

ANTH 303 -- INDIGENOUS CULTURES TODAY – READING GUIDE

Dr. Maximilian C. Forte

INTRODUCTION: SETTING THE STAGE FOR CONTEMPORARY INDIGENEITY

Sessions 1 & 2

Hughes, Lotte. 2003. *The No-Nonsense Guide to Indigenous Peoples*. London: New Internationalist & Verso Books. (Ch. 1, Overview, 10-28)

1. Why is it politically important for so many indigenous representatives to insist on *self-identification* as a primary means of establishing whether or not a person is indigenous? Do you suspect there can be any serious problems with this, and if so, what might they be?
2. Hughes does a decent job of condensing a wide range of key documents by institutions that engaged the question of “who are the indigenous peoples”? What are the elements that are *common* to all of the attempted definitions?
3. Keeping cultural institutions intact; possessing a different language; remoteness and isolation; residing in a territory they have occupied since pre-colonial times; subsistence economies—these are elements one can find in the diverse representations of who should be defined as indigenous. What do you suspect are the main political problems that such defining elements raise, especially if self-identification is valued at the same time as these defining traits?
4. What does it mean to say that “indigenous” is an “essentialist” category? Does it need to be?
5. How would you characterize the role of the United Nations in aiding, or impeding, something we might call “indigenous resurgence”?

Field, Les. 1994. “Who are the Indians?” *Latin American Research Review*, 29 (3): 227–238.

Note: when reading this article, don’t feel constrained to keep careful track of which group of authors says what about whichever peoples they are discussing—instead, try to stay focused on the main themes, on the “cultural survival school” and the “resistance school”, how they differ, and the points that are raised about tradition and its relationships to identity.

1. What does it mean to focus on the “processual” nature of indigenous identities?
 2. What are the distinguishing features of the “cultural survival school” in how indigenous cultures are represented?
 3. What are the distinguishing features of the “resistance school” in how indigenous cultures are represented?
 4. What are the likely anthropological sources from which the “cultural survival school” emerged?
 5. “...being Indian may have little or no connection to precontact sociocultural forms” (Reader page 34)—what do you think of this statement and what are its implications for the politics of indigenous representation?
 6. A number of authors covered in Field’s review seem to emphasize paradoxical features of (attempted) assimilation processes. Can you indicate a few of these features? In addition, how can “assimilation” be viewed as conceptually flawed, as destined to backfire from the outset?
 7. What is your personal view with respect to the concluding paragraph? Do you like the direction in which scholarship is going?
-

THE SCIENCE, IDEOLOGIES, AND PRACTICES OF EXTINCTION

Sessions 3 & 4

Sahlins, Marshall. 1999. "What Is Anthropological Enlightenment? Some Lessons of the Twentieth Century." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 28: i–xxiii.

Please note that this is one of the cornerstone articles for this course. If you don't understand elements of this article, please ask questions. In addressing the questions below, don't expect to find all the answers just in one particular place in the article: you will usually have to range across the article to develop an answer.

1. Please identify the central argument being made throughout this article. Having done that, identify the main themes and issues used by Sahlins to develop his argument.
2. What is "despondency theory"? How does it relate to "sentimental pessimism"?
3. Sahlins sees similarities between both Marxist and Capitalist/Modernizationist thinkers. What do these thinkers, presumably opposed to one another, share in common when discussing indigenous peoples?
4. Sahlins theorizes indigenous action in light of Western imperial domination. What, in his view, has been the impact of that domination?
5. Is tradition incompatible with modernity, in Sahlins' view? Please explain.
6. Can you see why the course instructor holds this article to be one of the cornerstones for this course? If not, what did you find was problematic about the reading?

Forte, Maximilian C. 2006. "Extinction: Ideologies Against Indigeneity in the Caribbean." *Southern Quarterly*, 43(4): in press.

Please note: you should not feel pressed to memorize historical details and concrete examples when you study this article. The key feature to pay attention to is the thematic one.

1. How is the notion of "extinction" an ideology that is "anti-indigenous" as argued in this article? Doesn't "extinction" simply *explain* what happened to people?
2. Forte argues that "extinction is part of a familiar story"—what familiar story is that? Assuming we agree that it is part of a familiar story, what does this help to explain?
3. In broad brushstrokes, paint the picture of indigenous cultural survival as presented in the article. Where do we find such cultural survivals? How does cultural survival seem to have occurred in a number of cases?
4. After reading the article, which conclusions did you derive as to what the article was trying to achieve?

