control representations of Native Americans; or, in Vine Deloria's straight-shooting words, "should Indians be allowed to present their side of the story, or will helpful and knowing whites be the Indian spokespeople" (p. 68)? The great strength of the collection is that the authors transcend their personal stake in such questions and suggest the relevance that such questions hold for Native communities. As Laurie Anne Whitt persuasively argues, there is a direct relationship between controlling intangibles, such as Indian history and spiritual knowledge, and controlling "tangible resources," such as lands and resources (p. 159). There is also the overwhelming sense among Indian peoples that such intangibles need to be carefully protected, for they are objects in a final act of cultural expropriation. Whitt quotes Margo Thunderbird: "They came for our land ... and now ... they've come for the very last of our possessions; now they want our pride, our history, our spiritual traditions...." (p. 146).

So who controls representations of Native Americans? There is perhaps the greatest degree of consensus on this question. Answer: non-Indians—white scholars with their horn-rims and doctorates, publishing houses and awards committees with scarcely a Native voice, white shamans, Native wannabes, New Age gurus with pseudo-Indian names like Mooncloud, and urban mixed-bloods who have lost touch with their roots but still claim to speak for Native people. It certainly seems grim. However, this book suggests a turning tide, as does the fact, as Elizabeth Cook-Lynn notes, that Hollywood producers are seeking more Native consultants in an effort to authenticate their Indian productions and, as editor Devon A. Mihesuah notes, that Native academics are asserting more and more influence on scholarly editorial boards.

Who profits from the production of American Indian scholarship? Again the answer is fairly obvious: the same non-Indians who control production. In the case of Hollywood and New Age charlatans who rip off Native American culture for personal gain, a healthy resentment seems justified. Since this book is more focused on "scholars," however, even shoddily clad academics are rebuked for crassly building "lucrative careers from studying [Indian] histories and cultures" (p. x). Even if "lucrative" does not describe the profession in which most of us dwell, the larger question of who profits from scholarship is an important one. As Mihesuah notes, many of us build our careers examining the "Other," the poor, the downtrodden. Whether it is on reservations or in the inner cities, we build reputations studying people who receive little compensation for the knowledge they offer. While we receive prestigious

awards and “bask in the glow of scholarly notoriety,” informants “must continue to do jobs, often manual labor, that have considerably less prestige” (p. 9).

This raises the question of scholarly accountability: do scholars owe something to their subjects? It also illustrates the absurdity of a profession which bestows “six figure incomes to individuals who know a little bit about the pottery patterns of a small group of ancient people....” (p. 9). How does the marketplace of knowledge operate? What kind of knowledge receives the greatest compensation? Apparently, tribal knowledge is not rewarded at all, while scholarly knowledge is amply compensated. To be fair, this is a critique of the structure of the academic marketplace in general. It is certainly not a problem that is particular to Native American studies.

In fact, many of the questions raised in the book speak to broader problems of how knowledge is mediated through the academic marketplace. For instance, why are certain books, such as Richard White’s *Middle Ground* and Ramon Gutierrez’s *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away*, singled out for prestigious awards when Indian communities disagree with their conclusions? Who legitimates scholarship? The answer, of course, is that the academy, not Indian communities (or even Indian scholars) determines what is legitimate scholarship and what is deserving of merit. Certainly the process is not “fair.” But here again, this is not a problem that is distinctive to Indian scholarship. In all fields, innovative scholars must overcome the defined orthodoxy. Mihesuah laments that Indian scholars may be hesitant to challenge existing scholarship for fear that they might not be accepted. She is no doubt correct. New story lines, new methods, new critiques, new histories are always contested. However, if she is also right that a recent “surge” in Indian topics has been funded by “fellowship granting foundations that fund projects submitted by anyone claiming to be an Indian ... [and] institutions that create positions for Indian scholars and fellowships for Indian students,” it would seem that Indian scholars, as much as anyone, should be able to find the institutional support to pursue alternative histories (p. 20).

Who should control the representation of Indian peoples? There is far less consensus on this question. The most liberal stance is taken by Duane Champagne, who argues that restricting Native American scholarship to Native Americans marginalizes the subject: “To say that only Indians can study Indians goes too far toward excluding American Indian culture and history from the rest of human history and culture” (p. 182). Champagne, along with Donald Fixico, Angela Cavender Wilson, and Mihesuah, all argue (to a greater or lesser degree) that any scholar who approaches Indian subjects with sensitivity and good faith should be able to carry out scholarship. Wilson and Mihesuah especially make strong cases for scholarly accountability to Native communities. However, they also send mixed messages to non-Indians. Mihesuah, for instance, suggests that no matter how sensitive a non-Indian may be to Native traditions, “listeners who do not come from an oral tradition may not understand the stories” (p. 4).

