UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Individuality Incorporated: Indians and the Multicultural Modern. By Joel Pfister

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6fg138q1

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

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Dirlik, Arif

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

scholars and our non-Indigenous allies must identify and overpower anti-Indianisms" (219). Generally, the essays in this collection might have elaborated more on the complexities raised by contrasting conceptions of oppression held within Aboriginal communities—debates about patriarchy and capitalism receive relatively little attention, for example—but after reading these essays and reflecting on the discussion questions in the book's appendix, each reader will undoubtedly develop her or his own definitional nuances.

In their introduction, Mihesuah and Wilson state that one of the purposes of the book is to continue a dialogue among indigenous academics and their allies. The collection will meet and hopefully exceed that expectation. As a white student at the beginning of graduate school, I read this book as a window on a conversation in progress among indigenous academics, but I also see *Indigenizing the Academy* as crucial reading for non-Native students and teachers. This collection offers white-identified readers a set of articulations on problems we might find too awkward or formidable to attempt to resolve publicly. At the same time, the book challenges us to interrogate our own politics regarding privilege and solidarity in search of solutions founded on respect rather than condescension. Like bell hooks's *Teaching to Transgress*, Linda Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies*, and *Natives and Academics*, *Indigenizing the Academy* breaks down the mythical divide between pedagogical and political praxis. Among its many lessons, *Indigenizing the Academy* teaches that numerous Aboriginal people are working to fundamentally change what the university is, and it is the responsibility of everyone interested in social justice to facilitate this transformation on campus and in community. After all, between the legislative activities of Mr. Schwarzenegger and Mr. Campbell alone, there's lots of work to do.

John Munro
University of California, Santa Barbara

Individuality Incorporated: Indians and the Multicultural Modern. By Joel Pfister. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004. 340 pages. $84.95 cloth; $23.95 paper.

Pfister states his goal in this book to be the study of "dimensions of the history of the 'individual' in America" and goes on to explain that "it is judicious not to employ commonsensical notions of individuality to read history, however natural that may seem, but rather to contribute historical perspectives on the social making of that common sense" (10). His approach should be appreciated by those, such as this reviewer, who think that excessive preoccupation with individuality more often than not produces cardboard conformity. In a more theoretical vein the work offers a revealing, if limited, account of formations of cultural hegemony under colonial circumstances of inequality.

The author's approach to the problem is through an examination of white conceptions of, and efforts to remake, Amerindians from the last quarter of the nineteenth century through World War II. It is not offered as a

comprehensive survey of cultural relations between whites and Indians. Rather, the work juxtaposes two modes of thinking on individuality in relationship to Amerindians that coexisted around the beginning of the twentieth century. One is represented by the Carlisle Industrial School for Indians in St. Augustine, Florida, which was in operation from 1879 to 1918, with special emphasis on its founding superintendent from 1879 to 1904, Richard Henry Pratt. The other is a group of Taos intellectual bohemians around Mabel Dodge Luhan (1879–1962), "wealthy impresario of bohemian artists and social critics" (153), with particular emphasis on John Collier, Bureau of Indian Affairs commissioner, 1933–1946, and author of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, whom Pfister credits with a "protomulticulturalist" approach to Indian affairs.

Pfister describes Carlisle as "an individualizing factory." The school was a product of end-of-century efforts to "Americanize" the Indian, the key to which was individualization. Having first been "Indianized" by the erasure of their diversity, Indians now had to be cleansed of their imagined Indianness through Americanization; the goal was, as Pratt stated famously in 1892, to "kill the Indian in him, and save the man" (20). According to Pfister, Pratt eschewed the identification of the individual with race or culture so that everyone was eligible for salvation from the ill effects of cultural or racial legacies. On the other hand, he and Carlisle were devoted to the production of a single kind of individual for citizenship in a civilized society that was identified with turn-of the-century United States capitalism. The 1887 Dawes Severalty Act already had opened the way to cleansing Indians of their "communism" and making them into individual landowners—however briefly before the lands, now marketable, quickly slipped out of their hold. Carlisle and other Indian schools devoted themselves to purging cultural identities and making their students into good workers; to "workerize" them, as Pfister puts it.

