# UCLA
## American Indian Culture and Research Journal


**Title**
Everything You Know about Indians Is Wrong. By Paul Chaat Smith.


**Permalink**
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8jh9h36d



**Journal**
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 34(4)

**ISSN**
0161-6463



**Author**
Bodinger De Uriarte, John J.



**Publication Date**
2010-09-01

**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

Ajo (with its Papago minority), and the Mormon Church alike. It may be useful to think of institutional completeness as a measure of the complexity and adequacy of the environmental control mechanisms that contribute to the survival of Stucki's "human-created systems."

*Linda M. Gerber*
University of Guelph

**Everything You Know about Indians Is Wrong.** By Paul Chaat Smith. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009. 193 pages. $21.95 cloth.

*Everything You Know about Indians Is Wrong* offers a collection of Paul Chaat Smith's critical essays, selected from more than seventeen years of thinking and writing carefully—and often irreverently—about the politics and poetics of Native self-representation. The book traces Smith's career trajectory in what he calls "the Indian business," from the American Indian Movement to his current position as curator at the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI). It is hard to imagine two seemingly more unlikely, and yet more perfect, bookends to a career that is far from over. The works take into account the changes in the stakes, narratives, and theaters of conflict over self-determination, while the core elements remain: Who gets to decide what "Indian" means? What rights are fundamental realizations of this identity(ies)? How are these identity narratives told?

The journey that Smith makes through these essays, as engagements with a changing Native America during the last three decades, is remarkable and inevitable. What is miraculous is not that Native people survived, but how they survived, and how this survival is worked through, and fully embedded in, different intersecting practices of political activism, struggles for sovereignty, and the politics of Native self-representation. One of the book's central recognitions is that "the Indian experience, imagined to be largely in the past and in any case at the margins, is in fact central to world history," one that "changed life everywhere" (10). This critically important observation is a touchstone for imagining and reimagining the history of the world. Smith, echoing Jimmie Durham, recognizes Europe as an "Indian project," stating: "there really weren't any Indians in 1492, there weren't really any Europeans either" (74). This is a fundamental and necessary recognition, that these categories, locations, and identities are fully coproductive through multiple practices of representation and domination, both political and poetic. The centrality of Native American history to all historical narratives, and not just those of the Americas, moves the representations of Native Americans from the peripheries of natural and American histories, while it recognizes contact and Native American histories as fundamental to an understanding of the "modern" world: "The Indian experience is at the heart of, or pretty damn close to, the history of everybody, period. Not just corn and potatoes, but the Atlantic slave trade. Gold and silver, ideas, microbes, animals" (71).

Smith advocates a "deeply skeptical approach to history," one that attempts "to question and investigate what we know as Indian people, and how we know it" (40). The object of this skepticism is, in large part, a critical examination of what he calls the "master narrative," or "the Big Movie," an identity-fabricating process made up of America-as-frontier narratives, westerns, and various articulations of US patriotism and foundational histories. Those familiar with any or many of the essays will appreciate their collection as a coherent representation of the evolution of Smith's thinking and the changing circumstances of Native politics and representational practice. His thinking is built on an understanding that the invasion and destruction of the Americas is only a beginning (and fully necessary) recognition for Native American history rather than an end result or analysis, "the minimum requirement for making sense of the histories of our countries" (20). In itself, this is not a groundbreaking observation, but its consistent voicing throughout the essays is one of the primary elements making them compelling and useful.

Smith engages one central tension throughout the collection: that negotiating between traditional and contemporary practices of authentically "being Native" is "a crazy-making factory running twenty-four hours a day" (171). He reiterates James Luna's insistence that "authenticity is not a goal for Native people but a prison" (90) and works to locate Native peoples firmly in the here and now, subject to the same cultural influences and drawing from the same wells of knowledge and sense-making apparatuses as everyone else: "Some of us come from traditional families steeped in resistance, educated by carefully remembered oral histories and speaking our native languages. But most of us do not. . . . We get much of our information from the same place as everyone else does" (40).

