From - Kehoe, Alice B. 1992

North American Indians: A Comprehensive Account 2nd e. Prentice Hall

Appendix

ANTHROPOLOGY AND AMERICAN INDIANS

Relate the discussion to the film "In the WhiteMan's Image".

Anthropology developed as a social science during the heyday of imperialism. Governmental support for anthropological research was frequently expected to yield information that could be used in the administration of colonies and subjugated people. Colonial powers that could insist on a native community receiving the researcher often facilitated anthropologists' access to peoples whose cultural patterns exemplified interesting alternative ways of life. Government agents, military officers, and missionaries sometimes provided accommodations, introductions, and background information for researchers in the field. Because of this apparent, and occasionally actual, alliance between anthropologists and colonial agents, some spokespeople for indigenous groups have accused anthropology of being an instrument of imperialism. It is true that anthropological data have been used by colonial agents, and even continue to be solicited by, for example, some Christian missionaries, but the relation between anthropology and the milieu that fostered it is complex.

It can be argued equally well that anthropology has contributed to the growing public sense of outrage at imperialism. To reduce the argument to very simple terms, there are a number of anthropologists who have studied or are studying native peoples of North America, who are themselves American Indians. Among the early employees of the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of American Ethnology, in the late nineteenth century, were J.N.B. Hewitt, a Tuscarora, and Francis La Flesche, an Omaha. Others, with less formal education, were the fully acknowledged collaborators of professional anthropologists: George Hunt, lifelong resident of a Kwakiutl village, who wrote thousands of pages with Franz Boas, or Robert Spott, a Yurok, coauthor with Alfred L. Kroeber. Arthur C. Parker, member of the well-known Seneca Iroquois family, was New York State Archaeologist, an ethnologist, and finally Director of the Rochester Museum in the early twentieth century. Somewhat later, Edward Dozier, whose mother was a Tewa, became a highly respected anthro-

pologist, and a younger Tewa, Alfonso Ortiz, has gained a similar position today. The late D'Arcy McNickle, a Flathead, wrote powerful novels of his people as well as anthropological volumes. Ella Deloria, a Lakota, was trained by Boas as an anthropologist and prepared texts in her language, although her career was in applied rather than academic work. Her niece, Beatrice Medicine, is a professional anthropologist (and Vine Deloria, Jr., the writer and legal scholar, is a nephew). Robert K. Thomas, a Cherokee, has become known both for scholarly publications and as a leading applied anthropologist. Others, such as Joseph Medicine Crow, a Crow, have preferred work in programs with their own people after obtaining graduate degrees in anthropology. These examples, extending over four generations, show that anthropology is not incompatible with prideful active membership in an American Indian group.

More fundamentally, anthropology and American Indians have been in symbiosis even before the emergence of anthropology as a recognized scholarly discipline. Sahagún's sixteenth-century compendium of Aztec beliefs and practices was a stimulus to reflection upon the nature and possible worth of non-Western societies outside of the fringes of the classical world. By the eighteenth century, European philosophers such as Rousseau were discussing at length the significance of the reported differences between American and European peoples. The weighty questions formulated in those discussions called for directed research that developed through the nineteenth century as the traditionally broad field of philosophy became fragmented into independent disciplines. Observations of American Indians had honed many questions; now scholars would go to American Indian communities to obtain data in greater depth to perhaps answer the questions.

The first modern anthropological study is said to be Lewis Henry Morgan's *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee or Iroquois*, published in 1851. Morgan was an upstate New York lawyer fascinated since youth by the differences between his immigrant people and the Seneca neighboring them. Noticing an Indian youth in a bookstore, Morgan struck up an acquaintance, and through this youth, Ely S. Parker, an introduction to other Seneca. From his visits to the Tonawanda and other Iroquois reservations, Morgan compiled his book. The matrilineal organization of the Iroquois intrigued him, and he decided to go West to interview other American Indians to discover how widespread this form of organization might be. He also sent questionnaires on kinship terms to missionaries and government agents in Asia and the Pacific islands. From his own and his correspondents' material, he prepared the landmark theoretical study, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity*, published by the Smithsonian Institution in 1871. As in any pioneering work on entirely new ground, Morgan's contains errors both of fact (especially where he had to use his correspondents' data) and of interpretation, but the volume inaugurated a whole new field of scholarly study, and much of its content remains usable. A more general work, *Ancient Society* (1877), attracted wide readership to its universal scheme of human societal and technical development, although the scheme was far too ambitious for the amount of data Morgan could obtain to support it. *Ancient Society* expounded stages of development tied to methods of subsistence, styles of crafts, and patterns of kinship and political organization. Insofar as it named non-European peoples as members of stages that Europeans had passed through and beyond, it seemed to justify imperialistic ethnocentric "development" forced upon these peoples. Morgan did not speak directly to this issue; he believed he was presenting a purely historical study, although one that required bold speculation to make history out of ahistorical descriptions. Karl Marx studied Morgan's popular book and Marx's disciple, Friedrich Engels, made it the basis of his revisions for publication of Marx's last notebooks. Engels' *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State* (1884) in turn inspired Lenin and raised *Ancient Society* to reverence as a seminal influence

