This series in educational perspectives
is published with the aid of a grant
from The Ford Foundation

The American Indian Reader:

Book One of a series
in educational perspectives

Jeannette Henry, Editor

Library of Congress
Catalogue Card No. 72-86873

THE ANTHROPOLOGIST: THE MAN AND THE DISCIPLINE

There are some who still believe that the science of anthropology deals mainly if not entirely with man's most ancient past. This discipline does indeed seek to develop a body of knowledge concerning man and his beginnings, his economy, family and social relationships, his developmental governing forms and the forces affecting them, as well as his physical attributes and the elements causing change, his beliefs and religions, customs, traditions, and languages.

But this is only part of the vast region of the "knowledge quest" that inspires the anthropologist in his studies and related activities.

It is no accident that some anthropologists are discussing what may be considered a new aspect of the profession. It is described as "Action Anthropology." This phrase was first coined by Sol Tax in 1952 (American Indigena Vol. 12, pp 103-109). A description of Action Anthropology was given by Nancy Oestreich Lurie in her paper read at the symposium on *Anthropology and the American Indian* (American Anthropological Association, San Diego, November, 1970).

"The action anthropologist," said Dr. Lurie, "does not act as planner or expert with programmatic solutions, but as a catalyst to put new and existing elements together to form new perceptions of problems and alternatives for their solution." Dr. Lurie admitted that there is "confusion" as to what action anthropology really is. In attempting to define this development in the role of the anthropologist today, she mentions among other things:

1) Programs of action anthropology "may not be explicitly labeled as such."

(2) "Thorough-going action anthropology insists that the definitions of problems and decisions to implement solutions are honestly left up to the people whose lives will be affected."

(3) "Goals are open-ended, subject to revisions as the people may see need to reassess and redirect effort.

(4) "The Action Anthropologist usually has to run some interference so the community can run with the ball." Such interference may "involve" funding, mechanical tasks, and helping with "outside agencies" which may impede the progress of a particular program.

Dr. Lurie gives examples of successful "action anthropology" involvement. Without being in a position to examine the specific cases referred to, it is certainly not possible to form a judgment as to the success or failure of the examples she has described. Besides, the notion of "success" is in the eye of the beholder, as well as in the standard of judgment, which involves a long-range view as to what is really desired and desirable by the Native people themselves.

These references to Nancy Lurie's remarks, however, are only made to bring forward a point: Anthropologists are very much a part of the whole spectrum of Indian affairs, and as such they are entitled to the applause of the community when they perform well; they are also entitled to be kicked in the pants when they perform badly. These are the risks in such involvement, as proposed in Action Anthropology. For, it is truly involvement that Tax and Lurie are talking about; unobtrusive and self-effacing as may be the proposed character that Action Anthropology should take.

Certainly anthropology is a science well deserving of a life of scholarly dedication. No science springs up pure and noble, and clean from error at birth. The science of medicine, as only one example, committed the blind to insane asylums only a few hundred years ago, and treated leprosy with incarceration. Our concern is with the role of the *anthropologist* himself, the man as he is, in relation to his cultural background, and in fact as part of a cultural phenomenon to be studied and understood. Our concern is also with the anthropologist as a man in relation to his discipline. We are not satisfied that Action Anthropology holds forth the promise of practical and needed help. If Action Anthropology becomes departmentalized as a viable part of the discipline (and we have all kinds of anthropological departmentalizations already) how can the Indian expect to be allowed his initiative, his creative development, his growing ability to solve his own problems in his own way!

The anthropologist is a man or a woman just like other men and women, a product of certain cultural mores, beliefs, religion, prejudices, and eagerness to serve, (sometimes with or without the patient's agreement).

On the other hand, it is to be remembered that anthropology deals with the descendants (and often the survivors) of an ancient

society which served its people well. This is a living people you are dealing with, we are often impelled to say to the eager young man or woman who elbows his way into an Indian's home or place of worship, without invitation or even permission.

But Nancy Lurie's plea, in the presentation above referred to, deserves some pondering as to basic reasons. She stated: "But I would still argue that there are going to be real returns in letting the anthropologist hang around doing his thing in his way to learn his trade and be on call when action efforts are desired, whether in the community where he is studying or some other Indian community able to use him in the future." Perhaps "Action Anthropology" is proposed as an answer to fieldwork needs of the young student, in order to continue the education of aspiring anthropologists. A consideration might be that this could be at the expense of the Indian people.

Anthropology has come a long way since the days of Lewis Henry Morgan, with his great contributions and his significant errors. It has come a long way since the days of Franz Boas, who denied the uses of hypotheses and demanded all effort in the collection of data, but who also made the young science into a university-based profession of distinguished stature.

It would appear to us that the next most fruitful era in the development of anthropology would be the intensive training of the young Indian in the discipline, so that he may enter the profession and become an "Action Anthropologist" in the service of his own people. In this case, an *Action Anthropologist* makes good sense. But "Action *Anthropology*" makes no sense at all, and indeed does not serve to further the continued development of anthropology as a science.

Professor Bea Medicine is professor of anthropology at the University of Washington, Seattle. She is a Standing Rock Sioux and has been active for many years both in the academic world as well as in the affairs of the Native American.

Dr. Alfonso Ortiz is professor of anthropology at Princeton University. He is the author of The Tewa World: Space, Time, Being and Becoming in a Pueblo Society," (University of Chicago Press, 1969). Ortiz is a Tewa Indian and was the chairman for the First Convocation of American Indian Scholars in 1970.

Dr. D'Arcy McNickle is an anthropologist, retired as chairman of the Department of Anthropology, University of Sas-Katchewan. He is Flathead Indian. and the author of *Indians and Other Americans*, 1959, Harper.

Anthropology and the American Indian

Anthropology and the American Indian was the subject of a symposium held concurrently with the annual convention of the American Anthropological Association at San Diego, in November, 1970. The symposium was a one-day affair.

General chairman for the event was James E. Officer, University of Arizona, formerly employed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington, D.C. Chairman of the morning session was Dr. Officer. Panelists who read papers, or had them read were: Gordon Macgregor, *Applied Anthropology and Indian Administration — The Collier Era,* Philleo Nash, former commissioner of Indian Affairs, *Applied Anthropology and the Concept of Guided Acculturation in Indian Administration.* Nancy Lurie, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, *Action Anthropology and the American Indian.* Omer Stewart, University of Colorado, *Anthropologists as Expert Witnesses for Indians: Claims and Peyote Cases.*

Discussants for the morning session were: Ken Martin, Assiniboine, University of California, Davis, Indian Studies. D'Arcy McNickle, Flathead, chairman of the Department of Anthropology, University of Saskatchewan. Mary Natani, Winnebago, Native American Church secretary, employed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Chicago. Abbott Sakaquaptewa, Hopi, director of the Hopi Action program.

Chairman for the afternoon session was Edward P. Dozier, University of Arizona professor in anthropology, Santa Clara Pueblo, New Mexico, author of *Hano.* Papers were read by: Margaret Mead, American Museum of Natural History. *The American Indian as a Significant Determinant of Anthropological Style.* Bea Medicine, Standing Rock Sioux, professor of anthropology, San Francisco State College, *The Anthropologist and American Indian Studies Programs.* Alfonso Ortiz, San Juan Pueblo, New Mexico, author of *The Tewa World* . . . professor of Anthropology at Princeton University, *An Indian Anthropologist's Perspective on Anthropology,* and Vine Deloria, Jr. Standing Rock Sioux, College of Ethnic Studies, Western Washington College of Education, attorney and author of *Custer Died for Your Sins.*

Discussants for the afternoon session were: Gloria Emerson, Navajo, teacher at Ramah High School; Mariliyn Halpern, Cayuga; W. Roger Buffalohead, acting director, Native American Studies Department, University of Minnesota at Minneapolis; and Agnes Savilla, Mohave.

The symposium was funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs through the National Indian Training and Research Center at Tempe, Arizona.