Broome, Richard. 2001. *Aboriginal Australians: Black Responses to White Dominance, 1788-2001*. 3rd ed. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin. (Ch. 6, Racism Enshrined, 91-104, 298-299)

1. Broome notes there was a transition from ethnocentrism to racism, and thus different assumptions about Aborigines came to the fore. Please describe the differences between the two concepts in the context of this article and what each concept entailed in terms of how Aborigines would be treated.
 2. Phrenology has often been associated with early physical anthropology. What is phrenology and what does it purport to show? Would you associate phrenological studies with polygenism or monogenism?
 3. What is "Social Darwinism" and what specific forms did it take in Australia? Who would be more likely to accept Social Darwinism, the polygenists or the monogenists?
 4. What was life like on early Australian reservations? Does it seem odd to you that some groups would today want to protect their reservations from encroachment by others?
-

Sessions 5 & 6

McDonnell, Janet A. 1991. *The Dispossession of the American Indian 1887-1934*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press. (Ch. 1, Introduction, 1-18)

The intention behind assigning this article is to have a condensed historical overview of the process by which American Indians came to occupy a reduced land base on often restrictive terms, and how this process might possibly be conceived as part of a larger phenomenon that one could call ethnocide.

1. Please explain how land allotment was tied into both evolutionary thinking and a policy for carrying out assimilation of American Indians into “white civilization.”
2. How were lands to be specifically administered under the Dawes Allotment Act of 1887? (Please explain lands held in trust, trust patents, fee patents, what types of lands were to be allotted and in what portion, and who was to receive the lands.)
3. In the end, how much land was allotted to how many American Indians, and how much surplus land was sold or ceded?
4. Please make a note in the text of the “Indian Rights Association” and the “Friends of the Indians”—who are they? What positions do they seem to be adopting?
5. In the final analysis, what does the author conclude about whether the Dawes Act was successful in achieving its objectives?

Lawrence, Bonita. 2004. “Real” Indians and Others: Mixed-Blood Urban Native Peoples and Indigenous Nationhood. Vancouver: UBC Press. (Ch. 1, From Sovereign Nations to “A Vanishing Race,” 25-44)

When reading this chapter, it is important to pause and take careful note of the following items:

- (a) Bonita Lawrence’s theoretical framework for understanding the political and cultural significance of identity legislation such as the Indian Act;
 - (b) The provisions of the Indian Act and how they relate to attempted assimilation;
 - (c) The Gradual Civilization Act, the Gradual Enfranchisement Act, and attempted assimilation; and,
 - (d) The provisions, both the initial ones and those added in subsequent amendments, of the 1876 Indian Act.
1. Bonita Lawrence repeatedly explains that identity legislation in Canada and the U.S. has had the effect of instituting a regime of ongoing colonization and reduction of indigenous cultures and communities. Please explain how this argument works.
 2. Why is knowledge of past identity legislation of any significance today? How does such knowledge impact on possible resurgence movements among indigenous communities?
 3. Can there ever be such a thing as “defining an Indian” in a manner that is not invested with power and domination?

Sissons, Jeffrey. 2005. *First Peoples: Indigenous Cultures and their Futures*. London: Reaktion Books. (Ch. 4, Indigenous Children, pp. 85–112)

1. How does Sissons relate the concept of assimilation with genocide, and what do you think of his approach?
2. While the previous chapters we read for this section addressed identity legislation and the loss of lands, this chapter focuses on the loss of children. Conceptually, how would you link all three?
3. What elements are common to the experiences of “educating” indigenous children under (neo)colonial

systems in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the United States, and Mexico?

4. How does Sissons envision the repossession of indigenous children as a form of resurgence? Indeed, does he see new indigenous schools as capable of generating revived indigenous communities? What can, and cannot, be done in his view where indigenous education is concerned? [This question and the ones that follow will be particularly relevant to discussions following the mid-term exam.]
 5. Sissons makes the argument that indigenous educational control can be defeated by indigenous economic marginality. What do you make of this argument? What are the assumptions on which this argument rests?
 6. Make note of the connection between the Navajo Rough Rock School and the Strelley school in Western Australia.
 7. What are the goals and challenges faced by *urban* indigenous re-education?
 8. Is indigenous “cultural preservation” the most important goal for urban, indigenous-controlled schooling, in Sissons’ view? What do you think of his argument?
-

“REAL INDIANS”? “RACE” AND THE POLITICS OF CONTEMPORARY INDIGENEITY

Sessions 7 & 8

Harmon, Amy. 2006, April 12. “The DNA Age: Seeking Ancestry in DNA Ties Uncovered by Tests.” *The New York Times*.