upon Soviet social theory—ironic, for Morgan was a capitalist. *Ancient Society* was denounced as fantasy by Franz Boas, who privately inclined more toward socialism than Morgan ever did, and has had little direct influence upon anthropology outside the Slavic-speaking nations. Leslie White, a professor at the University of Michigan, attempted to revive Morgan for American anthropology beginning in the 1950s, but the schemes of White and his successor, Elman Service, resemble Morgan more in outline than in detail.

The Bureau of American Ethnology was organized in 1879 to compile records on the native peoples of the United States. Administered by the Smithsonian Institution, the Bureau's first director was Major John Wesley Powell, who as chief of the survey of the Rocky Mountain region had explored the Great Basin and Southwest and carefully described the peoples of these regions. Powell saw a critical need for data on the indigenous peoples if, as his successor put it, the government was to be capable of "intelligent administration." Such information had been specifically requested as early as 1795 from government agents to the Indians, and had been a major goal of the 1804–6 Lewis and Clark expedition instructed by President Jefferson. Henry Rowe Schoolcraft had a few years later kept, and soon published, journals of his surveys as a mineralogist in the upper Midwest, and his interest in the peoples of this frontier led to his appointment in 1822 as Indian agent based at Sault Ste. Marie. Schoolcraft married a woman who was part Ojibwa, and through her amassed volumes of notes on her mother's people and their neighbors, published in 1839 as *Algic Researches* (Algic = Algonkian). *Algic Researches* lacks the scientific acumen of Morgan's work, but perhaps on that very account was more popular with the general public. It was the source of Longfellow's notions of Indians embodied in his famous poem *The Song of Hiawatha*. Early in his own career, Morgan had consulted with Schoolcraft as with a mentor. Schoolcraft thus was influential in forming nineteenth-century images of northern American Indians. His work culminated in a six-volume compendium that he prepared and published in the 1850s under the direction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

After the Civil War, Major Powell cited the Government's support of Schoolcraft's studies, his own series, Squier and Davis's *The Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley* (1848), and other publications to argue that a systematic plan of research was not only feasible but likely to produce many volumes comparable in value to these. Successful, Powell hired several persons eager to work on the envisioned massive research project, and sent them to Indian communities not previously studied. The goal was an encyclopedic inventory of the native peoples—their languages, beliefs, customs, physical characteristics, populations, histories, and current situations. A century later, with the Bureau of American Ethnology title discarded and its staff merged into the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History's Department of Anthropology, the project continues toward its utopian goal. During this century, Powell's vision not only supported many hundreds of field research and archival studies through his Bureau, but also encouraged, guided, and occasionally helped support research by persons in museums and universities, the privately employed, or wealthy.

Powell's competitor was the German immigrant Franz Boas, who received some training in ethnography in Berlin in the early 1880s before going first to Baffin Land and then to the Northwest Coast on expeditions. Boas obtained a position as anthropologist at the American Museum of Natural History in New York, and soon after began teaching at Columbia University, where within a few years he established a department of anthropology that granted its first Ph.D. degree to Alfred L. Kroeber in 1901. Boas agreed with Powell that it was crucial to obtain first-hand information on prereservation Indian life before the last generation to live free should die out, and with his colleague Clark Wissler arranged for a series of field trips that would complement the work of the Bureau of

American Ethnology. Unlike Powell, Boas believed it important to train ethnologists formally, and for some years there was rivalry between "Washington" and "New York" on the merits of academic preparation. Boas's position prevailed. As Powell's first ethnographers retired, they were replaced, for the most part, by men with graduate degrees in anthropology. (Both Boas and Powell encouraged and employed women anthropologists, but once the two founders retired, administrators at their institutions and others were usually reluctant to hire women for professional positions.)