For some years, sounds of discontent and even open hostility have been heard from many Native American quarters, concerning the conduct and activities of some anthropologists as they go about their professional work in which the Native American is the primary source of information. The "sounds" gave way, in 1969, to the publication of a book by Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins,* which was preceded in its publication by an extract appearing in *Playboy* magazine. Deloria's book has become a center of discussion as to the role of the anthropologist in relation to his source of knowledge, and has raised the issue of a need for establishing some sort of *Code of Ethics* among anthropologists, in their relationships with individual Indian informants, tribes, and organized groups. Indeed, other aspects of the book have been largely ignored in favor of this controversial question.

The preparation for the symposium left much to be desired, in the opinion of this writer. Direction was obviously in the hands of individuals with strong previous ties to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, ties which restrain their independent opinion, judgment, and contribution even today. Nevertheless, the symposium was important. More than 600 interested convention delegates and members of the Indian community at San Diego and elsewhere attended. But the all-important question of the establishment of a Code of Ethics guiding the anthropological profession remained left in the air.

An Indian Anthropologist's Perspective on Anthropology

By ALFONSO ORTIZ

Ninety years ago almost to the day, Adolph Bandelier, that great pedestrian and first anthropological student of the Southwest, wrote to his benefactor, Lewis Henry Morgan, as follows:

> At Sto. Domingo I could not stay any longer, I quarreled with the council of the tribe, after they had lied to me three times, and finally kicked the governor out of my room. This manner of protesting (?) was not to his taste, and the next morning came a declaration of war in the shape of a refusal to give me anything more to eat. To this I replied by simply *staying*, and supporting myself on watermelons, until at last the things grew obsolete and, unable to achieve anything more there, I moved to this pueblo of Cochiti . . .

Bandelier was only the first of perhaps hundreds of anthropologists who have been given a cold shoulder by Pueblo Indians, although it has rarely become necessary again to starve an anthropologist to get him out. Almost one century has passed since this incident, and during this time the Pueblos have become well practiced in the gentle art of rebuffing unwanted intruders, whether they be anthropologists or some other kind of "-ologist" or "-ist." Coming from this background and tradition, I have naturally wondered just what we are doing here in this kind of symposium. What is the ruckus all about? If all Indian tribes would be just a little more like Santo Domingo, they could be more sure of exercising some control over the how's and who's of academic research conducted among their people. But the problem is not that simple, of course. We are here because anthropologists working with Indians are under attack by Vine Deloria and by many other Indians who have taken up this call, and because there are many just grievances involved. I would like to think that Vine was just testing his bowstring to see if it was taut enough, to use his own imagery, and that his intended purpose is achieved when both sides can get together, along with those few of us who are unwittingly cast in the role of mediator, and

talk—really talk—about healing the strains in the relationship. As such, I am here to offer an Indian anthropologist's perspective on anthropology. This is the title of my presentation. I do not presume to speak for any other Indian or for any other anthropologist, only myself. Also, I am not here to speak about how it feels to be an Indian anthropologist; I do not feel any differently than I did eight years ago when I first decided to take the field seriously.

II

Let me begin by stating flatly that I initially went into anthropology because it was the one field in which I could read about and deal with Indians all of the time and still make a living. It was that simple. Imagine, if you will, a rather provincial fellow with a graduate fellowship and a fresh degree in sociology from the University of New Mexico in hand. Try and imagine, too, the difficulty anyone who is culturally Indian has in trying to find something to do in graduate school which is relevant to his background, something which would permit him to keep his own pride and identity. This was my predicament. I had contemplated entering law school, but all of the lawyers I spoke with in those days seemed to be completely preoccupied with Kiwanis club luncheons, making money, and running for public office—though not necessarily in that order. I have never been much concerned with the first two preoccupations, while any Indian running for public office in my part of New Mexico has about as much chance of success as a snowball in hell. The selfless orientation toward public service and avenues in which to exercise it were just not there in 1961, whether in law or in any other field. Nor had any other currently fashionable field of endeavor yet proven relevant to Indian concerns and aspirations. I had high hopes for sociology when selecting a major, but discovered in the end that it merely presented a spectacle of the American middle class endlessly contemplating its own navel. My interests were defined as rural sociology, or as race and ethnic relations. Only in anthropology could these interests be treated as a central concern.

I reminisce only because the general problem of finding a niche has, from the standpoint of Indian students grown more complex rather than altered significantly; more of them are still coming into anthropology on the graduate level than into most other desciplines, and the possibility of thereby being at odds with some of their own people bothers them. Only in this sense has the nature of the relationship between anthropologists and Indian students changed dramatically since a decade ago. The problem and the worry are similar

to that of the pretty lady who rides a pair of white horses around the arena in many Western rodeos. She rides standing up, with one foot on the back of each, and probably worries about what she would do if the horses suddenly decided to split. Would she manage to shift all her weight to one on time, or would she fall under a flying hind hoof? Along the way, my fellow Indian colleagues and I have contemplated at one time or another the rather bizarre prospect of being branded as Judas Goats, for being a part of the field. Clearly, neither a wholesale abandonment of the field by Indians nor an attitude of business as usual on the part of anthropologists is tenable.

To shift from what might be incorrectly interpreted as a defensive posture, let me emphasize and underscore the fact that anthropology provides a perspective on life; it is not a substitute for living, nor life itself. As such it can be abused, but it can also be used humanely and ethically, as well as scientifically. This depends on the individual, and the personalities of anthropologists are as diverse as those of any other random academic category one may select.

One could as easily write a satirical essay entitled "The only thing wrong with Indians are Lawyers," but it is difficult to be satirical about a trail of 400 broken treaties and 6,000-plus federal statutes dealing with Indian affairs. I readily concede that there are people who are anthropologists 25 hours a day who have an almost limitless capacity for mischief, but this also applies to many other "—ists" and "—ologists," and in the Southwest at least these others (artists, novelists, educationists, etc.) taken together are more numerous and more troublesome than anthropologists[2]. Like Shakespearean actors they may change costumes, but they are always acting. This suggests, then, that it is not a group's common status as anthropologists which makes them nettlesome when they invade Indian communities, but the general marginality and ignorance of some of its members, and the sheer fact of their being *there*. In condemning anthropologists as a professional category, moreover, there is the danger of throwing the baby out with the bathwater, for most Indian tribes know of anthropologists who have and would happily interrupt their own activities to help out a tribe, and on the tribe's terms.

On the other hand, anthropology has unquestionably brought its present problems upon itself through the appalling insensitivity of these 25-hour-a-day practitioners and the utter irrelevance of so much anthropological research. Let me illustrate with examples, and please pardon me for invoking my own experience one more time. I never considered majoring in anthropology as an undergraduate

because I had met too many members of the field who regarded it as a sacred calling and operated as if they had an inherent and inalienable right to the information they were seeking; the Pueblos seem to attract them because of the challenge. Their rule is "anything goes," and the system of mortality they bring to their dealings with Indians is akin to that of the heroin pusher.

Turning to the relevancy issue, two summers ago I was sitting in my grandmother's house in San Juan Pueblo when a young woman who identified herself as being from X University knocked on the door. She had steel tape measure in hand and wanted to know from my sister if she could photograph and measure the outdoor oven. My sister shot an inquiring glance at me as I nodded quickly, and then managed to keep a straight face while giving permission. We then watched this student—from a window but just out of sight—sketch, orient, measure, and photograph the oven for who knows what purpose. My family asked why people collected such knowledge and what they did with it. I could not answer them.

Another annual occurrence on many Indian reservations leads into still another Pandora's box of issues. Many Indian people are asking with increasing insistence why it is that each summer fuzzy-cheeked youngsters arrive, fresh from one year of graduate work, to study them with more grant money to spend in making their observations over three months than the total annual cash income of the average family on each reservation. It was possible to get $1,200 plus travel on one program of the National Science Foundation with which I was familiar a few years ago. One might be moved to protest here that this is more a reflection of national values and priorities than of anthropological values and priorties *per se,* and that this kind of example tends to lay all of the problems of Indians at the feet of anthropology. But let us not forget that anthropology is a part of these values and priorities and that anthropologists contribute, if only in a small way, to their perpetuation. The kindest thing I can say about the anthropological fraternity on this and related issues is that too many of us are still only too willing to act as conduits to flaunt these discrepancies before the Indian people. This kind of example also serves as a painful reminder, however, that anthropology is a science born of imperialistic and colonial powers and that, at best, all too many of its practitioners still approach their tribal and peasant subjects with a neo-colonialist attitude. Those of us who do not come from the kind of cultural background which fosters this attitude can reject categorically in our own work the neo-colonialist underpinnings and trappings, but we are

still too few to reorient the whole field. This is truly a festering sore, and it will not just go away of its own accord.

