20th-century American society. The Parsons Deacon constructs is a woman who followed Robert Louis Stevenson's prescription that "[t]o live out of doors with the [man] a [woman] loves is of all lives the most complete and free," a woman who found a new and simpler life on canoe trips and southwestern treks with Grant LaFarge and during anthropological fieldwork in some of the most beautiful (and instructive) places on earth. She is a loving mother and her four children emerge as important figures in Deacon's story, guiding Elsie's seasonal round and returning her love. Above all, she is a determined individualist who maintained high standards of honesty and integrity in human relationships, and who lived her life as a committed advocate and practitioner of socially responsible social science. Deacon's narrative reminds us that the social science we practise is intimately rooted in the people we are as individuals: in the quality of the relationships we nurture and in the values we hold sacred in our personal lives. The book is a must for scholars and students of the history of anthropology, women's history, American history and life writing but will have a wide appeal far beyond such disciplinary boundaries.

Richard Feinberg and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo (eds.), *Leadership and Change in the Western Pacific,* London School of Economics, Monographs on Social Anthropology, No. 66, London: Athlone Press, 1996, xvi + 416 pages, $90.00 (cloth).

Reviewer: *Mike Evans*
University of Northern British Columbia

Leadership has long been one of the key areas of concern for scholars of the Western Pacific, and a great deal of the attention paid to the study of leadership in the Pacific has been comparative. This volume offers a collection of diverse accounts of leadership among both Austronesian and non-Austronesian peoples of Melanesia, and among some of the Polynesian peoples of the Western and Central Pacific. Like many collections produced on the Pacific, the volume is constructed to support comparative thinking, albeit from an ethnographic rather than overtly theoretical basis.

The notion that theory need grow from ethnography rather than the reverse is one with deep roots in the anthropological literature on the Pacific, and it is an approach which is well represented in the work of Raymond Firth (to whom these essays were presented in celebration of his 90th birthday). The work of Firth, together with the seminal ethnological articles on leadership in the Pacific by Marshall Sahlins ("Poor Man, Rich Man, Big Man, Chief," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 5 [1963]: 285-303) and George Marcus ("Chieftainship," in *Developments in Polynesian Ethnology*, Alan Howard and Robert Borofsky, eds., University of Hawaii Press, 1989), form the axes around which the articles turn.

Individually, many of the articles in the volume stand as valuable contributions to the literature in and of themselves. But, in spite of the exhaustive review of the issues and problems of anthropological approaches to leadership offered by the editors of the volume by way of introduction, the articles do not work particularly well together. Neither Sahlins' "Big man vs. Chief," nor Marcus' "Kingly vs. Populist Chief" dichotomies are robust enough to provide anything more than foils for the appearance of comparison. Indeed many of the articles challenge the assumptions of these earlier ethnological frameworks. The volume retains value because of the concern of the various authors for ethnographic quality (à la Firth), rather than its ethnological contribution.

One possible route towards a greater comparative frame, that is a focus on political economy and the significance of exchange processes for the reproduction and transformation of leadership structures, is sadly neglected. With a couple of exceptions, detailed consideration of economic processes is strangely absent in the articles. This absence is all the more disturbing, given that the volume is concerned with change. There is a tendency to view changes in leadership as simply political, while the impact of changing relations of production and exchange, growing from the integration of Pacific polities with the world system, remains curiously underanalyzed.

In the end, the volume exhibits both the strengths and weaknesses of the anthropological tradition. The authors provide ethnographically rooted and finely grained analyses respectful of indigenous constructions, actions and intentions, which can continue to inform the work of others. Nonetheless, the collection of these articles together in one volume should not be understood to suggest any theoretical coherence. While readers may find essays that will be valuable for comparative purposes (and there are some in this volume I found quite useful), the work of developing frameworks or narratives, capable of supporting comparative thinking, remains undone.

Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, *Why I Can't Read Wallace Stegner and Other Essays: A Tribal Voice,* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996, xiv + 158 pages, $45.00 (cloth), $12.95 (paper).

Reviewer: *Winona Stevenson*
Saskatchewan Indian Federated College

Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, a Crow Creek Sioux Tribal member and Professor Emeritus of English and Native American Studies at Eastern Washington University, is well-known in academic and Native American circles as a forthright literary critic and proactive political commentator. *Why I Can't Read Wallace Stegner* is an anthology of her more provocative and insightful critical essays from the past three decades.

Cook-Lynn's essays address a range of Native American Studies concerns—from Indigenous philosophies, historical and contemporary realities, to literature, theory, criticism and appropriation. In addition to challenging Western paradigms and constructs of Native American experiences, she challenges Indigenous scholars to push beyond existing academic

confines. Native American Studies reaches its 30th anniversary in 1998, and Cook-Lynn's work provides an overview of the criticisms, pitfalls and challenges facing it. Most importantly, she forcefully distinguishes Native American Studies from conventional disciplines by reminding us why it emerged 29 years ago—why our subjects, objectives, methods and theoretical developments make us different.