The Bureau of American Ethnology amassed priceless data, including detailed procedures of ceremonies that today are referred to by Indian priests whose own teachers may have been able, in the period of governmental suppression of Indian religions, to pass on only shortened versions. The Bureau's material was greatly augmented by the observations collected by the fieldworkers of the American Museum, the Field Museum in Chicago, the University of California, and other institutions. From these data, and from fieldwork designed to elucidate theoretical hypotheses but productive also of more data toward Powell's great goal, anthropologists selected whatever seemed to support one or another explanation of causes of human behavior. In other words, data from records of American Indian communities were drawn upon to test social-science hypotheses. Through this interaction—the designing of field work to produce relevant data, and the construction of hypotheses from American data—the recording of the cultural patterns of the native peoples of North America has been formative in the development of anthropology. Powell's plan was pragmatic and colonialist, though infused by his intellectual drive and curiosity; Boas, by concurring in the necessity of recording the memories of prereservation adult Indians, focused anthropological theory building upon American data. (Boas's contemporaries in Europe, such as the Polish-British anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski, similarly combined the recording of cultures of colonial peoples in Africa and the Pacific with the building of theory. As in America, money to support student and professional researches was available from governments ostensibly seeking "intelligent administration.")

If their support money might seem, to some modern eyes, tainted, the majority of the anthropologists working in the late nineteenth and the twentieth centuries have sincerely believed that their work might improve the lot of the peoples they observed. The government was going to administer Indian communities, like it or no, so sympathetic descriptions of the dignity and complexity of the communities were a worthwhile attempt to sensitize bureaucrats. Bureaucrats don't always read all they should, or always follow recommendations in what they read, but better to try, if to no avail, than not to try at all. It is unfair to assume that anthropologists "mined" Indian communities for data primarily to advance their own careers. Instead, it should be recognized that many individuals who have been committed to cultural relativism as a foundation for human rights have chosen the unusual and not-very-well-paying career of anthropology in order to better live by humanitarian principles. When anthropologists' recommendations have proven ill advised, as when Alice Fletcher spoke in favor of the Dawes Act, it was not usually from dastardly motives, but from misplaced faith in government agents' capabilities to avert unscrupulous manipulation of their Indian charges. There are, of course, some anthropologists who were (or are) cads, or worse, but on the whole, anthropologists have been well-meaning friends whose principal sin has been the powerlessness of their small numbers and lack of wealth. Like everyone else, they have been molded by the beliefs and customary behavior of the societies in which they grew up. Even with anthropological training they cannot fully shake off these influences, and, like everyone else, they are frustrated by structures and processes they as individuals or as a tiny fraction of American society cannot control.

Often in reaction to these frustrations, anthropologists turned to theory building. Boas urged

great caution in extrapolating from observations of a few American Indian communities to grand explanations of human behavior, and held up Morgan's *Ancient Society* as an example of the errors to which such schemes are prone. Taking their cue from Boas, the majority of American anthropologists have eschewed universal explanations; Leslie White was an exception. They have instead increasingly tended to examine the ecology in which a community lives, and emphasize the adaptation of the members of the community to that ecology through cultural patterns. One classic of this position is Julian Steward's *Theory of Culture Change* (1955). Steward drew heavily upon his ethnographic fieldwork in the Great Basin and the Southwest, published in part by the Bureau of American Ethnology as *Basin-Plateau Aboriginal Socio-Political Groups* (1938). He had been deeply impressed by the small size and highly flexible social structure of groups of Paiute and Shoshoni, and he attributed these features of their societies to the low density of food resources in the habitats in which he found them. His correlation of population size and structure with ecology was taken over by the archaeologist Jesse Jennings, who was excavating prehistoric sites in Utah, and Steward's ethnographic descriptions became the basis of Jenning's reconstruction of ancient Basin life. Steward failed to realize that the Numa he interviewed had been driven from their ancestral homelands along the lakes and streams by Euro-American colonists. Jennings eventually realized, as archaeological researches proved heavier prehistoric habitation in these localities, that his picture of the "Desert Culture" was skewed, but the more general application of Steward's emphasis on density of resources as a causal factor in societal structural complexity has remained a major explanatory principle. Part of its strength lies in its grounding in its intellectual forebears, Clark Wissler's 1914 "Material Culture of North American Indians" map of culture areas based upon principal subsistence resources, and Kroeber's 1939 *Cultural and Natural Areas of Native North America*, which refines the culture-area concepts of Boas, Otis Mason, and Wissler with the aid of better ecological studies. The conceptualization of culture areas was initially, in the late nineteenth century, a means of organizing American Indian data by criteria important to the peoples themselves; three generations later, Steward had been able to transcend the American data to produce a universal scheme, his "multilinear evolution."