1. What appears to be the journalist’s main interpretive angle as to why some persons undertake genetic testing? How would anthropologists characterize the journalist’s perspective?
2. Having characterized the journalist’s perspective, does this mean that the journalist is “wrong,” or “right”?
3. If tests for “race” fail, then what are the alternatives? The article itself fleetingly provides us a glimpse of one possible answer.

Sturm, Circe. 1998. “Blood Politics, Racial Classification, and Cherokee National Identity: *The Trials and Tribulations of the Cherokee Freedmen*”. *American Indian Quarterly*, 22 (1–2) Win/Spr: 230–258.

1. Sturm begins her article by stating, with the aid of an informant, what together they see as the real crux of the problem affecting admission of the Freedmen back into the Cherokee fold. In your own words, what is the crux of this problem?
2. What appears to be the fundamental contradiction affecting Cherokee identification and from what/where does this contradiction seem to emerge?
3. When reading the article, what struck you as the fundamental problem underlying the question of whether or not the Freedmen should be accepted as members of the Cherokee Nation?
4. Are there ways of viewing “blood” that are not racial?
5. What is/are the source(s) of racial discrimination against the Freedmen? Please support your answer using precise materials from the reading.
6. What are some of the reasons that you read concerning why the Freedmen *ought* to be re-incorporated into the Cherokee Nation?
7. By the end of the article, were you in agreement with what you originally answered for question #2 above?

Churchill, Ward. 2004. “A Question of Identity.” In Stephen Greymorning, ed., *A Will to Survive: Indigenous Essays on the Politics of Culture, Language and Identity*. Boston: McGraw-Hill. 59-94.

1. In line with one writer who said that America is always finding more “Blacks” and always losing more Indians, Churchill notes that there was a definite political economic basis for this type of racial determination. Please explain what that was.
 2. Churchill repeatedly argues that Native nations in the US have become self-colonizing and self-subjugating. Please explain his argument.
 3. Churchill notes the transformation from indigenous inclusiveness to exclusiveness, both defended by diverse indigenous representatives as the traditional way. Please explain this apparent contradiction.
-

Sessions 9 & 10

Each of these articles (two dealing with the US, one with Mexicans, and the last focusing on Brazil) has to do with the recovery of an indigenous population, in part, through self-identification and re-identification. Look for commonalities and contrasts.

Hitt, Jack. 2005, August 21. "The Newest Indians." *The New York Times*.

1. What struck you as being the journalist's primary outlook on those he interviewed? What are some key words and phrases from the article that substantiate your interpretation?
2. "I'm a completely new Indian," she said. "I have had to learn everything from the ground up, and I'm learning every day"—what is an "old Indian" then?
3. Is there a "new kind of ethnic unease" in Indian Country, or is it the reproduction of a much older set of racial constraints...or is there any difference between the two?
4. Far from extinction, there has been a surging increase in American Indian re-identification: is this phenomenon, from the journalist's point of view, casino-driven, a grab for cash?
5. From the point of view of some critics, "lifelong Indians" as Hitt calls them, is there any difference between a "wannabe," a "hobby Indian," and a "new Indian"?
6. What does Hitt identify as the source of this preoccupation with race, with appearance, and why is it ironic from a historical point of view?
7. We have read of the rejection of Cherokees who were deemed to be too "Black," too dark and thus not "true Cherokees." This article, however, now shows us a different set of anxieties, over the disavowal of whiteness by "white Cherokees" (as one example). What is the basis for this anxiety over whiteness, according to Hitt? What is your opinion?
8. What is the reason for conscious language revival among so many tribes (according to Hitt)?

Gonzales, Patrisia. 2006, May 1. "In the Spirit of the Ancestors: Reconciling Post Tribal Stress Disorder." *The CAC Review*.

1. What does the author seem to mean by "de-Indianization"? Does it mean that indigenous culture is lost?
2. What are the sources of indigeneity in this article?
3. How does this writer appear to conceive of "resurgence" (not a term used in the article itself)?