III

But let us take a closer look and try to gauge the extent of anthropological influence in the life of contemporary Indian communities. By any standard it is really not very significant as compared to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the proselytizing churches, and newer bureaucracies such as the Office of Economic Opportunity. No Indian should need to be reminded that the BIA provides a ubiquitous presence in Indian communities, claiming omniscience in all matters Indian, with forces and resources many, many times that which can ever be marshalled for all anthropological activities. And the most enduringly pervasive influence in shaping the attitudes and hardening the most undesirable policies of the BIA has been the Christian churches, which themselves provide a ubiquitous and equally debilitating presence within most Indian communities.

Even the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity are largely immune from the direct influence of anthropologists. During fiscal year 1970 alone, OEO had 128 consulting, evaluation, technical assistance and support contracts worth almost 56 million dollars. Most of these contracts, including the most lucrative ones, went to special companies founded to provide these services, most of which are located within the Washington metropolitan area.[3] And most of these companies have no anthropologists at all on their staffs. Instead we have, to use Head Start as an example, child development specialists, sociologists, educationists, psychologists, and assorted other creatures determining policies for Head Start by providing the intellectual services on which policies are based. My point, then, is that the nature of academic influence on contemporary Indian communities is far more diverse than just that represented by anthropologists, and to pick on anthropology as a general scapegoat is to merely provide a distraction from the real diversity and complexity of this influence. Nor can it even be said that the unusual success enjoyed by many OEO programs is due to the input of these new academic influences. These programs have succeeded because the Indian people run them, and in spite of the new academic influence, most of which has centered around the misinterpretation and misuse of anthropological data.

The characteristics that anthropologists *seem* to have uniquely are a high degree of visibility and vulnerability. There is not much a lone Indian can do about the BIA, but he can certainly kick hell out of the resident anthropologist. In this, there is always the danger

of overkill and I cite two examples from case histories I gathered over the past summer. In one community a linguist, aided by a college student from that community, set up a program to teach those interested how to read and write their native language. The project was abruptly terminated because of pressures on and within the Council. In a second similar case, the linguist involved had worked among a group of communities for a dozen years and learned the language. He had for several years already been conducting evening classes for different age groups in reading and writing the native language, classes which have become extremely popular with the majority of people in the community, and most especially the reservation-bound youth. One of these linguists was not an academician, and the only wish expressed by the other was to develop materials for use in the elementary classroom, something he had done before coming to his academic position. In each instance, a factor contributing to the abrupt dispatching of the linguist was a too-literal reading of Vine Deloria's essay in *Playboy*. *The* "moccasin telegraph" took care of the rest.

Without losing sight of the very real problems and concerns which underlie incidents such as these, it must be stated frankly that if all anthropologists working with Indians were lined up and shot one day, very little really would change for the better in Indian communities. I, also, to adapt a line from an unlikely source, would rather be governed by the first thousand names in any telephone book than by the American Anthropological Association, but then the Association is not officially in the business of governing people. This is the point. And some of the young urban Indian activists who go from meeting to meeting eagerly passing resolutions denouncing anthropology as a field would do well to exercise more wisdom, constraint, and discrimination by selecting *individual* targets, if targets must be selected at all. Even if the whole field were dismantled and its members scattered, something else very much like it—and probably worse—would take its place. The real enemy is elsewhere because the real power lies elsewhere, and the attitudes which underlie the most despicable policies Indians have to put up with are far more general than certain elements of the anthropological fraternity.

IV

To summarize, I have taken a position as mediator fully mindful of the dangers of being shot at from both sides. I felt someone had to because while the need for internal reform is great, so is the danger of absolute polarization and there is already far too much polarization around us today. To anthropologists I say, put your own

house in order because what you may regard today as just a skirmish with Indians may tomorrow become a worldwide problem. Those of you who persist in thinking that the Creator put Indians on this good earth so that you can treat them like so many chessmen on a board while performing your logical operations over them are in for very hard trails ahead. It has been said that before one can reason with a mule one has to get its attention, and in order to get its attention one has to hit it over the head with a two-by-four.Vine's book has certainly seemed to have this effect on the anthropological mule. I hope we can one day return, at least in spirit, to that more gentle period when Indian research collaborators' pictures were printed in the *American Anthropologist,* and the passing of each noted therein with the same care accorded any other colleague.

To other Indian people, I must admit sadly that the tragedy of most sessions like this is that they are usually attended by people who agree with you and support your just grievances. Those who should attend usually do not. I warn also of the danger of judging American society on the basis of the behavior and attitudes of some of its most marginal members of either extreme. There are an awful lot of anthropologists who are marginal to the attitudes you despise, and who are really with you and me. With each passing year there are more and more of them, so there is hope. And, finally, we all know that the only alternative to dismantling something is to roll up one's sleeves and work to improve it. I favor this, because problems have to be understood before they can be solved, and I should like to think this is one of the things anthropology is all about.

NOTES

1: LESLIE A. WHITE (ed.), *Pioneers in American Anthropology: The Bandelier-Morgan Letters,* 1873-1883. University of New Mexico Press, 1940:II:214.

2: One of the outstanding examples of these is the novelist Frank Waters. The publication of his *Book of the Hopi* was followed by more controversy and harsh feelings among the Hopi than any anthropologist has ever been able to engender among them. The book has been repeatedly denounced as a fabrication by many traditional chiefs, and several elders who were listed as collaborators in the preface were surprised to discover this. The taped interviews on which the book is allegedly based have never turned up despite frequent requests by the elders. (Published 1963.)

3: *The New York Times,* November 8, 1970.

The American Indian & American Indian Studies Programs

Bea Medicine

A relatively new approach to the study of the North American Indian has emerged in the last five years. This aspect of the education of Amerindian youth has been given various names: American Indian Studies Programs, American Indian Culture Programs, and Native American Studies, as examples. The latter is found in the Ethnic Studies Divisions or Third World Colleges, where Native Americans are in descending numerical order under Black, Chicanos and Asians. This is reflected in funding and staffing allocations.

In the majority of cases, the inclusion of Native American Studies in Ethnic Studies has appeared to be a backlash of the confrontations and pressures exerted by other minorities. James Hirabayashi, in an unpublished manuscript, writes:

> Most essays concerning the need for the development of Third World studies base their rationale upon an emotional assessment of the conditions of certain groups in our society. This is certainly legitimate in view of the current situation. The development of concerns over the plight of the Third World Peoples were intricately interwoven with concrete events, principally riots in the cities and student unrest on a large number of campuses, relating essentially to questions of racism and therefore an emotional evaluation is a necessary assessment of the total situation. However, it is not the fact of racism per se that gives us the reason for the development of the rationale. The best way of developing a rationale for Third World Studies is to recognize its legitimacy and to create a positive base from which to construct a meaningful program from the people it is to serve. To build the rationale on the basis of racism results in negativism and this is not a healthy base upon which to develop a creative program. (p. 1 from *Some Notes on Third World Studies With Specific Reference to the Asian-Americans,* unpublished ms., 1969).

Most American Indian students who have enrolled in colleges and universities had no need of published studies to indicate the

inadequacies of previous educational experiences. There was no need of high-powered theoretical research designs to superficially present "cross-over" phenomenon, lack of motivation, lack of needs to achieve, and drop-out data. Most Indians are aware that elementary and secondary educational institutions are construed to ensnare Indian aims and aspirations to the White middle class mold. Perhaps, most of us looked to colleges and universities as the last stronghold for control of our destinies and the grasping of knowledge for "the betterment of Indian people" which was most often instilled in Indians by the White change agents. In some cases, this statement allowed some American Indians to leave reservations to explore the Land of the Great White Father. For instance, Edward Dozier once remarked that many Native Americans entering this discipline often viewed Anthropology as "a means to help our people." This discipline was seen as having possible potential for self-study and "problem" alleviation for Indians.