The critical importance of American Indian data came to the fore again when several fieldworkers sharply took issue with the postulate of Steward and of Elman Service, another exponent of evolutionary schemes, that patrilocal bands were the norm for hunting peoples. June Helm and Richard Slobodin, working with Dene, David Damas with Central Inuit, Charles Bishop with Cree, and others were convinced that the northern hunting peoples did not blindly bind sons perpetually to their fathers, but rather weighed a number of factors to select the most pleasant and reliable family alliances. If anything, these northern peoples slightly favored matrilocality in that they expected a young couple to remain with the wife's parents for at least a couple of years. Debates over residence rules may look like quibbles, but there is a significant dimension in that these anthropologists, basing their arguments upon field observations, long discussions with members of the native communities, and historical archives, have exposed the limitations of evolutionary theories drawn from inadequately diversified field experience.

Much earlier, in 1917, a blow had been struck at the nineteenth-century notion that "primitive" peoples are simply organized in kinship structures when Kroeber published his *Zuñi Kin and Clan*. The matrilineal clans in Zuni are the basis for property rights, he admits, but non-kin-based religious fraternities and priesthoods and private friendships are also instruments through which Zuni people organize for tasks and personal goals. Kroeber's colleague, Robert Lowie, demonstrated the same situation for Plains Indian communities in his study of the sodalities so characteristic of these

peoples in the nineteenth century. Post-World War II recognition by sociology and anthropology of the eminence of voluntary associations in many societies owes much to the data presented by Kroeber and Lowie decades earlier.

In the 1950s, some anthropologists concluded that at least under modern conditions on reservations, there are American Indian communities with very little societal structure. After conducting fieldwork with northern Wisconsin Chippewa (Ojibwa), Victor Barnouw and Bernard James could perceive so little organization other than federal bureaucracy among Chippewa that they termed them "atomistic." Much debate ensued, in part on the question of whether the prereservation hunting Chippewa were "atomistic" (game density being relatively low in the forest, each nuclear family had to look out for itself, the argument ran), or whether this was a breakdown caused by government paternalism. In time, the latter position seemed more defensible as new archival research on the Ojibwa indicated more formal and pervasive societal structures and alliances in the past, and the difficulties of combating the Bureau of Indian Affairs became better appreciated by outside observers. Contemporary with the debates on Chippewa "atomism," Oscar Lewis was using his work with Indian peasants in Mexico, especially those who had emigrated to urban slums, to develop his theory of the existence of a "culture of poverty" that he claimed characterizes all underclasses in modern societies and can be a major obstacle to betterment. Lewis's theory was rapidly extended from Mexican slums to American black ghettos. Most social scientists now seem to feel that Lewis overstated his case, that the bureaucratic and economic obstacles faced by the very poor are so overwhelming that their cynicism toward betterment programs is amply justified. One need not invoke any cultural tradition of cynicism to explain what are usually only too realistic perceptions.

Quite a different emphasis came, in the 1950s, from the research of Anthony F.C. Wallace on Iroquois. Wallace had become fascinated by the Seneca prophet Handsome Lake. Analyzing Ganioday'o's movement beginning in 1799, Wallace saw a pattern that he proposed was a general form of what he termed revitalization movements. From Wallace's perspective, there are striking parallels between Ganioday'o and his Longhouse religion, and Jesus and Christianity. In both cases, the prophet appears as a humble man revealing the will of God to a defeated people suffering demoralization and poverty. Disciples soon adapt the prophet's message into a code that appeals to a large segment of the populace as a new way of life. Wallace's well-presented study spurred many anthropologists and historians to be alert to revitalization movements as sound adaptations to new conditions. Formerly, because the prophet was not a formally educated theologian, such movements were often dismissed by scholars as merely "hysterical reactions" by "primitive" people to crises. The Ghost Dance religion preached by Wovoka (Jack Wilson) beginning in 1889 is a prime example of a true and intelligent religious movement maligned by popular commentators. The curious aspect of the disrespect paid to the Ghost Dance religion is that James Mooney's description of it, published in 1896 by the Bureau of American Ethnology, was entirely sympathetic and clearly stated that it was then, six years after the Wounded Knee Massacre, a strong and promising movement. The fiction that the Ghost Dance represented a year-long or two-year-long hysterical "dance" indulged in by "primitives" who could not understand modern civilization is a racist myth that has persisted among many Euro-American writers who seem loath to give up the nineteenth-century idea of a dichotomy between "civilized" and "primitive."