The Taos bohemians held almost the exact opposite views of the Indians, as having something that white capitalist civilization had lost: "Luhan and many of her White artist confreres, as contributors to therapeutic culture and critics of the genteel middle class, romanticized cultural and psychological *disassimilation*: the idea that by seeming to rub up against 'Indians,' they could begin to put the 'savage' back into themselves and thus evolve as artists, 'individuals,' and spiritually and psychologically indigenized Americans" (155). They were the forerunners of contemporary New Agers, searching for spirituality in the primitive while assigning to themselves the roles of saviors of the primitive. Collier, himself influenced by the anarchism of Peter Kropotkin early on, believed that "one might employ social policy to nurture a creative 'individuality' and 'personality' rooted in the commitment to a community" (186). Part of Collier's admiration for Indians grew out of his critique of capitalism; nevertheless, he seemed to feel responsibility for bringing Indians into "modern life," into an American modernity that would be multicultural. Collier believed in "indirect rule," which required the collaboration of Indians in their own government. A colonial state such as England created Native elites, or nurtured them as collaborators, to make possible "indirect rule." The 1934 Reorganization Act, it seems, has had similar results in

producing a tribal leadership often at odds with tribal constituencies, which is ironic given the socialist inspiration in Collier's thinking. Pfister also notes that, in the end, Collier's "therapeutic protomulticulturalizing . . . , like Pratt's capitalist individualizing, was invented in part to workerize 'Indians'" (210)—a kind of "diversity management" that anticipated some aspects of a contemporary multiculturalism. Especially important in my reading is Pfister's identification of these new managerial tendencies with two modern ways of knowing: the "psychological," looking for the patterning of the self, and the "anthropological," looking for the patterning of cultures and societies and how they in turn pattern individuals.

In his discussion of Carlisle and the Taos group the author is sensitive throughout to not erasing Indian agency in the development of these ideas of individuality not just as concepts but as organizing principles of social life. This is much easier for Carlisle, where the voices of students and alumni are audible in school records, student newspapers, and public performances of various kinds. The discussion of Taos intellectuals is much more dependent on literary products and documents, although Pfister does a conscientious job of bringing in Amerindian writers as often as he can. One problem here is the question of "close reading." Close reading may provide some very important insights, as in the author's identification of the metaphors of "redemptive death," "assassination," and "hegemonic digestion" that appeared repeatedly in Carlisle publications (44–45). On the other hand, close reading is also vulnerable to arbitrary reading, as when Pfister tries too hard on occasion to find complexity, resistance, and agency in words and symbols that are open to interpretation because they are vague, which may or may not be meaningful, depending on context—as in the case of Pfister's reading of Mr. SeeAll, a sort of comical Carlisle panopticon figure (32–33).

Pfister places his analysis of the problematic of individuality within the context of a structural transformation in US society from a nineteenth-century industrial-producer-sentimental culture to a twentieth-century corporate-consumer-therapeutic culture. This gesture toward political economy is underworked, however, because the author does not make a serious effort to relate his themes to transformations in production and management or to shifts in consumption practices (especially as therapeutic). Indeed, it is not very clear from the Carlisle/Taos juxtaposition that what is at issue is a temporality deriving from changes in the mode of production and consumption (nineteenth-century Carlisle against twentieth-century Taos) rather than an issue of class, social experience, and education, which may be visible in the author's belated, and rather weak, qualification of his periodizing scheme (231). There is also the geography. The Taos group was part of (and a contributor to) the invention of the Southwest, and what it "discovered" in Indians presumably was related to this broader spatial invention. The tempting reference to "Indianscapes" (148) is not accompanied by analysis of broader issues in the economic colonization of the American West. A similarly tempting reference to the Santa Fe Indian School, which paralleled Carlisle in its methods ("individualizing"), might have provided a revealing contrast to Taos had Pfister pursued their juxtaposition more explicitly.

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.