Karen Gayton Swisher takes a more extreme view on the question of who should “control” American Indian scholarship. Unlike Champagne, who argues that cultural understanding does not correlate to the “presence of

Indian blood," Swisher contends that only Indians can understand Indian problems. "How can an outsider," she asks, "really understand life on reservations, the struggle for recognition, sovereignty, economic development, preservation of language and culture?" (p. 194). Swisher calls on non-Indian scholars to defer to Indian authors. If non-Indian scholars "believe in Indian people and want them to be empowered, they must now demonstrate that belief by stepping aside" (p. 192). After all, only Native peoples can "ask appropriate questions and find appropriate answers" (p. 193). The question remains, however, would such a move actually empower Indian scholars (and Indian peoples), or simply marginalize them further? Swisher's view raises another important question: who is to say that an Indian person can always understand Indians better than a non-Indian? Is understanding so clear-cut? I am reminded of Martin Duberman's recent defense of his biography of Paul Robeson. Duberman is homosexual and white, while Robeson was heterosexual and black.

Which of the affiliative links ... between biographer and subject are likely to prove the most trenchant pathways to understanding? Perhaps—heresy!—the answer is *none*, or none that guarantee access to the furthest recesses of personality. Perhaps what will turn out to matter most is that which is least visible and hardest to define: something to do with an elusive empathy of the spirit between biographer and subject.... How one positions oneself in the world will always reflect to some degree the seminal experiences and indoctrinations of class, race, and gender, but may also, perhaps to an even greater degree, float above them, wondrously unanchored in categorical imperatives, mysteriously untraceable in derivation. (Martin Duberman, "Writing Robeson," *The Nation*, 28 December 1998: 34)

Is it possible that kindred white scholars could interrogate Indian culture and history as empathetically (and accurately) as Indian scholars? Alternatively, if we are to decide that only "insiders" can speak for a certain group, what is to stop us from selecting even further? In fact, this is exactly what Elizabeth Cook-Lynn does. In her eyes it is not enough to be Indian, one must also espouse Indian "ideology." Urban mixed-blood intellectuals do not represent an authentic Indian voice because there are few "useful expressions of opposition and resistance in their writings." In fact, their writings reflect an "aesthetic that is pathetic or cynical, a tacit notion of the failure of tribal governments as Native institutions and of sovereignty as a concept, and an Indian identity which focuses on individualism rather than First Nation ideology" (pp. 124–125). Cook-Lynn apparently believes that there is an "essential" Indian intellectualism which is tied to a specific worldview and committed to defending "Indian nationhood." Her view far oversimplifies the complexity of the modern Indian experience. How is "First Nation ideology" more "traditional" or more "Indian" in the modern context than the views of urban mixed-blood intellectuals who stand at the crossroads of postcolonial cultures, ethnicities, and identities? Are not concepts such as "Indian nationhood" themselves modern constructs of the post-European-conquest political landscape?

Even if we decide (as some scholars in this collection do) that Native American scholarship and cultural production should be controlled by Indians, the question also remains whether Indians actually want to shoulder such a burden. The irony is that while many Indian peoples lament the fact that non-Indians seem to be controlling representation, Indian peoples imbued with “traditional” values are least likely to engage in any kind of representation, especially when it comes to topics that are sensitive or sacred. Theodore S. Jojola notes that conservative communities in New Mexico do not market Indian spirituality, leaving such commerce to non-Indian communities such as Sedona and Santa Fe. “As ‘insiders,’” Jojola asks, “how much cultural information will [Native peoples] be willing to divulge and under what circumstances” (p. 176)? Can Indian peoples afford to turn from the glare of the marketplace when “outsiders” will no doubt continue to commodify Indian culture?

Paula Gunn Allen’s essay cuts to the heart of the conflict around which this book revolves—the different ways of understanding knowledge between westerners and Native traditionalists. In the Western world knowledge is data to be compiled, calculated, and analyzed; it is information to be disseminated widely in the pursuit of knowledge, scientific objectivity, and freedom. Allen notes that even U.S. political culture is based upon full disclosure—on the lack of mystery, secrets, and privacy. On the other hand, knowledge in traditional societies is sacred, it is immanent in the “minds and molecules” of its bearers and it is not served up for mass consumption. It is often private and—as one young Native scholar explains—it is “not for sale” (p. 57).

How do we reconcile these tensions, especially within the academy, between a culture based on exposing and revealing, and one that is trying to protect its secrets? Can Native American life and culture exist unscathed within the halls of academia or walkways of the shopping mall? Allen courageously offers no solutions or resolutions to this tension between two very different systems of knowledge. There are, of course, no easy answers. But this book is certainly a step in the right direction.

David Arnold
Columbia Basin College

On Native Ground: Memoirs and Impressions. By Jim Barnes. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997. Vol. 23 American Indian Literature and Critical Studies Series. 278 pages. \$27.95 cloth.

Jim Barnes is best known as the editor of *Chariton Review* and as a poet. *On Native Ground: Memoirs and Impressions* is as much a selection of his poems as a memoir, since it includes about a hundred poems, more than a third of the book. They come from his six books, starting with *The Fish on Poteau Mountain* (1980) to, most recently, *Paris* (1997). The poems indeed are the places where the magical transformations of literature occur; the prose, though well crafted, is straightforward language. The book is like a transcribed poetry reading, with introductions that set up the individual poems.