Garrouette, Eva Marie. 2003. *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America*. Berkeley, CA: University Of California Press. (Ch. 4, If You're Indian and You Know It (but Others Don't)—Self-Identification, 82-98, 186-190)

1. You are Indian because you say you are—is that how self-identification as indigenous is being conceived by Garrouette?
2. These newly created communities of self-identified American Indians are not federally recognized. Given that fact, and that federal funds and other financial opportunities remain closed to them, it would seem that an instrumentalist interpretation of their motivations is not valid? Is this conclusion correct? What do their motivations appear to be?
3. The chapter presents a range of problems with self-identification—please list these.
4. If self-identification poses a challenge to tribal sovereignty, this chapter essentially asks: so what? What do you think of the arguments presented with respect to this question?
5. If self-identification and tribal boundary maintenance each poses problems, then what is the way out of this mess?

Warren, Jonathan W. 2001. *Racial Revolutions: Antiracism and Indian Resurgence in Brazil*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. (Ch. 1, Posttraditional Indians, 5-33)

1. This report on Brazil presents some remarkable similarities with the North American situation, where indigenous resurgence has rendered assertions of extinction to lose credibility. What are the main points of similarity?
 2. Is the author's depiction of the posttraditional condition grounded in essentialist or processual understandings of indigeneity?
 3. Looking back at the previous readings for this section, would the concept of "post-traditional" have helped you to better appreciate those who self-identify and re-identify as Indian in the US?
 4. What makes the metaphor of "contact" valuable in Warren's eyes?
 5. How has Indian identity been circumscribed in Brazil, and do you read this as being unique to Brazil?
 6. At the end of these readings, if you had to undertake a research project on contemporary indigeneity, what would you be looking at first?
-

INDIGENEITY IN NEW SETTINGS, I: URBANIZATION & "SUPRATRIBALISM"

Sessions 11 & 12

Cornell, Stephen. 1988. *The Return of the Native: American Indian Political Resurgence*. New York: Oxford University Press. (Ch. 8, The Politics of Indianness, 128-148)

1. Cornell begins with a short theoretical treatment of the subject of urbanization and identity. Using that material, on what basis can one argue that cities would not destroy Indian identity in the United States?
2. Focusing on the early to mid-1900s, what were the forces at work in moving American Indians into cities?
3. Was there any voluntary element to relocation? How much for "choice" does the article allow?
4. What is the paradox of "Pan-Indianism"? What are the origins of "urban supratribalism"?
5. For supratribalism to emerge, is it enough to just have "lots of Indians" living close together in cities?
6. We are being introduced to something new in this article, and that is a different way of conceptualizing indigeneity than we learned from the materials on race and tribe. What are the bases that constitute this new urban indigeneity?
7. Why did a generic "Indianness" become relevant in cities?
8. How have the processes of cultural transformation associated with Indian urbanization affected rural reservations?
9. In which ways does Cornell's argument mirror that of Sahlins in "Anthropological Enlightenment"?
10. Mobility and cohesion, urbanism and tribalism—are these paired opposites?
11. Cornell ends with a deflated view of the power of supratribalism to ever replace or substitute for tribalism. What do you think of his argument, and on what bases is it constructed?

Sissons, Jeffrey. 2004. "Maori Tribalism and Post-Settler Nationhood in New Zealand." *Oceania*, 75 (1), 19-31.

1. Sissons, more so than Cornell, emphasizes the dividing lines between urban and rural Maori. What are some of the key features of this division?
 2. Is "Maori" a generic label, like "Indian" in the US?
 3. How many Maori are urban? How many do *not* identify with a given tribe? How does this compare to the US case above?
 4. Please pay careful attention to Sissons' explanations of "individualized dispossession" and "official tribalism."
 5. Please pay especial attention to the Conclusion, where Sissons compares New Zealand, Australia, Canada and the United States. The root problem, he seems to suggest, is that of "oppressive authenticity". Please explain how that problem relates to the ambiguous position of urban indigenous peoples.
-

INDIGENEITY IN NEW SETTINGS II: INDIGENOUS TRANSNATIONALISM

Sessions 13 & 14

Muehlebach, Andrea. 2001. “‘Making Place’ at the United Nations: Indigenous Cultural Politics at the U.N. Working Group on Indigenous Populations.” *Cultural Anthropology*, 16 (3): 415–448.