Institutions of higher learning presented terrains of the unknown. As with most institutions of the dominent society, colleges and universities were developed and controlled by Whites. The entire value structure of White society permeated these monoliths of "advanced" learning. The direction of these establishments pointed almost exclusively to the moneyed, middle-class college student or to the aspiring less-than-middle-class family. Endemic in this structure is the White-American concept of their superiority to others both racially and culturally. This cultural heritage is the one in which most anthropologists have been nurtured. These institutions acted as mazeways to mediocrity and, in some cases, to lonely isolation of Indians in White society. Alienation of Indian college graduates from native life-styles seemed inevitable. In some cases, rejection of cultural heritage by Native Americans was the only passport to a pitiful existence in the dominant society achieved by traversing the post-secondary educational treadmill.

Generally, the pathways to "progress" and acceptance in the White world as manifested in the curriculum of colleges and universities were but webs to trap Indians for the "melting pot" theorists. Ethnocentric Chauvinistic curricula and premeditated policies to maintain the *status quo* and to propel Indians toward assimilation and ultimate, but dubious, acceptance into White society were but extensions of an educational process experienced by most Native Americans.

The preceding briefly focuses the entry of the Native American in the arena of Third World Studies. Growing pronouncements and

articulations regarding the general uselessness of college curricula inflicted upon American Indian students found their expression for change BY Indians.

Analogous to this movement of confrontation and control in academia, there was a similar coalescence of Indian sentiment in urban areas. American Indians who had been relocated in the 1950's and those who made seasonal and/or voluntary migrations to urban centers voiced some opinions. Indirectly and directly, the voices of these "urbans" had feedback into educational planning. Even Tribal Councils were involved in ineffective "Advisory Boards" in some mid-western states. This, however, should be seen as a part of the increasing self-awareness and positive identity of being Indian.

Essentially, the fervor for self-determination was most dramatically evident in educational policies. This might be seen as a "spin-off" of the blatant and enduring White American motif of "pulling oneself up by the bootstraps" through education. Whatever the connotation, many Native Americans felt that control of educational facilities (school boards, advisory boards, etc.,) and policies, as in Native American Studies Departments, was a possible first step to *relevant* education.

Curiously, the names of the various programs have some significance in the planning, composition of curriculum and staff, and the program's operation. Those programs labeled as American Indian Studies Programs tend to be organized much as autonomous academic departments with an "area program" approach. Basically, the programs are oriented to both Indian and non-Indian students. The base of instruction encompasses the entire native world — North and South America. Academic qualifications are of prime consideration with an emphasis on scholarly endeavors. As Indian activists and "action-oriented" academicians feel they have a stake in such a program, their impact on this program is still in an unassessable state.

The Native American Studies departments in Third World components have somewhat differing bases and aims. Being aligned with the commitment to make education more closely attuned with the unique historical experiences of the minority peoples involved has been the decided focus. This has directed many of the department's classes to action. In these cases, action has extended to community structures with definite aims to involve *the* community. Anthropologists working in urban Indian research are aware of the many variables which constitute *the* Indian community. Many of the programs were begun in colleges and universities in urban areas. Many Native

American segments obtained and retained the role of step-child in the umbrella-like structure of Third World Studies. Recruitment of students was hasty and decidedly non-selective. Quotas had to be filled for EOP slots. Curricula construction was paramount in priority with many Native American students recruited from the ranks of the student population. In some instances, technical advice regarding course outlines, presentations, etc., were under the guidance of anthropologists. In some cases, students worked alone.

Eventually, a wide range of Native American students were collected. These students reflected the entire gamut of life-styles of the varied tribal groups in urban areas. A polyglot of tribal backgrounds also appeared. There were students who were not far removed from predominately monolingual families. In contrast, there were students, products of the relocatees and voluntary urban dwellers, who often did not know to what tribes they belonged. They only knew they were Indian. These students presented an interesting, and in some cases, pathetic search for identity. There were some older students who represented the transient life so typical of some Indian males—travels to urban cities, life on "skid rows" and transactions in Indian bars.

There quickly arose dichotomies based upon traditionality or pseudo-traditionality, degrees of Indian blood, and categories based upon physical appearances—"White Indians" or "Full-Bloods." Additionally, a very real issue arose, the opposition of Native Indian (native to a particular state), to the "outside" Indians who were often in positions seen as ones of power.

In general, movements to foster identity symbols proliferated. Long hair, head bands, beads, moccasins and fringed Native-style clothes tended to outdo the "hippy" counterparts on campuses. This "contrived culture" seemed to predominate in all programs.

Assertiveness and aggression were seen as normative acts. Controls over decisions regarding the educative process was seemingly synonymous with attempts to con money, cars and promises from the Administration. Action and community involvement were seen as activism and there began a whole series of land grabs with status accruing according to those who went over in the first, second, or third landing party. Nothing so subtle as counting coup sufficed. Being essentially bi-cultural and a semi-product of the economic man, more tangible rewards were part of the non-traditional approach. Many of the Native American Studies departments are still in the throes of activism as witness the latest seizure of land near UC-Davis for a Native American-Chicano University. It must be

added that the initial repossession of land focused attention on the dismal plight of the Indian in general. The support by several anthropologists is difficult to assess. In some parts of the country, the wedge between Urban Indians and Tribal Peoples was widened. In some areas, this new activism had no effect at all.

In the third category of American Indian Culture Programs, the tendency is still to revamp university educational policy to make it more meaningful for Indian students. Some of the programs are decidedly remedial and of an upgrading nature. Recruitment has tended to specify the preparation of Native American students for university entrance. In some cases, this is dovetailed with university work.

It is apparent, through this cursory examination of so-called American Indian Studies Programs, that there is a range of types and objectives. Unfortunately, there is great competition for funds and for Native American instructors with proper credentials to meet the requirements to work in colleges and universities and for Indian students to fill quotas. Furthermore, there is a great proliferation of variations of the three aforementioned types—American Indian Studies Programs, American Indian Culture Programs and Native American Studies—in both the public and private sectors of university life. Competition is keen with tremendous duplication of services and the shrouding of existing courses with fringes for goodness-of-fit into so-called American Indians Studies Programs. The attempt to capitalize on these programs is evident in every small college, where grant-getting to fill administrative coffers seems the sole aim. To establish such programs, these colleges are conducting "surrounds" to capture Indians with at least a baccalaureate degree to head the Native American Studies programs. Additionally, most of these institutions of higher learning write proposals for funds without consulting Indians—much less anthropologists.

Possibly due to the inter-tribal character of personnel in these departments and the acquisition of "social capital," many of these new departments are full of indigenous intrigue, character assassinations and power struggles. Accusations of misuse of funds, concerns for inter-marriage patterns ("Indian by day, White by night,") and the aspirations to "go National," plus a tendency to create more chiefs and not enough Indians prevail in some departments. This state, dismal as it sounds, seems typical of many other Third World studies programs.

The majority of Native American Studies Programs deal with student populations of an inter-tribal character. This is yielding a

"contrived culture" with roots in a variety of experiences and cultural backgrounds. Thus, relevancy of educational experience is basic to curriculum development to encompass all groups. Uniqueness of tribal heritage is often difficult to present. The examination of "experience relevant to the group" that Vine Deloria suggests *(We Talk, You Listen,* New York: Macmillan, 1970, p. 42 and 57), has potential in redirecting curriculum. This strain toward self-awareness in an historical framework leading to present issues confronting Indian peoples posits a fruitful approach to a complex area. However, many Native American students reject categorically any writings by anthropologists relating to their tribes. There is the corollary danger of relying on student opinion and information given the negation of culture and background previously instilled by ethnocentric educational processes. The role of the anthropologists in the Native American Studies and in Third World Departments in general, is hazy and fraught with many dangers. The concern for the plight of Third World peoples seemingly has provided a "dog-soldier" stance of *some* anthropologists who manifest a responsibility for the realistic development of American Indian college students. In addition, the possible "under-dog" status and under-enrolled segment which the Native American sector represents in most Ethnic Studies Divisions serves to solidify certain anthropologists' involvement. In some instances, this concern has included writing course outlines, collecting bibliographies, recruiting Native American students and staff, attending meetings, and teaching courses. Much of this interest has been directed toward the utilization of students in all planning phases.