Three main events unite a number of the essays: the 1969 occupation of Alcatraz; the 1972 Trail of Broken Treaties and the takeover of the Bureau of Indian Affairs offices in Washington, D.C.; and the events at Wounded Knee in the winter of 1972 to 1973. They are seminal moments that articulate Indian rage and focus national attention on Native issues: "In the last days of February 1973, Indians were [the] biggest story in the country" (59). Seemingly overnight, the American public was confronted with Indians that didn't comfortably fit in popular narratives affirmed in westerns or dominant histories and museums. To the above list I would add, more recently, the 1988 Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, the 1990 enactment of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and the 2004 opening of the NMAI.

Smith connects the construction of the NMAI—an institution whose main project is "absurd, impossible, and urgent" (62)—to the recognition of Washington, D.C., as an iconic American location built on "an Indian place." The NMAI is realized as an opportunity to dig deeper into that Indian past, to be a place "where the most important exhibit comes after everyone leaves, as visitors, for the very first time, look closely at the ground beneath their feet" (63). Here the museum is recognized as a space for Native American representation and political activism. Although the NMAI may be "a bad idea whose time has come" (184), it locates Native American representation in the here and now and provides powerful, contextualizing counter and parallel

American histories for the surrounding Mall (and nation): "If amnesia is the state religion, then the act of remembering turns you into a heretic, a revolutionary, a troublemaker" (90). The NMAI is not a space for establishing or ratifying Native authenticity as much as it is a space for conflict and argument within and outside "the master narrative," an Indian world "full of argument and brilliance and foolish mistakes" (162). But Smith also understands the museum as a site for exhibitions, intentional and other: "The Indian floor staff members have become objects, and it's safe to assume all of them knew this would happen when they signed on. . . . [through] placing ourselves over and over again in the same rooms with those things museums call artifacts, asking others to notice, to see, as we perform a work titled *Not Dead Yet*" (100). Here, as throughout this collection, his voice shifts between irony and brutal honesty (all the while pointing out that the differences between the two are illusory at best).

In his closing essay, Smith quotes from a 1993 lecture: "Today, the cutting edge of the political Indian world in North America revolves around questions of gaming, tobacco, of representation, of mascots and burial sites" (182). If the 1960s and 1970s saw the rise of new Indian "legal and extralegal methods" for asserting Indian self-representational power, the 1990s witnessed the rise of other powerful public self-representation in the growth of Indian gaming and Native museum practice (the establishment or expansion of Native-owned and -operated museums, as well as mainstream museum responses to shifting Native public presence and political power). Although Smith identifies the NMAI as a "contested and unresolved space, somewhere in between a disreputable past and a glittering future," one that grows out of good intentions and failures, he goes on to state that "Good intentions aren't enough; our circumstances require more critical thinking and less passion, guilt, and victimization" (184, 187). Smith also asserts, "What the Indian world in the United States has failed to produce on a significant scale and in sufficient quality and quantity is a cadre of public intellectuals" (161). *Everything You Know about Indians Is Wrong* presents another important step in this direction.

*John J. Bodinger De Uriarte*
Susquehanna University

**Humor in Contemporary Native North American Literature: Reimagining Nativeness.** By Eva Gruber. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2008. 274 pages. $70.00 cloth.

Eva Gruber's *Humor in Contemporary Native North American Literature: Reimagining Nativeness* is a welcome addition to indigenous humor studies. Gruber's major focus is on how literature, including drama, emancipates (or mentally "decolonizes") readers from externally imposed definitions and ideas of "Nativeness." As others have, she critiques the earlier key Native humor study, Kenneth Lincoln's *Indi'n Humor: Bicultural Play in Native America* (1993), as taking a largely Western approach (in Lincoln's case, through Northrup Frye's ideas on comedy), a perspective she seeks to avoid in her book and