One essential and distinct element in Native American Studies derived from Indigenous intellectual knowledge is "the reality of race memory" connection to the land (p. 82). Since the relationship between Indigenous peoples and the land is inherently spiritual, it is imperative that Native American scholars maintain spiritual and ideological groundings in their own intellectual traditions. Further, since Indigenous intellectual traditions inform discourse, Native American scholars are most valuable and inspirational when proactively engaged in "partisan struggles" (p. 39).

These essential criteria, often called grass-roots intellectualism, are evident in each essay. Cook-Lynn intimately places herself in her texts and grounds her work in the best of both worlds—her tribal *tiospaye* and her transdisciplinary academic background which is predominantly informed by the postcolonial critical thinking of Said, Deloria Jr., Medicine, D'Souza, Momaday, Otriz and others. Politics also informs the core of her work, a point criticized by mainstream scholars who perceive it as a lack of objectivity. Native American scholars agree that Eurocentric standards of "objectivity" serve as rationales which often undermine, minimize and negate our scholarship.

Cook-Lynn's field is Native American literatures and she challenges Native American writers to engage their own and each others' work more critically. She encourages an "ethical relationship between tribal nationhood and the imagination" (p. xiii) and is concerned about authorial intent. For example, she claims that Louise Erdrich denies nationalist and spiritual connections to her tribal homeland and by doing so does not write from tribal place. She asks, "how can one be a tribal nationalist and 'set the pace' if one claims no connection to the land either in one's personal life or in one's fiction" (p. 82). The political ramifications of cosmopolitan, as opposed to nationalist literature, undermine and negate tribal sovereignty and First Nations status. This in turn directly opposes historical realities and the current work of tribal governments, activists, politicians and grassroots intellectuals.

Critical essays provoke debate because they are inherently interpretive in nature. Since Cook-Lynn's work exemplifies that principle on a range of Native American studies issues, it will be a valuable university text. One aspect students will immediately note is its strong Dakota bias. How this plays out in her analysis of the historical role of Métis, for example, deserves mention and caution. In her title article Cook-Lynn counters Wallace Stegner's representation of the Métis as cultural buffers with the assertion that the Métis were active enforcers of "assimilation and oppression of native populations by the American and Canadian governments" (p. 35). She asserts that the Métis were responsible for much "hatred and violence within tribal groups" (ibid.) and were a society "produced through unsanctioned marriage and reproductive activities" (p. 36). To view them as buffers, she claims, "is to look at it from a purely European point of view, not from the vantage point of the *tiospaye* value system" (ibid.). Clearly this revisionist assault is weak, narrow and dated in the wake of more recent Métis scholarship. It strongly reflects ancient Dakota/Lakota hostilities towards a traditional enemy and demonstrates a failure to recognize the uniqueness of the Canadian Métis' experience.

While Cook-Lynn's sometimes caustic tone and turgid, convoluted writing style add to the challenge of reading this work, her essays are urgent, stimulating and vital. Her dedication "To the indigenous writer in the modern world" speaks directly to those of us who follow in her stead and she need not fear—what Native American Studies has gained in the last three decades will not be consumed by the growing conservative wave.

Thomas Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman (eds.), *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria, Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology,* Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997, x + 226 pages, $45.00 (cloth), $19.95 (paper).

Reviewer: *James B. Waldram*
University of Saskatchewan

The legacy of Vine Deloria, Jr.'s *Custer Died for Your Sins* continues to plague anthropology in complex and amusing ways. A single chapter in his 1969 book, devoted to "Anthropologists and Other Friends," presented a satirical, biting and hilarious send-up of the discipline from the perspective of a Native American scholar. Certainly there was some truth to Deloria's claim that anthropology was little more than a fancy form of colonialism, and anthropologists intellectual vultures. What puzzles, however, is not so much that Deloria was hardly the first to make these accusations, but that, for American anthropologists in particular, his words had such a dramatic impact. Following his publication, the American Anthropological Association convened what might be seen as crisis meetings designed to defend anthropology and respond to the critique. What followed was a major shift in the direction of the discipline, giving an impetus to the emerging field of applied anthropology, as practitioners attempted to reconfigure their work so that Native Americans benefitted.

This volume consists of 10 chapters by various contributors, plus an introduction by the editors and, not surprisingly, a final comment from Deloria himself. The papers vary in style and tone, but all address in one way or another the question: what has the impact of Deloria's critique been on anthropology and Native American studies? Most papers have been written specifically for this volume, and the addition of one previously published paper (by Peter Whitely) strengthens an uneven text. The papers range from intellec-