There are those anthropologists who have gathered North American Indian data for their theses, and safely tethered in the academic hierarchy, are not concerned about the training of Indian college students. They are not committed to Third World programs. In some cases, they have actively opposed Third World programs. In effect, the colonialist mentality prevails. The possibility that Ethnic Studies could alter the "scientific" base of Anthropology is predominant in their thinking, i.e. "unscientific" equals applied. One major university has had a special program for American Indians for three years. Only this year, an Indian-initiated meeting between anthropologists and Native instructors occurred. Whether this may be attributed to lack of interest by anthropologists or a new appreciation for self-determination by Native Americans is difficult to assess. These two extremes, however, present a polarity of professional interest. There are between these polar types a wide range of support

and active aid in the development of Native American Studies Programs. Native Indians in the university structure tend, however, to have roles defined by ascription by their anthropological colleagues. Other Indians assist in such programs through commitment.

It is from an increasingly vocal group of native college students that Indian sentiment against anthropologists has been verbalized. This was occurring before Deloria's article in *Playboy*, August, 1969, which has posed a problem of reassessment of roles by many Native American anthropologists. The predilection to the tried-and-true acculturation model sorted Native Americans in convenient classes of "native-oriented" to "white-oriented," with two or three gradients in between to allow for systematic scaling. In addition to the convenient sorting criteria which presented clear-cut categories, the "My People" orientation of anthropologists prevails.

Any generalization that may have had pertinence to the university training of Indian youth often had roots in the "but among *my* people" approach. This is often part of the paternalistic protection that many anthropologists assume. The tired dodge of pure science as opposed to applied science also had input. Frequently, some anthropologists are within a bureaucratic policy-making process but the "target-population" is never consulted as to the relevancy of university training of Indian youth. Generations of administered human relationships have taken toll on Indian personality. This presents credence to the oft-heard "sell-outs" who sometimes fill offices in bureaucratic structures dealing with advanced education for Indians.

Both the physical isolation of reservations and the anthropological concept of the ethnographic present have encapsulated the Native American in a static posture which presents an unrealistic picture of the varied and viable Native American cultures in existence today. D'Arcy McNickle writes tellingly of this in his article, "Indians Who Never Were," *(The Indian Historian,* Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 4-7, Summer, 1970). The popular stereotype that the American Indian is invisible because of his physical and social isolation validated the decision-makers in higher education view of him as an unimportant unknown. In their view, therefore, pertinent and significant educational programs for this silent, stoic aborigine need not be considered. The Indian's bargaining base was low on the totemic power pole.

Strangely, this position predominates in Anthropology courses about American Indians. This may account for the disenchantment Native American students profess about many Anthropology courses.

Additionally, the role of the "informant" is often assigned to Indian students.

The fear of having secret data elicited from them permeates much of the educational ventures of Indian students. True, in some instances, there may be no body of secret data in certain Indian individuals. Besides being suspicious of anthropologists, a strange ambivalence is evident. Most often, Indian students have found that some anthropologists, at least listen to their statements regarding the system. Whether they do anything about it or not is quite another matter. Anthropology itself presents a general disillusionment. The study of Indians as a "primitive" people presents a burden to many Indians. This framework has generally put Indians in the realm of "experiments" or creatures to be examined. Anthropologists always study someone else, but despite this, are not able to make generalizations that are useful for students to apply to contemporary Indian communities. Thus, the very content of anthropology courses seems questionable. If Native Americans have been the object of research for so many years, why is the data, in most cases, meaningless to Indians? There is no feedback of data into Indian communities. The predominant conceptual contribution of cultural differences seems strangely lacking in much of this recent interaction.

A workable approach to Native American Studies is effective only in an intellectual milieu which views North American Indian cultures as dynamic, pluralistic, and enduring. This statement points to the fact that many of the anthropological studies have not dealt efficiently with American Indian societies as they presently are in the areas of reservation and urban life. This stance essentially suggests that both anthropologists and Native Americans need to reassess their commitments, their analytical frames and their world views.

An Open Letter to the American Anthropological Association

FROM:
The American Indian Historical Society
1451 Masonic Avenue
San Francisco, California 94117

It is now many years since anthropologists have begun to study the Native Peoples of North America. Such studies have been done with individual Natives as a rule, and have resulted in a great body of knowledge about the original peoples of this land.

However, serious complaints have been heard during the last few years—from individual Natives, tribes, and organized Indian and Eskimo groups. These complaints have been levelled against some anthropologists who invade reservation lands and conduct themselves improperly.

It is also being charged that some anthropologists have published inaccurate and even prejudiced reports about the Native peoples. Another complaint states that individual anthropologists have involved themselves in the internal affairs of the Tribes or organized groups, attempting to influence policy and politics.

Recognizing this situation, the Convocation of American Indian Scholars, assembled by the American Indian Historical Society at

Princeton University in March, 1970, discussed and passed a Resolution asking that researchers, anthropologists and all others engaged in such scholarly work, consult with the Tribes or groups involved.

We believe this is not a solution for the current unsatisfactory situation. We ask that the American Anthropological Association, at this convention for the year 1970, at San Diego, California, set up a BOARD OF REVIEW, which would lead to the enunciation of a *Code of Ethics* for all anthropologists in connection with working with Native peoples in research, study and the general gathering of information.

We do not wish to censor or in any way attempt to influence the work of scholars. We suggest only that a climate of objectivity and proper conduct be established and this can be done through your Association.

We suggest that such a Code of Ethics is needed. We believe that such guidelines would help the scholars, many of whom are Natives, as well as the world community, in the search for accurate knowledge about the history of Man upon this earth.

We offer you our wholehearted support and assistance in this endeavor, and trust that this kind of action can be taken.

November, 1970

The Anthropologist as the Indian's Image Maker

Bea Medicine

Anthropologists as reporters of "exotic" and "primitive" peoples of the world, have, by the very nature of their data, been portrait-painters of indigenous peoples and purveyors of images of these human beings. This projection of image is done through standard ethnography courses, area courses, peoples-of-the-world courses and through comparative, cross-cultural data stemming principally from the life-styles of these non-Western peoples. The European background of most investigators has inevitably presented an overlay of a "manifest destiny" quality implicit in the investigative role. The material for the ethnographies deriving from the anthropological axiom of field work and specialization in competency based upon that method of collecting data is an important part of the rite of passage into becoming an anthropologist.

North American Indians, or Amerindians, or Indian-Americans, and more recently, Native Americans, have been the subject of much anthropological theorizing, interrogation, and analytical interpretations of these creatures' lifeways. Indians are seen as creatures; as experimental objects; as givens! The peoples of the Americas have been variously known by the above designations, and, other names. Tribal designations or names in their native language for "the people" are preferred by the native Indians. However, the "White" terminology has reflected a certain color and orientation to the Indians' examination. This has ranged from the "vanishing American" syndrome to the present-day activist and articulate image of the Native American, who poses a problem for contemporary anthropologists.

Most students in Native American Studies programs categorically reject anthropological reporting on their tribes. Indeed, some subtle pressure is applied to those few Indians entering the discipline which causes much soul-searching of self and discipline in relation to the "Indian World" or the "Indian Movement." Some anthropologists are seen as patronizing; some as the "bleeding heart" variety; some as still romanticizing.

The image of the Indian as internalized by the anthropologist has had great implication in the implementation of his research. We have learned in the history of Anthropology courses of the need to collect data, items of material culture to enhance museums, "memory" cultures from the aged Indians which predominated during the time of Boas and his students. Much of this early data-collecting was fostered in an atmosphere of Indian pre-occupation with the "good old Golden Days." The data is of an extremely variable quality, depending upon the skills of the anthropological fieldworkers.