1. The Working Group for Indigenous Peoples (WGIP) was a “nodal point” in the “global indigeno-scape”. What does that mean?
2. What are the main issues that are at the focus of international indigenous activism at the UN?
3. What are the main symbols of an international indigenous morality that are deployed at the UN?
4. In which ways can it be argued that indigenous activism represents something fundamentally new in our world?
5. The answer may seem obvious, if you restrict yourself to the simplest and most ordinary of observations—but of what value has transnational indigenous organization been to indigenous peoples and their self-representations?
6. What is the most common core of perspectives voiced by indigenous representatives at the UN? How did this common core come to exist?
7. The author discusses the clash between indigenous visions of justice and liberal conceptions of legal rights. Please explain this, noting the impact this clash has on the language deployed by indigenous representatives.
8. How can the situation of indigenous “moral exclusion” by the West possibly be of value to indigenous activism?
9. What are the main features of the “politics of place” discussed in this article?
10. What are some of the problems that are created by using the language of “self-determination”?

Brysk, Alison. 1996. “Turning Weakness into Strength: The Internationalization of Indian Rights.” *Latin American Perspectives*, 23 (2) Spring: 38-57.

1. Why, in Brysk’s view, is the internationalization of the Indian rights movement a paradox?
 2. Why does Brysk repeatedly argue that a “social movements approach” is the best suited for analyzing indigenous transnationalism?
 3. Which “foreign actors” have been important for indigenous transnationalism? How so?
 4. How is it that some of the domestically “weaker” and most remote indigenous communities are some of Latin America’s most connected and prominent on the transnational level?
 5. Brysk points to the “inherent irony of identity-based movements.” What is that irony?
 6. What are some of the “weaknesses” of the international Indian movement?
-

ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORIES OF “NATIVISM,” TRADITION, AND RESURGENCE

Sessions 15 & 16

Linton, Ralph. 1943. “Nativistic Movements”. *American Anthropologist*, 45 (2): 230–240.

1. In its simplest sense, what is a nativistic movement?
2. What is particularly significant about Linton's emphasis on the “conscious” manipulation of culture?
3. Do nativistic movements concern themselves with the revival of cultures as wholes?
4. Linton draws a distinction between two broad types of nativistic movement—what are they and how are they different?
5. Under what conditions do “rational revivalistic nativistic movements” occur? What are their aims?
6. What is the aim of a “rational perpetuative nativistic movement”?

NB: Beyond basic definitions and key characteristics of the main elements alluded to above, do not try to commit to memory Linton's varied permutations and cross-combinations.

Thomas, Nicholas. 1992. “The Inversion of Tradition.” *American Ethnologist*, 19 (2), 213-232.

1. Thomas argues “self-representation never takes place in isolation and...it is frequently oppositional or reactive.” How does this relate to what happens to tradition, and in which context? How might this be a defining theme of what we have studied in this course?
2. In which way does the point of view of Thomas echo that of Linton almost 50 years before?
3. In particular, how is one aspect of Thomas' argument (“inversion”) a radical departure from the kinds of studies to which he refers, and in fact, a very different emphasis from what is presented in this course?
4. Simply put, is Thomas focusing on the taken-for-grantedness of “everyday” culture, or, is he focusing on the way some cultural practices can be turned into something that are emblematic and have political value?
5. Thomas' key question is *not* “are traditions invented” but rather...?
6. What is so different and unique about life under colonialism where the conscious production of difference is concerned, especially as Thomas himself indicates that Pacific islanders had always established strong distinctions between one another in pre-colonial times?
7. Thomas' concept of “inversion” has two sides to it, one internal to indigenous societies, and one expressed in opposition to colonial domination. Can you think of examples from the article?

Sissons, Jeffrey. 1993. “The Systematisation of Tradition: Maori Culture as a Strategic Resource.” *Oceania*, 64 (2), 97-116.

1. Sissons uses and elaborates on a number of key concepts in this report. Specifically he speaks of the *ethnicization*, *politicization*, *rationalization*, and *ethnicization* of Maori tradition in New Zealand.
 - (a) What do each of these concepts mean?
 - (b) In which contexts would these concepts be applicable?
 - (c) If you were to use any one of these concepts in addressing a question, what would the question be?
2. Why is the profusion of these and related concepts of what is *done with* or *done to* “tradition” even occurring? Why are any of these concepts needed, what do they purport to do, what do they teach us?
3. What does it mean to “objectify” or “reify” a tradition?
4. Which actors would tend to “politicize” a tradition (and why) and which actors would tend to “rationalize” a tradition (and why)?
5. How are politicization—rationalization related to systematization—reactive objectification?
6. Which “actor” is at the centre of Sissons' analysis in this article?
7. What is Sissons' overall purpose in writing this article?
8. Outline the main features and goals of the systematization of Maori tradition in New Zealand, which is the focus of Sissons' empirical case study.
9. As a result of systematization efforts, Sissons indicates that rather than Maori culture being treated as an organic and autonomous whole, it was subject to fragmentation, objectification, and standardization.

