cultural continuity with the communities and groups that preceded them. Insofar as Pflüg's effort has at least pointed us in the direction of working with such a conception of tradition, she has achieved something considerable in this book. Indeed, as the Odawa recognize, so much of the ethics of giving lie not in the actual receipt of the gift, but in the willingness of the giver to offer it. In this way Pflüg has graciously fulfilled her promise.

Justin Richland
University of California, Los Angeles

To Show Heart: Native American Self-Determination and Federal Indian Policy, 1960–1975. By George Pierre Castile. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1998. 216 pages. $35.00 cloth; $16.95 paper.

I began reading this book with my usual hesitance toward Indian policy commentary by a non-Indian anthropologist. Because I always hope to encounter a non-biased overview of this policy as described by a non-Native, however, I investigated *To Show Heart: Native American Self-Determination and Federal Indian Policy.* I wish I could say that my hopes were fulfilled. I hate to be critical of this book because it is well-researched and -written. Unfortunately, the book also is exceedingly biased and often insulting to Indian leaders who were pivotal in changing Indian policy.

The premise of the book is to give an "insider's" view of Indian policy from 1960 to 1975. George Castile worked for the Office of Economic Opportunity's (OEO) Community Action Program (CAP), which was important in that it allowed tribal communities to submit grant proposals for community development programs in the early 1960s. Castile's thesis is that the CAP program was the model for the Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act, which allows tribes today to contract for tribal control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' (BIA) programs. Along the way, however, Castile takes aim at tribal leaders, the American Indian Movement (AIM), and the Democratic Party. The result is a somewhat narrow contribution to the body of work on Indian policy that focuses on the strength of Richard Nixon and his vision for Natives in America.

Castile is intensely harsh on tribal leaders such as Vine Deloria, Jr., who was president of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) at the time. For example, he writes that Deloria's claims were "doubtful" or "impossible" whenever Deloria made a statement that conflicted with Castile's opinion (see pp. 49, 59, 87). In other instances, he cites Deloria to support his ideas (see pp. 41, 48). The most frustrating example of Castile's competition with Deloria pertains to his mention of Deloria's contention that NCAI coined *self-determination* at one of their meetings in 1966. Castile then refers back to this statement to "prove" that the term was first used not by the NCAI, but by Woodrow Wilson in 1919, by Robert Yellowtail of the Crow, by the OEO, and by Sargent Shriver. I don't think that it matters who spoke the term first, for the idea is that Indians desired to govern themselves since first contact. What

is important is who articulated the term with a policy behind it. While it is true that Nixon signed the paper, Indians and other subaltern peoples have been asking for self-determination for a long time.

Castile presents himself as a person who hates for Indians to get credit for anything. It was non-Indians who started the self-determination movement in his book. If the basis of this book is to respond to books such as *Native Testimony, Indian Self-Rule,* or *American Indians, American Justice,* then it should be couched as such at the onset. Perhaps in the introduction, Castile could have stated that he was unhappy with these books' portrayals of Indian Self-Determination and wanted to show a different perspective on the era and its policy changes.

The book is also very hard on AIM. This criticism is somewhat more on target, since many Indian leaders and community members agree that AIM's demonstrations did not represent Indian Country's tribal and reservation populations. Castile proves that AIM was not a part of the policy-making process either before or after their occupation of the BIA. Castile's portrayal, however, is snide and cynical rather than unbiased. In the second page of his castigation of AIM, he criticized other accounts written by both Indian and non-Indian scholars as highly biased. It is hard to see how his account is less partisan than these other depictions. I am sure there is a middle ground. An unbiased account of this important period of modern history would be relevant to understanding the changes that have occurred in Indian policy since Nixon's presidency. Moreover, an unbiased view lends more credibility to Indian policy-making.

The most ironic part of Castile's AIM-blasting is that he has chosen to exhibit a cover photo of those same Indian demonstrators camped in Washington, DC with the White House in the background. While saying that AIM's actions, such as the occupation of the BIA office in Washington, DC, actually undermined Nixon's advancement of Self-Determination, he places their image on the cover of his new book. It seems hard to reconcile these two approaches to AIM. On the one hand, he asserts that AIM actually hindered the advancement of Nixon's Indian agenda; on the other, he places the faces of Red Power on the cover of his book.

The book does hold much merit for the political scholar, however. Reading the book gives an understanding of the deep roots of partisanship in Congress. Castile sides with the Republicans, arguing that they were truly concerned about the Indians. He carefully details discussions between Nixon's advisors and states that they lobbied congressional leaders to support an Indian agenda. He paints the Democrats (especially the Kennedy family) as unwilling to let anything pass through Congress because they did not want the Republicans to get credit.

We can all agree that Nixon helped the Indians while in office—he acknowledged them in pubic actions, statements, and policy. But I wonder if there is more to the story than this. I have doubts only because of the author's extreme bias on other fronts. For example, when Nixon withdraws support for Indian affairs, it is because of AIM, according to Castile. If Democrats withhold support, however, the author claims that it is because of purely partisan motives. For

example, when Nixon gave the January 1972 State of the Union Address, he mentioned all of his initiatives—restoration of Blue Lake, Alaska Native Claims, and Indian preference—but excludes the Indian Education Act. Even though the bill was going through, he won't tell the nation because it is a Democratic (Kennedy) initiative. So partisanship cuts both ways—Castile does not explain this in a clear and concise way.

Castile's writing style is clear and well-presented and the endnotes are substantive. The text is organized and reads well for the most part. The book presents an exciting time in Indian political history and thus contributes something to us all. Unfortunately, the book is limited by the author's bias. He has added his opinion to Indian policymaking by arguing that Indians were not a part of the process. I would recommend this book, but only to those who have read other accounts of the period. These readers would be able to benefit from the contribution this book makes. However, they would also be able to look past Castile's slanted view of Indian policy under President Nixon.

Michelle LeBeau (Pit River, Maidu, Cabazon)
University of California, Davis

Watermelon Nights. By Greg Sarris. New York: Hyperion Press, 1998. 432 pages. $21.45 cloth; $13.95 paper.

JOHNNY SEVERE

> It was only after her and the boys was gone that I seen how her face was just then: plain, without the little smile she had before; not worried or upset, just plain, the way a field is solid yellow in July (p. 25).

Imagine Huck Finn on a raft with Injun Joe, floating down the Sacramento River, getting along. Imagine Lipsha from Louise Erdrich's *Love Medicine* crossed with Sethe in Toni Morrison's *Beloved.* Imagine a three-generational Native American epic fed by William Faulkner, Eudora Welty, Washington Carver, and Mae West. Just imagine something you've never read before.

The first section's narrative voice experiments with regional dialect and Red English among California Indians, the least understood Native Americans of all. Outside government treaties, off the reservation, mixed with Filipinos and Portuguese, confused with Mexicans and Blacks, these California Natives are preliterate, street-smart, mixed-blood, now-day Indians. Johnny Severe and Felix no-father sell used clothing and modern beadwork. They bisexually cruise the streets, scam tribal casinos, live on castoffs, scrounge for paternity and pride, and survive the back alleys of the American Dream and Great Depression. Regional genius rises up here with challenging cultural materials—off-rez, anti-romantic, gossipy, endearing, back-stabbing, desperate, enduring, ravaged Indians, neither noble nor savage. These characters are real people among the rest of us, for better or ill, corruptible and courageous all at once. So too wrote Faulkner of racial despair, regional pride, and ethnic freedom in *The Bear.*