

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Metaphysics of Modern Existence. By Vine Deloria, Jr.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/74z1k3j6>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 5(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Churchill, Ward

Publication Date

1981-06-01

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/>

In short, *LBR* offers new important information on a variety of topics central to Lakota culture. The editorship is of the same high quality as the primary sources, thus making *LBR* of great value to both the serious scholar of Lakota culture and Native American religions and the casual reader interested in exploring a way of life that daily appears more and more meaningful to the individual living in contemporary society.

Angelo A. Calvello
De Paul University,
Chicago

The Metaphysics of Modern Existence. By Vine Deloria, Jr. New York: Harper and Row, 1979. 233 pp. pap. \$8.95.

Reading *The Metaphysics of Modern Existence* was a perplexing experience. A second reading served only to reinforce the frustration engendered by the first. This is brought about not so much by what the author advances, but by what he ignores. Considering that the author in question is Vine Deloria, Jr., such a situation is truly unusual; not that he has not perplexed others often enough, but because this has seldom been due to his begging of major questions.

Deloria opens his most current work with a rather casual survey of the intellectual "state of things" today. From there he proceeds to postulate a perceived need for the revitalization of collective intellectual energies in order to solve certain problems confronting contemporary humanity. He indicates intent to elaborate a basis for such revitalization, and along the way mentions that he will seek not so much to introduce new theoretical material, but to provide an effective synthesis to existing theory. A quote from Jean-Francois Revel's *Without Marx or Jesus* concerning the need for a revolutionary transcendence of current theory serves to underscore this procedure. Everything may seem to the good at this point, but the seeds of a problem central to Deloria's development of material have already been sown.

Setting aside Revel's rather close relationship with Jean-Jacques Sevant Schribner, an unabashed proponent of a Europe centered corporate-liberal ideology (a factor which tends to offer some

interesting perspectives to Revel's thesis), the central figures within his schema are Marx (dialectical materialism) and Jesus (Christian theology / idealism). Deloria never picks up the strands of this line of argumentation which he notes at the onset. Rather, his treatment becomes so lopsided as to cause real consternation.

Questions of theology are dealt with at length throughout the text. Teilhard de Chardin is subjected, rightfully enough, to a major theoretical critique and crumbles before Deloria's secular siege-guns. After that, it is a relatively easy matter to dismantle comparative lightweights such as Paul Tillich, Ian Barbour, Werner Heisenburg and Joachim Wach. This is the sort of devastating criticism at which Vine has always excelled, a game he knows and seems to love. Insofar as the theology he addresses still exists as a relevant entity, he performs a real service in providing a lucid refutation. But it is a service he has already provided admirably in *God is Red*. An open question remains as to why he felt compelled to return to the same arena as an end rather than as the prelude to further exploration.

As Deloria himself points out early on, philosophy as such springs directly from theology, at least within the European intellectual tradition. With this said, however, he promptly abandons the field of philosophy proper to deal with adjunct matters. Science replaces philosophy in an exchange which centers first upon Charles Darwin. Darwinian evolution is dismissed as impossible within its chosen context; the mathematical criterion of evolutionary postulation simply does not jibe with similar projections in terms of geological data, etc. From this position, Deloria is able to launch an effective demolition of anthropological precepts as represented by Cassirer, Lévi-Strauss, Ferre, Radin and Ardrey. But this too is a path well traversed by the author in other works, albeit in somewhat lesser depth and his return to it here as a major theme seems questionable. Even as an approach leading into consideration of the Velikovsky affair, this treatment is flat. That the scientific community behaved absurdly in relation to Velikovsky was brought out compellingly in *God is Red*. A new twist illustrating similar scientific attitudes concerning astrology does little to redeem the rehashing offered in the more recent book.

It is not that the material contained in *Metaphysics* is invalid or poorly presented. It is that the material is not to the point. The problem is one of the *context* of presentation. It is clearly impossible to develop a contemporary metaphysics based upon the syn-

thesis of existing thought/material while failing to incorporate conclusions drawn from the bulk of European philosophy proper. This is most particularly true in that Deloria himself opted to treat European thought as his primary format. Yet it is precisely the bulk of European philosophy which is omitted from consideration in this book. It is time to be specific.

Returning to the observation that philosophy springs from theology, it has been noted that Deloria merely mentions this in the process of developing argumentation concerning theology and science. Thus, real void is created relative to philosophy *per se*. Nowhere in the entire text is there so much as a reference to Hegel. Yet it was Hegel who most directly accomplished the secularization of theology which *is* mentioned, and of which tradition Deloria's argument is itself a part. Further, Hegel brought into general use the very dialectical methodology which Vine hopes to utilize in achieving his synthesis. This omission becomes not merely peculiar, but disastrous, when it is considered that the ignoring of Hegel precludes any discussion of the left/right Hegelian debate which went so far toward creating the intellectual schism Deloria is currently attempting to address.