Whether there are differences between "primitive" and "civilized" minds has excited discussion for centuries in Europe. The majority of anthropologists have denied that there are real differences, and have cited many studies with American Indians to prove that the notion must be discarded. Mooney's great work is one example. Several of

the studies have taken a psychoanalytical approach. Irving Hallowell, for one, used this general perspective in his descriptions of Berens River Ojibwa in northern Canada. Kroeber collaborated with Erik Erikson, the well-known psychologist, in an intriguing analysis in Freudian terms of Yurok beliefs and metaphors. Whatever one may think of the Freudian exercise, the underlying point is that neither Kroeber nor Erikson assumed there was any fundamental difference between Yurok and nineteenth-century Viennese minds. More recently, studies in cognition and learning processes have been made with American Indians to elucidate how different cognitive schemata, embodied in word structures and metaphors and transmitted as cultural patterns, produce the apparently different "ways of thinking" of the various peoples of the Americas, and the world. These studies include many that stem from pioneer work by the anthropologists Edward Sapir, an early student of Boas, and his student Benjamin Whorf. Sapir's researches on the Northwest Coast, and Whorf's in the Southwest, guided them to the fact that languages mold perception by the implicit classes or categorizations in grammatical structures and word meanings. For example, a Navajo sentence may not need a separate subject word because a particular verb-form choice implies a particular kind of subject, such as round or angular. Navajos, Whorf pointed out, are sensitive to noticing whether an object is round or angular because they must do so in order to select the correct grammatical form of the verb they wish to use. Blackfoot, to take another example, may be less sexist than English speakers because the pronouns in their Algonkian language refer to whether the referent is animate or inanimate, but not to its sex, so they may be less sensitized to always noticing a person's sex as a significant attribute of that individual in every situation.

Blackfoot speakers not infrequently have difficulty in using the correct pronoun in English because these grammatical differences mean they cannot translate directly from their thought in their own language, and this difficulty of course affects some children's schoolwork. Anthropological clarification of the causes of such difficulties can be useful in designing better curricula. Other anthropological studies of schoolchildren, such as Murray and Rosalie Wax's iconoclastic account of Oglala Sioux children in school, and Thomas Rhys Williams's thoughtful description of the largely nonverbal learning style of Papago ('O'odham), have been important contributions to the reassessment of traditional schooling. Anthropologists who have served as education consultants to reservation schools pointed out conflicts between traditional Euro-American classroom behavior, such as the expectation of eye contact between teacher and student, and etiquette in Indian communities where, for example, children are supposed to modestly lower their eyes when addressing an elder. More importantly, Indian children may learn it is bad manners to embarass others by "showing off" one's abilities, then be labeled passive or slow in a classroom where the Euro-American teacher assumes children will be competitive in gaining attention and higher grades. Adjusting teaching strategies to encourage cooperation not only revealed Indian children's capacities but merged with critiques of conventional classrooms to foster a general educational movement toward cooperative learning in all schools, even universities.

American Indian peoples have themselves hired anthropologists to research data on their heritages. A large number of anthropologists prepared testimony on land-claim cases. Some Indian communities, including the Makah in northwestern Washington and several British Columbia bands, Southern Utes, Zuni Pueblo, and the Navajo Nation, employ archaeologists to excavate their ancestors' villages in order to extend back the history of their people. The Makah and many others are building museums on their reservations to preserve and exhibit not only the results of excavations and historical archival work but also heirloom and contemporary crafts and art. Here, too, anthropologists have been invited in as consultants and pl[illegible]

ners, and now Indians who are themselves professionally trained in anthropological museum work are engaged in researching, preserving, and exhibiting their nations' heritages. (John Collier initiated the building of tribal museums on reservations in the late 1930s, but in time, each of the four actually completed before World War II ended the program was turned into a craft-merchandising center and lost its professional anthropological staff and research activities.)