A major influence in native communities was the training of Indian peoples as collectors of native texts, folktales, and geneologies. Such Indian people as Ella Deloria, Henry Hunt, S. Cranmer, Francis La Flesche and others have provided an awareness of anthropology and a legacy of native Indians entering the discipline. The works of these individuals have seldom been utilized by equally ethnocentric American Indian college students.

However, it is the casting of American Indian life-styles into the printed word which has allowed a certain unchallenged expertise and validity to the anthropologists as the Indians' image-makers. The printed word, so important in academia as *the* documentable source, has resulted in the corrupting concept of the ethnographic present which has posed the Native American in a stilted, static stance which has had great repercussions in the image-molding perspective of American anthropology.

A contemporary Indian author, D'Arcy McNickle, has put into print some observations on American Indians. He writes in "American Indians Who Never Were" (in *The Indian Historian*, San Francisco, Summer, 1970, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 4-7). He states: "Tribes were seen as components of 'culture areas', frozen in the days of Boas, Wissler, and Lowie. It is this image which has lent credence to that of contemporary mass medias, and feedback into the curricula of social science studies at all levels in the educational system. The stolid, stupid image is imputed in such terms as the "D'gger ecological domains and social systems." He describes exceedingly well the general tenor of courses offered in Anthropology departments, as he says:

> Such studies recorded impressively long lists of behavioral practices, technologies, and material artifacts which seemed to describe a tribe exhaustively, and yet said nothing about it at all. Usually, it was not clear whether the traits described were still practiced or were long defunct. In instances where it was clearly shown that the traits were non-existent, the tribe was pronounced dead or dying. At the other extreme, tribes that had disappeared as living societies were described in the literature as possessing the attributes of a contemporary community. The traits themselves—their origins, their cognate forms in neighboring areas—became so central to the exercise that association with a tribal name was added almost as an afterthought. (p. 6)

We pay deference to the printed word.

It is within this realm that we choose to explore this implication. There is currently great importance assigned (with corresponding funding) to obtaining tribal histories from the "Indian point of view." This view shall predominate and place us in a vulnerable position with cries of "subjectivity" and "ethnocentrism" from our anthropological colleagues. This can also be heard in shouts of "emotionality" and designations of "tertiary sources" by many so-called ethno-historians.

Most of the audience who are, or profess to be, American Indians have had some acquaintance with the word "anthropologist." However, for many of us, the generic word "white man" has greater implications. This word encompassed the "bogey man" of our childhood and by extension can be applied to the unpredictable decision-maker in the institutions of the dominant society in our adulthood.

Although anthropologists have not held decision-making posts in institutions making policy decisions for the welfare of most Indians, their reports were usually consulted and gave credence to policies relating to Indians. The sacrosant soundness of their printed observations cast credibility which is seldom questioned. More damaging perhaps, was the utilization of anthropologists' oral testimony in action-oriented policy with complete disregard for this assessment in the activation of programs affecting Native American life. However, because anthropologists, as experts on indigenous life, were "consulted," "primitive" aboriginal life was preserved.

Fieldwork, being a requirement for becoming an anthropologist, predicated studying a group of most accessible Indians. Generally, permission to enter a reservation was obtained from the White decision-maker — the Agent of the agency. Seldom were Indians consulted. They were available. It is astonishing that the rules of hospitality and graciousness extended to ethnologists in the Wissler and Lowie periods is prevalent in many areas today.

Generally, fieldwork was oriented to collecting, displaying and storing material objects in museums. This was the direct outgrowth of the culture-area concept which categorized tribal entities, especially in the Plains, into static units bolstered by traits collected by the "laundry list" method. In the eagerness to trace diffusion of material goods, parfleche designs, moccasin types, and medicine

bundles assumed more dynamic qualities than the people themselves. Many Indians were seen as living museum pieces. The recording of music and language grossly obscured the dynamics of Indian interaction and laid the foundations for the "apathetic, defeated Indian." The over-riding conviction of the disappearing native hastened the collection of a record that has formed a congealed ethnographic present impervious to change. The image of the Plains Indian generally remained fixed in the mind of the public.

This model has had pervasive and predominant consequences for the American Indian as in Wissler (1946, Doubleday and Company, New York, p. 175-176) whose description of the Dakota depicts the Plains Indian model which persists to the present day.

Early anthropological fieldworkers tended to be well-meaning scholars and men of good will, or so this is what many Indians on the Plains say. The flavor of this favorable interaction is predominant in Lowie's *My Crow Interpreter* (in Casagrande, J.B., *In the Company of Man*, New York, Harper and Row, 1960, pp. 428-437). This delicate, dyadic realtionship seems the exception rather than the rule however.

The Dakota were the heroes of the original Wild West shows; Longfellow's Minnehaha belonged to the family, and such fine musical composition as "The Waters of Minnetonka," "Red Wing," etc., immortalized Dakota music; and finally, the Dakota is the ideal of the artist. Tall, slender, with small hands and feet but sinewy body, strong features, high cheekbones and beaked nose—the Indian of the nickle—all these characteristics may be seen in the Dakota or some of their hybrids. We expect all Indians to wear the Dakota costume, so that no matter what tribe, all modern Indians appear in it. It is conventional formal dress of the contemporary Indian, but was devised by members of the Siouan Family and popularized by the Dakota. When a new president is inaugurated in Washington, a few Indians ride in the procession wearing the traditional costume of the Dakota. The painter or the illustrator knows that if he presents a conventionalized figure in the Dakota style of dress, man or woman, it will spell Indian. It is a kind of picture writing. This is why we see paintings of the Pilgrims landing at the famous rock, greeted by Indians dressed like Dakota, or again Indians receiving Henry Hudson at Manhattan in the same kind of clothes, or Pocahontas in the wedding dress of a Dakota bride. All absurdities, except that we understand this to be art's way of telling us that Indians are being depicted. Buffalo Bill was a great showman, the first to capitalize the popularity of the Indian. He chose his Indians from the Dakota, and both in America and Europe, persistently spread their fame, with drooping eagle-feather headdress and sharp features, so that young and old rarely imagine there are any other kind of Indians. Therefore, it behooves us to look a little deeper into the history of the Siouan Family of which they are a part.

The "our Indians" approach was well established as a tradition with the publication of Clark Wissler's book, *Indians of the United States*. By this time, the over-riding image of *the* Plains Indian, added

much to the impress of a stolid, taciturn, stoic with no sense of humor and only grunts and groans to indicate human communications Otherwise, what was the function of sign language? This "our Indians" orientation has relevance to the "my people" approach of anthropologists. To quote Wissler, "in contrast to the Hopi and Zuni Pueblos, and even an Iroquois Village, they fall well below par" (Wissler, revised by Lucy W. Kluckhohn, New York, Doubleday, 1967, *Indians of the United States*, pp. 204-205).

It is exceedingly difficult to focus the viewpoints of Indians to coalesce upon *one* authropologist. Each group reacts from their own particular perspective. We have not, however, heard any Native Americans using the term "our anthropologist."

Anthropologists may have accepted the Indians as they were, labeling them "non-technological," "primitive" and more recently, "tribal" or "folk." This has predicated a comparative approach with the anthropological vantage point situated comfortably in a European-based, highly technologically developed society.

Despite this essentially value-laden view as seen by many Native Americans, anthropologists have contributed significantly to the diversity of cultures in Native North America. This has had great influence in the presentation of differences in language, physical type, and ways of life. Life styles are seen as essentially unique adaptions to ecological areas. It is only within the subject matter of anthropology that it has been possible to convey this richness of culture. The generalized picture of thematic styles: stoicism, lack of humor, and underlying savageness in males and a corresponding gentleness in females, a tremendous tendency toward—but an inability to hold firewater, which was posited by the pioneers in American Anthropology, presents an image of American Indians which is difficult to dispel.