- Can you provide one example of each of these three latter outcomes?
10. Would you argue that New Zealand is a bi-cultural society? Why or why not?
-

Sessions 17 & 18

Hanson, Allan. 1989. "The Making of the Maori: Culture Invention and its Logic". *American Anthropologist*, 91 (4) Dec: 891–902.

1. Why has the invention of Maori history and cosmology by some Europeans become "Maori tradition," assuming that you agree with Hanson's argument?
2. What have been some of the ironies of Western/Pakeha scholars' engagement with writing about Maori history and culture?
3. According to Hanson, how do we know when we are dealing with an "invention"?
4. This article engendered what might be described as furor, rejection, and endless criticism by both Maori spokespersons and other non-New Zealand anthropologists. On which grounds do you suspect this article would be criticized? Would you agree with them?

Lattas, Andrew. 1993. "Essentialism, Memory and Resistance: Aboriginality and the Politics of Authenticity." *Oceania*, 63 (3): 240-268.

1. At the start of the article, why does Lattas target critiques of essentialism?
 2. Lattas, and those he criticizes, both agree on the need for political transformation, and both appear to sympathize with Aboriginals. Lattas notes that, nonetheless, serious differences remain over what constitutes "good politics". What does Lattas say about this issue? Where is Aboriginal resistance to be found?
 3. What makes resistance to "gentility" an act of resistance against hegemony, in Lattas' view?
 4. In the views of figures such as Rowse, whom Lattas criticizes, what would be a better and more substantial politics of Aboriginal opposition?
 5. With reference to Keeffe, what does Lattas mean by "the pastoral" attitude of the white, Aboriginal Studies intelligentsia?
 6. Lattas argues that it is a mistake to see essentialism as something imposed by the state, and as a "negative" feature of Aboriginal politics and self-representation. Please pay careful attention to the main points of his argument, and try to summarize them. This is possibly the core of his article. How can essentialism be empowering? Why is the role of the state in imposing essentialist standards not as significant in Lattas' view, or, at least, overstated by his intellectual opponents? How are the past, the body, ancestry, and myths of place vital for Aboriginal politics?
 7. Lattas charges left wing and right wing intellectuals as sharing some important ideas in common, when speaking of Aboriginals. What do they have in common?
 8. Lattas also argues that leftist intellectuals in Australia are "dispossessing" Aboriginality. Please explain.
-

Sessions 19 & 20

Alfred, Gerald Taiaiake. 2005. *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Peterborough ON: Broadview Press. (First Words, 19-38)

1. What are the primary principles of what Alfred himself calls “resurgence”? Compared to “resurgence” as used in the course, how is his approach much more delimited and specific?
2. What is “the politics of pity”?
3. Armed confrontation or non-violent resistance: which path does Alfred advocate and why?
4. What has been the problem with what Alfred calls “the economic revolutions”?
5. What is Taiaiake’s position on economic development and self-governance?
6. Ultimately, what do you think Taiaiake is outlining as the two most important aims of resurgence? (Hint: think in terms of “self” and “other”)

Castillo-Cárdenas, Gonzalo. 1987. *Liberation Theology from Below: The Life and Thought of Manuel Quintín Lame*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books (Appendix, Quintín Lame's. “The Thoughts of an Indian Educated in the Forest,” 97-152)

1. Themes of justice abound in this text. What does “justice” look like from Lame’s perspective?
2. Images and symbols of nature also abound in the text. Make a note of them. Lame stresses his Indian identity as rooted in nature. What do you notice about some of the ways that natural elements are symbolized?
3. What does Lame think about formal education and intellectuals?
4. What does the redemption of “the Indian race” look like in Lame’s vision?
5. When reading this text, do you find that Lame’s ideas, expressions, or values are completely “alien” to you, or do you recognize something familiar in them? What accounts for the apparent familiarity? What does this familiarity, if any, say about the nature of Lame’s vision?
6. Lame has a particular interpretation of the relationship between victory and defeat, superiority and inferiority. Make a note of the passages that reveal this relationship.
7. If we were forced to impose the word “resurgence” on Lame’s vision of Indian redemption, what would that resurgence look like ultimately?