The public has seen on television a few confrontations between archaeologists and Indians angrily waving signs protesting alleged desecration of ancestors' graves, but they have not seen the many positive collaborations, and not even the results of the confrontations, which usually turn out to involve sites that have no graves but merely the abandoned floors and garbage dumps of prehistoric inhabitants, or, at worst, sites where archaeologists salvaged burials exposed by construction machinery. One highly publicized protest by Indians living in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, against such a salvage project ended with the excavated bones, approximately three thousand years old (Late Archaic), awarded by a local judge to the protesting Indians for burial according to their "traditional rites." The city Indians drove the cartons of bones to a northern Wisconsin reservation where the community refused to allow interment because the dead were not likely to have been members of that reservation's tribe. The dénouement underscored how hasty and ill-informed the protest had been, in sad contrast with the collaborations where valuable genetic as well as historical information have been gained from study of salvaged data before the bones and artifacts are reinterred or carefully stored in museum vaults.

American anthropologists have seen a responsibility for making records of nonliterate peoples to be an obligation imposed on cultural relativists by the juggernaut of European and Euro-American colonization. Ideally, such records would have been made by persons of native ancestry, but in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries only a tiny handful of such persons became fully literate, and these few tended to be ministers, doctors, or lawyers concentrating upon active use of their professions rather than recording of traditions, although happily there were some exceptions. The exceptions are more numerous now, but still far from sufficient to do justice to the task of preserving or rediscovering the heritages of the hundreds of American Indian nations. Collaboration between anthropologists and the native nations of this continent will continue, enhanced where the anthropologist is also of Indian origin. A by-product of this research will continue to be the stimulus and testing of anthropological theories of human behavior.

RECOMMENDED READING

Hinsley, Curtis M., Jr. 1981 *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846–1920*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press. Not only important, and very readable, on American ethnology, the book offers also a thought-provoking history of the effort to promote a democratic, truly American science.

Kelly, Lawrence C. 1983 *The Assault on Assimilation: John Collier and the Origins of Indian Policy Reform*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. Incisive analysis of the interplay between American Progressivism, romantic ideals, and hard-nosed politics, fused in the person of Franklin Roosevelt's Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1982 *The Way of the Masks* (trans. Sylvia Modelski). Seattle: University of Washington Press. Very different indeed from most American anthropology, the noted French anthropologist's analysis of Northwest Coast masks exemplifies the use of American Indian data for theoretical discussion.

Mark, Joan. 1980 *Four Anthropologists: An American Science in Its Early Years*. New York: Neale Watson Science History Publications. Focusing on the same period as Hinsley's book, Mark covers the development through comparing the careers of four major contributors.

——— 1988 *A Stranger in Her Native Land*. Lincoln:

University of Nebraska Press. A biography of Alice Fletcher, pioneer anthropologist with the Bureau of American Ethnology, close friend of the La Flesche family of the Omaha Nation. Her story illustrates the difficulties besetting even the most well-meaning, intelligent and hard-working Euro-Americans attempting to ameliorate the lot of conquered Indians.

Moses, L.G. 1984 *The Indian Man: A Biography of James Mooney*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. Coming from an impoverished Irish immigrant family, Mooney felt empathy with those other victims of Anglo conquest, the American Indians; out of this came timeless studies of Indian variants of human behavior.

Washburn, Wilcomb E., ed. 1988 *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 4, *History of Indian-White Relations*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution. Not only summaries of national policies, church missions, wars, and treaties, there are also unusual descriptions of the Indian hobbyist movement in America and in Europe, "Indians and the Counterculture, 1960s–1970s," Indians in literature and in popular culture.

CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN INDIAN WRITERS

A number of contemporary American Indians have achieved literary success as serious writers, frequently setting their novels, short stories, and poetry within their experience in Indian communities. Among the best known are James Welch (Blackfoot/Gros Ventre), Leslie Marmon Silko (Laguna Pueblo), and Louise Erdrich (Chippewa). The following are guides to this genre of contemporary literature:

Colonnese, Tom, and Louis Owens. 1985 *American Indian Novelists: An Annotated Critical Bibliography*. New York: Garland.

Krupat, Arnold, and Brian Swann, eds. 1987 *Recovering the Word: Essays on Native American Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lincoln, Kenneth. 1983 *Native American Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

SOURCES

Anthropology and Education Quarterly. 1991 Vol. 22, no. 1 (entire issue).

Bieder, Robert E. 1986 *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820–1880*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Goldschmidt, Walter, ed. 1979 *The Uses of Anthropology*. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, Special Publication no. 11.

Stocking, George W., Jr., ed. 1983 (vol. 1), 1989 (vol. 6), *History of Anthropology*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Sutton, Imre, ed. 1985 *Irredeemable America: The Indians' Estate and Land Claims*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.