Given that Marx came from an initial left Hegelian position, it became necessary to ignore the Marxian inversion of Hegel's idealism/spiritualism (Jesus) in favor of materialism/science (Marx). Thus, one full half of Revel's schema is lopped off through such a handling. And yet, *Without Marx or Jesus* is ostensibly a major pivot to the rationale for the writing of *Metaphysics*. This contradiction goes far in flawing Deloria's effort, but it is hardly the end of the problem. As with any fundamental contradiction, there are continuing ramifications.

While Deloria belabors theology, theology itself has had little to say since Hegel. Somehow science becomes substituted for philosophy, and while science holds clearly interesting properties for philosophy, the two are not synonomous. The positivist writings of Alfred North Whitehead cited by Deloria do little to produce reconciliation, since positivism has generally proven as barren as theology in the Twentieth Century. In ignoring the vast bulk of European philosophy (Marxian and otherwise) since 1800, Vine renders his own arguments tangential and devoid of closure. This is all the more strange in that there are myriad points of intersection available between the peripheral areas discussed and the mainstream areas ignored.

For example, Ernst Mach might have been utilized as a medium through which to link late 19th Century Marxism to the then unraveling theory of relativity. His intellectual influence on the young Einstein is no secret. Einstein's own Marxian inclinations might then have been explored in relation to Von Rank's hermeneutics, and the latter would have led directly back to the Frankfurt School Marxists—Adorno, Marcuse, et. al. Thus, the symbiosis between science and philosophy might have been thoroughly demonstrated, and this would occur in view of the theology/Hegel/Marx progression. If this were not clear enough, any discussion of Adorno might have served to bring Walter Benjamin into the fray. Benjamin's eclectic blend of Kantianism, Marxism and theological inclination might have served as an exemplary model to tie up science, philosophy and theology in one reasonably coherent package. Even Deloria's own critique of Darwin might have been used as a springboard from which to enter the above domain, insofar as Marx and Engels held that the work on evolution provided a rather helpful underpinning for their own theoretics.

The above is but one possible strategy which might have been employed to salvage *Metaphysics*. There are others. Kirkegaard's Christianity and its relationship to Niels Bohr might have proven an interesting area of exploration. Heidegger, Neitsche, Wittgenstein and Russell are all to obviously important to have been ignored in any examination attempting to synthesize a metaphysics. Husserl's fusion of biology (the physiology of perception) with phenomenology would have led the examiner directly to Merleau-Ponty and Sartre and, through Sartre's inversion of existentialism, to Marx in the form of Althusser and Foucault. The work of Breton, Artaud, Chomsky, Lenin, Gramsci, Lukacs and others might have been at least acknowledged.

If this critique is beginning to seem to enter the realm of name-dropping, it is succeeding in a certain sense. The point is that the names represent a tremendous collective body of theory, much of which directly pertains to the intellectual turf Deloria's title leads one to believe will be dealt with. The book begged for further inclusions, elaborations, demystifications. Yet the author refrained. In so doing, he willingly eclipsed an entire intellectual world; perhaps the most important one currently available. At least it is the currently ascendant intellectual world.

The pros and cons of Marxism are ultimately not to be denied a hearing in any contemporary metaphysical construct. This philo-

sophical terrain possesses far too much strength to be dismissed with the single sentence Deloria devoted to the subject. At least as many people on the planet more or less adhere to Marxist doctrine as ever fell under the sway of the Church at any given moment. To deny a hearing within the context of metaphysical discourse not only to Marxism, but to all European thought beyond nonsecular theology and "science" is to charge full tilt into the sublime.

The careful reader is thus placed either in a posture of attempting to read constantly between the lines, to draw conclusions for Deloria in areas he never touches, or to give up in a flurry of idle wishing for a critique which matches the book's title. That a thinker/writer of Deloria's undeniable stature has ventured into such a position leaves one grasping at explanations. And, to one who essentially agrees with the conclusions the man has drawn in the past, this is hardly an unimportant situation.

There is, however, a possible route out of the dilemma thus defined. *Metaphysics* was intended, by Deloria's accounting, as the first volume of a *trilogy* designed to cover the subject matter at issue. Hence, while mistitled in and of itself, the book may be no more than the direct prelude to a follow-up *tour de force* in precisely those areas of omission noted in this review. This would logically be followed by a third volume which caps this critique of prevailing Euro metaphysics with a full blown elaboration of what might be termed "the multicultural alternative." Such a treatment would be desirable, to say the very least.