Rainbow Spirit Elders. 1997. *Rainbow Spirit Theology: Towards an Australian Aboriginal Theology*. Blackburn, VIC: Harper Collins Publishers Australia Pty. (Ch. 2, Doing Rainbow Spirit Theology, 10-28)

1. What is the source of this theology and why could it be historically significant?
2. How are the “rainbow spirit,” theological reinterpretation, and resurgence interconnected?
3. What are the meanings of the four directions in this theology?
4. How does land figure in this theology, and how is that connected to resurgence?

After completing all three of these readings, ask yourself whether you are able to compare and contrast these three to one another. What are the most salient differences in terms of the preferred outcomes of resurgence? (No two of these are alike.) What are the main elements of the vision embodied in each writing? How do they stand with reference to Western culture?

Case Study: The Indian Movement in the USA
Sessions 21 & 22

Nagel, Joane. 1996. *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press. (Ch. 5, The Politics of American Indian Ethnicity: Solving the Puzzle of Indian Ethnic Resurgence, 113-157)

This is another of the critical readings for this course. I highly recommend that you take good notes on the key elements supporting the author's argument in this chapter.

1. Nagel claims that the material and symbolic worth of American Indian identity has increased since the 1960s. Please explain the main factors that led to this transformation in value.
2. How did assimilation programs backfire, according to Nagel?
3. How did urbanization lead to increased Indian activism?
4. In which ways were the Black Power and Red Power movements linked? Were the links direct ones?
5. Describe, in condensed form, the political and symbolic importance of the Alcatraz occupation.

Champagne Duane. 1997. "Self-determination and Activism Among American Indians in the United States 1972-1997." *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, 21.2: <http://209.200.101.189/publications/csq/index.cfm?id=21.2>

1. On what grounds can the period since the 1960s be called the "self-determination era" in the US?
2. As in Nagel's chapter, Champagne argues that the Alcatraz occupation was an event of foundational importance for Red Power Activism. List the reasons he gives for making this claim.
3. Did legal and institutional changes governing education and religion produce the conditions that one could call a resurgence of Native tradition?

Deloria, Vine, Jr. 1994. *God is Red: A Native View of Religion*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing. (Ch. 1, The Indian Movement, 4-24)

1. Deloria raises a very interesting point about the so-called privileges of Indians and the need for them to be made "equal" to the rest of America? In reality, what does this entail, as he explains?
 2. What are the origins of the urban Indian movement, according to Deloria? From what you have already read, why is this movement important?
 3. Please note the "fish-ins" (also mentioned in Nagel's chapter) and the Gallup protest.
 4. Was there anything in common underlying the numerous local Indian protest occupations of the 1960s and 1970s? Is it reasonable to speak of "resurgence" and, in the context established by this chapter, what meanings does the term begin to acquire?
 5. Were the early Indian protests an "Indians only" affair?
 6. Grave robbing—this is an important issue raised by Deloria which throws into bold relief the relations between anthropologists and Native peoples in the US. What are the main dividing/uniting lines? Which side appeals to you more?
 7. In Deloria's view, what were the positive results of the more radical activism of AIM members?
-
-

Case Study: Aboriginal Australians

Sessions 23-26

Goodall, Heather. 1996. "Land In Our Own Country: The Aboriginal Land Rights Movement in Southeastern Australia, 1860-1914." In Valerie Chapman and Peter Read, eds., *Terrible Hard Biscuits: A Reader in Aboriginal History*. St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin. pps. 167-201.

This chapter is loaded with historical detail, and you are *not* required to keep track, take notes on, or memorize all or even most of the actual details. Instead, focus on areas where the argument is being explicitly stated, where main themes become apparent, where issues are summarized. Also pay close attention to instances where we hear/read Aboriginal voices—note the terms used, the objectives being sought.

Note: "Koori" is the preferred term of many Aboriginals for referring to themselves, instead of "Aborigine" or "Aboriginal" even.

1. Goodall points to an important paradox—the creation of reserves as an instance of not just oppression, but of Aboriginals creating their own history. How does that argument work?
2. Why is it that, in areas settled by Europeans, Aboriginals came to not have land? What are the actual dynamics by which Aboriginals did not occupy land in those areas? (The answer is not as obvious as you might think at first.)
3. In what sense can we speak of an early "Aboriginal land rights movement" in Australia?
4. What were the three main strategies used by Aboriginals to gain access to lands?
5. Note the instances where Goodall makes references to events discussed in the lecture, for example, parallels with the "Tent Embassy".
6. When we read Aboriginal statements, what are the objectives that they specify? Do they reject Whites? Do they indicate self-consciousness as native, and as having rights to land? On what basis do they argue that they should have land?
7. What were the consistent elements of all Aboriginal demands for land?
8. *How* did Aboriginals want to use "selections" and *why*? Did they just want any lands, anywhere?
9. Can one make the case that reserve-based Aboriginals were assimilated into Western culture? Why or why not?