It has been, it seems, exceedingly impossible for anthropologists to present the external changes superimposed by the dominant society upon indigenous social systems. In many cases, the treaties, governmental policies and effects of educational and religious superstructures have seldom been within the province of anthropological exploration. This has often led to an investigative leap into "acculturation" studies which were seen in unilineal developmental schemes. Thus, residual remembrances formed pictures of "before-and-after" episodes of American Indian life. Social disorganizational reports prevailed. Conceptual schemes of Indians resulted to show greater or lesser degrees of acculturation to an implicitly superior lifeway. These adjustments could be rated on scales and anchored in

polar types. Adjustmental categories of orientation emerged — "native-to-white" — and Indians of all tribes could possibly be placed in this new heuristic model. These categories often replaced such all encompassing terms as Dionysian and Appolonion.

In gross terms, the *Image of the Indian* has been presented as a picturesque person, a noble savage, and "shrewd, far shrewder than any of the beasts around them," (Wissler, p. 157) but still fumbling for acceptance and appreciation of a superior white society. The words of Floyd Westerman's (Sisseton folksinger) song is pertinent.

Encapsulated on reservations, the American Indians still remain target populations for "the anthros, coming like death and taxes to our land" (Perception Records, 1970).

Fall, 1971

American Indians Who Never Were

D'Arcy McNickle

The so-called Red Race has yet to overcome the disadvantage of its condition at the time of white European contact—of being a people without a written history. With one notable exception, New World peoples had not developed the written languages which would have permitted them to record their accomplishments; the one exception was quickly eliminated when Bishop Landa destroyed temples and burned whole libraries of manuscripts in the Maya country—and afterwards wrote the history of the Maya people according to his own lights.

The consequences of this initial handicap was to place in the hands of strangers, invariably misinformed, often hostile, the delicate task of transmitting to the world information about one of its major population groups. As it happened, this occurred at a time in the history of Europe when humanistic learning was in eclipse and men lived in terror of heresy and black magic. It was not a time when a newly discovered human population could expect to be regarded with tolerance and brotherly love. On the contrary, a formal decree by the Pope was required to accord the inhabitants of the New World the status of human beings possessed of souls. The declaration was intended to secure the "discovered" people in their lives and property. But in fact, many European settlers even late into the nineteenth century regarded Indians as no better than the beasts of the forest and neither life nor property was secure.

A modern writer reviewing the history of attitudes toward the Indian people points out how early speculation was colored by the traditional wisdom of western Europe "Everything had to belong to something already known." Wilmsen observes (Wilmsen, 1965), hence Indians were first explained with reference to events recorded in the Bible or according to the philosophies of Greece and Rome. The new people could be accounted for if they were seen as one of the lost tribes of Israel, or as survivors of the holocaust that swept

away Plato's mythical Atlantis.

A notable early consequence of the absence of a written history was the reluctance to accept ancestral Indians as the builders of the great mound structures in the Ohio and Mississippi river valleys. Along the Atlantic seaboard in colonial times indigenous tribes were barriers to westward expansion, and to justify their eradication Indians were characterized as treacherous, savage, and cruel, more animal than human. The first several generations of colonizers were so conditioned by unrefuted accounts of Indian atrocities (in very earliest times, before this conditioning took effect, the sons of leading Indian families were sent to England to be educated) that by the end of the eighteenth century when settlers pushed beyond the Alleghenies into midcontinent, they could not believe the evidence of their own eyes. The colossal man-made structures and associated artifacts could only be explained as the creations of a vanished super-race. Individual scholars, such as the physician-naturalist Benjamin Smith Barton, and Caleb Atwater, both of whom explored the mounds between about 1800 and 1820 and argued that modern Indians were descended from the mound builders, found little sympathy for their views. Even Thomas Jefferson, speculating on the antiquity of Indian languages and the probable origins of the American race, was not able to persuade his contemporaries to regard Indians as rational creatures.

The problem of projecting an unbiased history of the New World and its people was complicated by the larger problem which Arnold Toynbee refers to as "the misconception of the unity of history—involving the assumption that there is only one river of civilization, our own, and that all others are either tributary to it or else lost in the desert sands." He ascribes the misconception to "the egocentric illusion . . . and the illusion of progress in a straight line" (Toynbee, 1947). Of course, egocentrism and its parallel cousin, ethnocentrism, are not qualities peculiar to European speakers and writers. The tribal peoples of the New World have ways of speaking of themselves which leave no doubt as to whom they consider genuine and whom spurious; but in no case are these tribal manners as supercilious as those displayed by the Chinese emperor. Ch'ien Lung, responding to the British envoy seeking to gain trade concessions for King George III. Toynbee quotes from the emperor's written message:

"Swaying the wide world, I have but one aim in view, namely, to maintain a perfect governance and to fulfill the duties of the state. Strange and costly objects do not interest me. If I have commanded

that the tribute offerings sent by you, O King, are to be accepted, this was solely in consideration for the spirit which prompted you to despatch them from afar. Our Dynasty's majestic virtue has penetrated into every country under Heaven, and kings of all nations have offered their costly tribute by land and sea. As your ambassador can see for himself, we possess all things. I set no value on objects strange and ingenious, and have no use for your country's manufactures."

Montezuma should have had Ch'ien Lung as adviser at his court. If ethnocentrism was the gauge by which New World manners and morals were judged, the illusion of the unity of history as straight line progress resulted in some bizarre conclusions about the origin and development of New World cultures. One of these was G. Elliot Smith's attempt to prove that the high achievements in the Americas were carried there from ancient Egypt in Phoenician ships. To have transported all the arts and sciences which flowered between Mexico and Peru those Phoenician ships would have been manned, not by tough-minded sailors undaunted by the terrors of unknown seas, but by a choice selection of architects, astronomers, poets, sculptors, and mathematicians. Moreover, temple pyramids, the idea for which presumably was diffused from Egypt, were being built at La Venta in southern Mexico between 800 and 400 B.C., which is about the time, in Smith's reckoning, that the Phoenicians were learning to build and navigate sea-going vessels. How they managed to go ashore without challenge, convert the people to a new order of life, and recruit the considerable labor force required for pyramid construction, are questions which Smith makes no effort to examine and dispose of.

In recent years more sober studies have been conducted of the evidence for trans-Pacific culture contacts, but these studies deal with limited and specific traits and complexes, and they are still speculative.

In a highly generalized way, these have been the kinds of barriers to understanding which native peoples around the world, not Indians alone, have had to transcend, often helped by discerning strangers dwelling among them. but often embarrassed by well-meaning scholar friends. The *Jesuit Relations,* for example, when theological preconceptions are cleared away, frequently convey remarkable insights into Indian society of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Anthropological writers. on the other hand, have been guilty at times of using ethnic material to score points in advancing a theory of society,

and obscuring the realities of native life in the press of the argument.

When Margaret Mead set out to study adolescence as it was experienced in Samoa, her ultimate objective was to help the people of her own society achieve a better understanding of themselves. Recognizing that the social scientist was not able to test hypotheses by arbitrarily interfering in human lives, she urged the necessity of studying "human beings under different cultural conditions in some other part of the world". . . preferably "simple peoples, primitive peoples, whose society has never attained the complexity of our own." (Mead, 1928.) In further justification of such field studies, she explained: "In complicated civilizations like those of Europe, or the higher civilizations of the East, years of study are necessary before the student can begin to understand the forces at work within them." whereas "A primitive people without a written language present a much less elaborate problem and a trained student can master the fundamental structure of a primitive society in a few months." (Mead, op. cit.)

The validity of the field work method and of comparative culture studies is not questioned — they have greatly expanded urbanized man's awareness of himself as a creature of culture. Whether they have improved his understanding of other peoples is open to question. Dr. Mead's suggestion that a preliterate people can be understood by a trained and presumably bright student in a matter of a few months, was not calculated to bring such people into sharper focus.

If over the years anthropologists have worn out the rules of hospitality that normally prevail in an Indian community, their failure to see native society in its own light is sufficient cause for disaffection. Whether or not a people has achieved "complexity" in its organization of experience, what is known and systematized is complex enough, sufficient to its needs. This is the effect of Sturtevant's observation: "A culture itself amounts to the sum of a given society's folk classifications, all of that society's ethnoscience, its particular way of classifying its material and social universe" (Sturtevant, 1964). The anthropologist who carries into a community the attitude that he comes from a higher order of existence, may fool himself, but he doesn't fool the tribal yokels to whom he brings the word. When Mead describes the people of Manus as "puritanical" in their attitudes toward sex, she is describing her own kind. "When my people act like that, they are puritanical," she is saying, and she is understood by people of her own background. Whether the term is appropriate to the classification system of the Manus tribe and ac-

curately descriptive of its social universe, is another matter. That was not the object of the research.