Such speculations, of course, tend to open up questions such as where, after three years, the second of the three volumes might be. In this connection, one is forced to look to the publisher rather than author for answers. Assuming that Deloria may be taken at his word insofar as the two remaining manuscripts exist (and there is no reason whatsoever why he shouldn't be believed), the question then becomes why they've not been published.

Clarity along these lines may be established through consideration of Harper and Row's support for the one volume it *did* begin to put in print. Perhaps *lack* of support would be more appropriate terminology. *Metaphysics*, after all, was a selection from the much touted "Contemporary Indian Authors Series" at Harper and Row, the same series which generated Hyemeyohsts Storm's great literary sham, *Seven Arrows*. Any comparison of the media hype and marketing technique lavished by the publisher upon *Seven Arrows* as opposed to that afforded *Metaphysics* reveals a sad reality.

It would seem that Harper and Row contracted Deloria to write for its series sheerly on the basis of his then highly marketable image as a writer of "Angry Indian" polemics. The publisher was therefore seemingly unprepared for a serious scholarly manuscript, and was quite unwilling to publish what it received.

Contracts, however, are contracts. So despite objections centering upon the editorial notion that "Indians don't write books on metaphysics," the publisher put the first manuscript in print. Such a mercenary performance on the part of a supposedly reputable publisher is little short of pure tragedy on at least three levels.

First, and perhaps most obviously, it bespeaks a sorry state of affairs within the realm of American publishing itself when such ignorance and de facto censorship are brought to bear at the highest levels.

Second, one of the most articulate and eloquent writers ever to emerge from the ranks of Native Americans has been effectively stranded in a needlessly untenable intellectual position, seemingly on the basis of highly bigoted editorial preconceptions. Deloria deserved and deserves much better than to have a portion of his major works published out of context as complete and self-supporting arguments. The community of Native American scholars deserved and deserves better than to see one of its more important members projected in terms of intellectual narrowness, methodological sloppiness and as a "half-baked" thinker.

Finally, Harper and Row's conscious policy of allowing *The Metaphysics of Modern Existence* to languish as an unadvertised and (therefore) unsaleable tax write-off serves to reinforce the stereotyped notion that Indians just don't write successfully on certain subjects. The book was, after all, a commercial flop (albeit, it was so intended by Harper and Row). Thus, a popular publishing wisdom is anchored in current "reality" whereby not only Deloria, but other Indian scholars, are precluded from whole areas of serious writing.

Considered alone, *Metaphysics* is not a particularly good book. It is certainly not up to the standards of excellence which Deloria has established for himself during the past fifteen years. Taken as a part of a much broader effort however, one which matches the implications of the book's title, *Metaphysics* may well assume a significance and long-term stature which belies its initial impact (or lack of same). Only the publication of the remainder of the trilogy can reveal the ultimate merit of Deloria's recent work and of this preliminary review.

In any event, it is long past time that Native American authors who have achieved a literary/intellectual stature such as that which can be rightfully claimed by Vine Deloria, Jr., receive the uncontested right to publish the fruits of their efforts. This is no more than the essential courtesy accorded Euroamericans occupying comparable academic and social positions. Until the day arrives when such a situation becomes normal reality, all Indian writers will face an ongoing dilemma of either writing in veins approved by a non-Indian publishing status quo or effectively being frozen out of print.

For all its defects then, *The Metaphysics of Modern Existence* is an important book. In insisting upon his right to offer up a manuscript on any subject he chose, and in offering it as validly Indian writing simply because an Indian wrote it, Deloria took on a fight for all of us. In this sense at least, the fate of this book speaks to the situation of all Native American writers, scholars and intellectuals everywhere.

Ward Churchill
University of Colorado,
Boulder

The Village Indians of the Upper Missouri: The Mandans, Hidatsas, and Arikaras. By Roy W. Meyer. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977. 354 pp. \$14.95.

In the words of Roy W. Meyer, *The Village Indians of the Upper Missouri* is intended as a chronological outline of the "major events and trends in the history of the Three Tribes from as far back as archaeological evidence reveals their presence in the Missouri valley, down to the time of writing" (p. xii). Because any work must be evaluated within the parameters of its stated goals, I would have to state at the start that Meyer's book is success. The reader who started this book, knowing nothing about the history of the Three Affiliated Tribes as seen by non-Indians, upon finishing it, would certainly have an excellent idea of the historical events which affected their lives.

Employing a methodology which is multidisciplinary, by a careful union of historical, archaeological, and ethnological informa-