Eades, Diana. 1994. "They Don't Speak an Aboriginal Language, or Do They?" In Ian Keen, ed., *Being Black: Aboriginal Cultures in 'Settled' Australia*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press. pps. 97-115.

In this course we have encountered tendencies that have sought to disqualify certain people as being "not really indigenous" on the basis of "race". This article is about how language can be deployed in the same fashion.

1. How does the theoretical approach of the author reflect a processual understanding of Aboriginal identity?
2. On what grounds have non-Aboriginals disputed or dismissed claims to Aboriginal identity in southeast Queensland? In this course, how have we referred to such a perspective on "real" Aboriginality?
3. We are told that none of the Aboriginals in the site of the author's study speak an Aboriginal language as their primary language, that they instead speak "varieties of English". How is the speaking of these varieties reflective of contemporary Aboriginal experience and identity, rather than a sign of simple assimilation?
4. Language is not just something that is spoken, but also performed. How does the performance described in the chapter tie into established patterns of Aboriginal culture? (Think here of kin terms and avoidance behaviour.)

Rowse, Tim. 1993. *After Mabo: Interpreting Indigenous Traditions*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press (Ch. 3, Aborigines Incorporated, 54-82)

1. What is a “mob”? How does a mob differ from what the author refers to as a “corporation”? What is being highlighted in making such a distinction?
2. What is “public ethnicity”? How does this relate to the state’s relations with Aboriginal communities?
3. “Aboriginality as persistence” versus “Aboriginality as resistance” relate to ideas of essentialism and processualism that we encountered very early in this course. Note how these concepts are used in this chapter, and the relevance they have for describing Aboriginal bureaucrats and their relations with their communities of origin.
4. What is the debate that has emerged from the creation of national Aboriginal political bodies and their relationship with local communities?
5. Has the Australian state in effect created “tribes” for the purposes of Aboriginal land claims? What are some of the difficulties faced by the Australian state in deciding which type of Aboriginal entity represents Aboriginal interests (i.e., mob, horde, tribe, etc.)?
6. What were some of the critical judgments made about the NAC?
7. What is the issue of concern involving “factions” and “community”?
8. What kinds of images of Aboriginality have been constructed by the Australian state in its search for “representative” Aborigines?
9. When you add some of the key observations of this article to those of the previous one, what problems are posed for those seeking to represent Aborigines?

McIntosh, Ian S. 2000. “When Will We Know We are Reconciled?” *Anthropology Today*, 16 (5), Oct., 3-11.

1. Do you think that Australia’s Reconciliation plan might be applicable to Canada? Does Canada already have one?
 2. How did Prime Minister Howard justify his rejection of some of the main proposals for Reconciliation? Was/is his position justifiable?
 3. Please make a note of the passages relating to “strategic essentialism” and “invented tradition.”
 4. What is the view of anthropologist Francesca Merlan on the Aboriginal reconciliation agenda, and what does McIntosh have to say about it?
 5. McIntosh describes some arguments made by anthropologist Ron Brunton. If you were asked to, how might you defend or add to Brunton’s argument? On the other hand, how you might further defend McIntosh’s criticisms?
 6. What is the nature of the impasse between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal views of reconciliation, as described by McIntosh?
 7. What is the significance of the Aboriginal bagel-maker vignette? Is the vignette of the Druidic spiritual advisor to the Rolling Stones different, and in which ways? What does McIntosh see in common between the two stories?
 8. McIntosh asks: “Realistically, can the non-Aboriginal collective offer to Aborigines anything other than assimilation or integration into the nameless, featureless whole?” What do you think of this statement, its assumptions, and what it implies?
 9. McIntosh, speaking again of “membership and remembrance,” notes that if Aborigines can ever hope to control non-Aborigines it will have to be through the process of adoption, by enclosing non-Aborigines within Aboriginal social relations. Does this differ from the Mohawk Warriors’ perspective in the Caledonia protest, and if so, how? How do you evaluate the two strategies?
-