A later consequence of the non-literate Indian condition was a concentration of studies which described Indian life as fixed in time and in culture content. Tribes were seen as components of "culture areas," frozen in ecological domains and social systems. Such studies recorded impressively long lists of behavorial practices, technologies, and material artifacts which seemed to describe a tribe exhaustively, and yet said nothing about it at all. Usually it was not clear whether the traits described were still practiced or were long defunct. In instances where it was clearly shown that the traits were nonexistent, the tribe was pronounced dead or dying. At the other extreme, tribes that had disappeared as living societies were described in the literature as possessing the attributes of a contemporary community. The traits themselves—their origins, their diffusion through time and space, their cognate forms in neighboring areas—became so central to the exercise that association with a tribal name was noted almost as an afterthought.

As a device for sorting out the extant, it became the practice to describe tribal societies in an "ethnographic present." This allowed the investigator to report his findings without accounting for changes that might have occurred, other than passing references to Indian eagerness to accept the white man's superior trade articles. The impression conveyed by such references was of the brittle, transient quality of Indian lifeways. No one seemed to object to so characterizing Indian culture, since it was the general assumption that the societies under scrutiny were on the road to disappearance, and it was important only to make a record for comparative purposes.

These synchronic studies, by arresting the flow of history at a given time interval and a given extension in space, deprived the New World inhabitants of a past or of any kind of ordered sequence in their movements and adaptations. And worse, it left them without any hope for a future as a distinct and enduring people. Theirs was a culture without a dynamic—an anomaly in the history of man.

One further negative result should be noted. These "findings" by respectable, academically trained students of Indian life gave credibility to national Indian policy, based on an assumption of inevitable assimilation into something vaguely defined by the phrase, the "main stream of American life." The scholars put themselves on the side of those who advocated the unilateral scrapping of legal and moral commitments and the forced abandonment of Indian identity. The academic community has been moving away from this compro-

mising association, as will be noted in a moment, but until some fifteen years ago its position was equivocal at best.

Let me examine a little further the consequences of relying on literate strangers to interpret Indian history and Indian society to the outside world.

From descriptive studies of static societies, ethnologists turned to an examination of the dynamics of culture change, and a new generation of students appeared in Indian communities to talk to old men and to record observations. It was of this period of which some wit remarked that a Navajo extended family always included an anthropologist. It was in this period also that Julian Steward asserted: "Anthropologists are in general agreement that it is purely a question of time before all Indians lose their identity" (Steward, 1945). Indians would increase biologically, he predicted, but not at a rate to keep pace with their cultural assimilation.

This view characterized the approach of most of the acculturation studies of the last thirty years. Change was always seen as a one-way process. White culture was always superordinate; the Indian, subordinate; and the flow was from high to low. There were exceptions to this, of course, but that was the trend. What was overlooked, or ignored as inconsequential, was the strategy of withdrawal which over and over again marks Indian crisis behavior. Indians have been repeatedly overwhelmed by superior firepower or by sheer numbers, or they have been outmaneuvered at the bargaining table, but what was seen as victory by the conqueror was not experienced as defeat by the victim. The white man found the Indian an unsatisfactory adversary. He always disappeared over the hill, to regroup and fight again.

In terms of culture contact, this has meant that Indian societies, those especially that had adapted to their environments, as in the Great Basin or the Northern Plains, grasped eagerly at superior technologies and material goods introduced by Europeans, and abandoned whole segments of what had been typical of their former style of life. This in its way was also an overwhelming experience; but what looked like the annihilation of a culture was actually a stage, however disruptive and traumatic, in a process of change, a continuum out of the past.

This view is substantially supported by the consensus expressed by the participants in the Wenner-Gren conference on "The American Indian in Transition" conducted at the University of Chicago in February 1954. The participating social scientists, all of whom knew Indian Communities from personal field experience, were in

"complete agreement" that "assimilation of the American Indian into the normal stream of American life" was not inevitable, as was generally assumed in the United States. Other observations are worth recalling here, for example: "Most Indian groups in the United States, after more than 100 years of European contact . . . have not yet become assimilated in the sense of a loss of community identity and the full acceptance of American habits of thought and conduct." And "Despite external pressures and internal change, most of the present identifiable Indian groups residing on reservations . . . will continue indefinitely as distinct social units, preserving their basic values, personality, and Indian life way . . ." (John Province and others, 1954).

Dr. Sol Tax, writing about the Fox Indians of Iowa, a community of Indians completely surrounded by prospering white farmers, remarked: "It seems to us that most of these Indians will not make a change which (1) requires them to switch their identity; if a change requires that they desert their group symbols. Probably only Indians already expatriated will change. (2) Nor will most of these Indians make changes that would violate Fox moral values" (Sol Tax, 1958).

In these statements are seen a new reality about the Indian people, and something about the nature of society itself — a questioning at least of the thesis that each human group progresses in straight lines and recapitulates what every other group had experienced.

When James Downs describes how members of the shattered Washo tribe still go to Lake Tahoe—now a land of spurious joy—as to "a precious and indeed a sacred spot . . . to look at the blue waters and reflect on what they mean," and when he concludes that "the nature of the Washo future will be determined by the processes of the Washo past" (Downs 1966), he is saying something about the history of all Indian people. They came out of an Indian past, not a white man's past; and the future is something they will make out of what they had to begin with.

Dr. Edward Dozier, reporting on the Tewa village of Hano, observes: "The Tewa's increasing relations with whites are drawing them more and more into the American pecuniary economic system. It is possible that as succeeding generations grow up, away from the close touch of the extended household and clan relatives, the importance of the nuclear family will increase. New generations may find satisfactions with a new pattern of relationships and value systems. On the other hand, native customs are strong and complex and apparently will long continue despite modern pressures. The Hopi and Tewa have thus far adjusted to modern conditions, and

there is no reason why they cannot continue to make such adjustments while preserving most of their own traditional social and ceremonial organization." What he is telling us is that the people associated at First Mesa will work out an adaptation which is not violative of their sense of what is moral. This is a concern they share with the Fox and perhaps every other tribe.

These few observations—which could be multiplied—are suggestive of what has been happening to the concepts out of which, in the past, Indians were visualized. It is no longer defensible to describe Indian society as fossilized, albeit picturesque, structures out of the past. Like all societies, those in which the Indians live are more properly viewed as processes in times, always at the point of emerging into new forms and involved in finding answers to problems of adaptation.

It may yet be possible, given this emerging awareness, to see Indians in the perspective of their own time—space experiences and to write about them within the moral order created by those experiences.

REFERENCES CITED

WILMSEN, ELWIN N. 1965. An Outline of Early Man Studies in the United States. *American Antiquity*, Vol. 31, No. 2, Pt. 1, pp. 172-192.

TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J. 1947. Abridgement by D. C. Somerville. Oxford University Press, New York and London.

MEAD, MARGARET. 1928. Coming of Age in Samoa, New York.

STURTEVANT, WILLIAM C. 1964. Studies in Ethnoscience. *American Anthropologist*. Vol. 66, No. 3, Pt. 2, pp. 99-131.

STEWARD, JULIAN H. 1945. The Changing American Indian in *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, Ralph Linton (editor), Columbia University Press, pp. 282-305.

PROVINCE, JOHN and others. 1954. The American Indian in Transition. *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 56, No. 3, pp. 387-394.

TAX, SOL, FRED GEARING and ROBERT RIETZ. 1956. Symposium: The Fox Project. Central States Anthropological Society.

DOWNS, JAMES F. 1966. The Two Worlds of the Washo: An Indian Tribe of California and Nevada. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

DOZIER, EDWARD P. 1966. Hano: A Tewa Indian Community in Arizona. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Summer, 1970