

## PART THREE:

### Anthropologists and Indigenous Peoples: Conflicts and Collaborations

#### Session 8

“Reflecting on Patterns of Anthropological Relationships with Indigenous Peoples” Part One

**Kuper, Adam. 2003. “The Return of the Native”. *Current Anthropology*, 44 (3): 389-402.**

1. Why is the concept of “indigenous peoples” ultimately an essentialist one, in Kuper's view?
2. How does the indigenous rights movement differ little from racist and anti-immigrant movements?
3. In which ways does Kuper take issue with anthropologists themselves?
4. What are Kuper's criticisms of NGOs?
5. If you had to try to discern what Kuper's own political agenda may be in writing this article, how would you describe it?
6. Do you think that the criticisms made of Kuper's approach, by respondents writing at the end of the article, represent valid viewpoints, and if so, how so?

**Kenrick, Justin and Lewis, Jerome. 2004. “Indigenous Peoples' Rights and the Politics of the Term 'Indigenous'.” *Anthropology Today*, 20 (2): 4-9.**

1. Why do the authors say that Kuper should be ignored, and yet taken seriously? When they use the term “polemic” what do they mean and are they justified in using it? Is their response non-polemical?
2. What are their main disputes with the Kuper article above? How does Kuper misrepresent the international indigenous peoples' movement?
3. The authors say they will provide better ways of understanding the indigenous peoples movement? What are those better ways?
4. The authors argue that an “obvious point of departure for any debate on the concept of 'indigenous peoples',” ought to be how the concept has been codified within the UN? Is this a good argument, and how might they be reinforcing Kuper's argument by taking this approach?
5. Pay special attention to their discussion of the case of the Innu of Labrador, and contrast it with Kuper's own description of their claims for lands.
6. Also, go back to the Kuper article and re-read his quote by Brody of a Cree Ph.D. student who argued against the notion that the Cree were migrants, but instead “emerged.” Now, note how these authors explain and translate the notion of emergence. What do you think about this argument?
7. Is the concept of indigenous rights really about “special rights,” as gaining over others, or a way of fighting discrimination and loss?
8. How does the authors' “relational” idea of indigenous differ from Kuper's which is also supposedly about relations with others?
9. How does “cultural double-speak” work?

**Deloria, Vine, Jr. 1969. *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. London: Collier-Macmillan. (ch 4. “Anthropologists and Other Friends,” 78-100).**

1. What are at least two of the primary accusations that Deloria levels at anthropologists in this chapter?
2. Note how the issue of the defunct “real Indian” appears in this piece.
3. What damage do anthropologists do, in Deloria's view?
4. Deloria seems to be laughing a great deal at anthropological constructions of Indian problems. Please name at least three of the “problems” invented by anthropological discourse, and why are these apparently so “funny” for Deloria?

Grobsmith, Elizabeth S. 1997. "Growing Up on Deloria: The Impact of His Work on a New Generation of Anthropologists." In Thomas Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman, eds., *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology*, pp. 35-49. Tucson: University Press of Arizona.

1. What impact did Deloria have on anthropologists such as Grobsmith immediately after the publication of Deloria's book above?
2. Does the author hint that Deloria does not speak for American Indians? In which way? Is she consistent in the details of her time spent on the reservation and her relationships with hosts?
3. Does Grobsmith appear to be optimistic, or defensive, or self-critical, or all of these? Justify your answer.
4. In the long-term, how did anthropology change, post-Deloria?