

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 grass-roots 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 govern-

ments" (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-

tual ruminations about Deloria and the state of the discipline, to case studies, personal reflections and largely irrelevant polemical statements. While the editors appear to establish a postmodern/postcolonial tone in their excellent introduction, there is no uniform theoretical orientation to the volume. This is unfortunate, as it seems that the postmodern critique appears to offer the best insight into the issues raised by Deloria.

It is not possible here to discuss each chapter in the volume. From my view, the most interesting chapters include the introduction and several papers contained in the section titled "Ethnography and Colonialism." Thomas Biolsi, for instance, employs the framework of primitivist discourse to critique the work of early-20th-century ethnographer Haviland Scudder Mekeel and its role in redefining Lakota culture and governance. Gail Landsman discusses the conflict between Iroquoian scholars and the Iroquois themselves over the fundamental issue of whose view of history is accurate (i.e., "objective") and whose is fancifully inaccurate (i.e., "subjective"). Whitely's discussion of the relationship between anthropology and the Hopi is one of the best in the volume, and presents a clarion call in support of applied anthropology and the need to produce knowledge of direct use to Native Americans.

Deloria's concluding comment is vintage Deloria. The reader is invariably frustrated by his continuing tendency to issue blanket statements without substantiation (e.g., "Anthropology departments still cling fiercely to the belief that it is more valid and scholarly to have an Anglo study an Indian tribe than to have a member of that tribe trained in anthropology"

[p. 211]). This polemic is tempered by occasionally astute observations (e.g., "In America we have an entrenched state religion, and it is called science" [ibid.]) which challenge and provoke. Deloria does not appear to want to eliminate the discipline, for in it he sees many things of value for Native Americans. However, he continues to argue for a shifting of anthropological paradigms and methodological strategies.

In the end, the volume is more about anthropology and less about Deloria. There have been some solid critiques of Vine Deloria's views, his apparent looseness with "facts" and lack of comprehensive knowledge of many of the disciplines and approaches he criticizes—see, for instance, his new book, *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact* (Scribner, 1995). That anthropology as a discipline still feels compelled to respond to him is intriguing, especially in light of the much more informed views of Native American anthropologists such as Bea Medicine and the late Alfonso Ortiz. Canadian scholars will find some merit in the American perspectives offered here, but many, like me, may finish the book feeling that the situation in Canada is quite different. Recent books published here, such as Robert Paine (ed.), *Advocacy and Anthropology* (Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1985), Noel Dyck and James B. Waldram (eds.), *Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples of Canada* (McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993) and Edward Hecican, *Applied Anthropology in Canada: Understanding Aboriginal Issues* (University of Toronto Press, 1995), together provide a Canadian perspective on the issues raised by Deloria and discussed in *Indians and Anthropologists*.
