

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Southern Indians and Anthropologists: Culture, Politics, and Identity. Edited by Lisa J. Lefler and Frederic W. Gleach.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6vm436b3>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 26(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Karr, Steven M.

Publication Date

2002-09-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

University of Colorado, Boulder

Southern Indians and Anthropologists: Culture, Politics, and Identity. Edited by Lisa J. Lefler and Frederic W. Gleach. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2002. 151 pages. \$40.00 cloth, \$20.00 paper.

By the late 1960s many people both in and out of Indian country, spurred in part by nearly a decade of heightened social awareness, challenged American anthropologists to reevaluate the motivations, methods, causes, and effects of their work among Native peoples. Three decades later anthropologists, including archaeologists and ethnohistorians, continue to grapple with many of the same questions posed to their disciplines years earlier—whose research is being conducted? How has research on Indian groups traditionally been carried out? Is the Native perspective represented? Is it even considered? Who beside the researcher might benefit from this work? Can Indian communities and academics work collaboratively to achieve certain goals?

Created out of a scholarly symposium in which these and many other questions were applied and discussed, this edited volume is a compilation of eleven essays on topics concerning a broad interpretation of southeastern Indian cultures, representing areas of study in sociocultural anthropology, linguistics, archaeology, and, although not mentioned, ethnohistory. The book's primary purpose, its two editors state, is not to replace earlier efforts by academics discussing these same issues, but instead to supplement this current dialogue with examples of ongoing collaborative work between Indian communities and anthropologists.

Several of the book's essays deserve further discussion. On the subject of archaeology, author Brett Riggs provides a personal account of his own archaeological work among the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians. In it he highlights the development of a current tribal policy concerning historical and cultural preservation, noting that "during these episodes, relations between archaeologists and the native community have ranged from open confrontation to active partnership;" however, "[N]ative and archaeological communities are gradually building rules of engagement that accommodate the interests of both groups" (p. 19). Although Riggs recounts initially being met with mistrust by some Indians until this point, through his own efforts and those of interested tribal members, he was able to serve both his needs and those of the community, simultaneously rehabilitating archaeologists' images among Native peoples. More interesting, perhaps, is Riggs' discussion of conflicting principles regarding the development of tribal lands between what he calls "tribal preservationists" and "development-minded" tribal members. Here Riggs is careful not to succumb to the old habit of labeling these two factions as traditionalists and non-traditionalists, but rather suggesting that among the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, as is certainly the case with other tribes, not all development-minded Indians are necessarily non-traditionalists.

In another study employing traditional ethnographic methodologies Betty J. Duggan points to the unique attributes of the Duck Town Cherokees of southeastern Tennessee based, in part, upon the continuity of certain cul-

tural practices and their historical interaction with both non-Indians and neighboring Cherokee enclaves. Focusing on the years 1840 through 1910, Duggan identifies three phases of the Cherokees' occupation of the Duck Town Basin marked by succeeding decades of changing economic systems, a declining population, shifting settlement patterns, and often hostile interethnic relations. In the face of these and other influences, the Duck Town Cherokees proved to be what she calls, as determined by Edward Spicer and Fredrik Barth, "a persistent identity system or a unit of continuity through time" (p. 61). Duggan provides several examples for this assertion. Culturally conservative, by the 1860s she argues, the Cherokees' traditional kinship systems remained intact as, "matrilineal kinship and matrilocal residence patterns were the organizing principles for all post-Removal settlements in the Ducktown Basin" (p. 49). Following the Civil War, despite population decline, settlement dispersal or relocation, and an increased non-Indian population, interaction with another Cherokee enclave at Long Ridge provided "the ability to speak the Cherokee language, participation in Cherokee community life, ... safety of numbers, [and the] potential for marriage partners" (pp. 53–54). As a result of these factors kinship ties endured, as did group identity. By the turn of the century racial tensions, marked by increasing occurrences of violence, compelled many Cherokee families to remove collectively from the Ducktown Basin altogether. Still, Duggan concludes, "Among culturally conservative Cherokee groups ... these ancient senses of group activity carried forward, sometimes through displacements in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. ... While long gone from a specific geographic locale, the Duck Town Cherokee enclave endures" (p. 62). Certainly it is not unexpected that collective identity for any group is based as much, if not more, upon cultural fabric (i.e., kinship systems, language, religion, oral history, and tradition) as it is on place.

In his short essay on museums and tribal perspectives Russell G. Townsend discusses the participation of Native peoples in the depiction of their own cultures. After a brief overview of Indian involvement, or lack thereof, in traditional museum curation, he provides examples of the establishment or renovation of both tribal and non-tribal Cherokee museums. Interestingly, Townsend expresses the surprise he and non-tribal museum workers experienced when they consulted with various Cherokee groups on museum projects. In light of concerns over the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), consultation with these groups was expected before displaying funerary objects, photographs of burial exhumations, and any discussion of medicinal culture. What wasn't expected was "what little resistance to their overall exhibit plan came from Native Americans [and that] people wanted to de-emphasis [*sic*] the Trail of Tears" (p. 75). Townsend ends his summary noting that when he spoke to Cherokees asking specifically what they wanted to see in their museums, "the most common answer was a desire to see the Cherokees portrayed as living people that exists in many different places in the United States today" (p. 76). The scenarios should not, however, be a surprise to anyone familiar with Cherokee culture. As stated numerous times throughout the book, not all Cherokees

were removed to Indian Territory. More important still, the Trail of Tears can hardly be characterized as the defining element of Cherokee peoples in Oklahoma, as is surely the case with the dozens of other Native cultures throughout North America who suffered similar experiences.

On the whole, these essays provide sound though largely anecdotal examples of how and in what manner academics and Native peoples collaborate in the various disciplines mentioned earlier in this review. Several of these essays appear more sociological, almost clinical, rather than anthropological. Ultimately this volume might be best used as a text in an introductory course in applied anthropology. Graduate students and scholars may find it useful for providing different examples of situations they may have faced while conducting their own research. While agreeing with this book's primary theme—collaboration between researchers and Indians to serve broader interests—this reviewer would argue that today most anthropologists, archaeologists, and ethnohistorians working among Native Americans do in fact abide by this standard. Today fieldwork is conducted with Indian collaborators, not informants. Researchers do not merely gather data from human subjects; they are educated and informed by those who are more knowledgeable. Indian peoples do not necessarily meet museum curators with resistance; they may simply disagree. Any study on Native peoples and their cultures that does not include the Native voice is simply not a study on Indians. This last statement may in fact beg the question of whether the broader study of American Indians is experiencing a paradigm shift. With this issue in mind, perhaps those engaged in the field need to ask new questions regarding their research and its outcome.

Steven M. Karr

Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County

Studies in American Indian Art: A Memorial Tribute to Norman Feder. Edited by Christian F. Feest. Altenstadt, Germany: European Review of Native American Studies, distributed by University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 2001. 208 pages. \$35.00 paper.

This collection of essays compiled by *European Review of Native American Studies* editor Christian F. Feest is intended to serve as a tribute to Norman Feder (1930–1995) as a seminal figure in American Indian art studies and to illustrate the interdisciplinary nature of the field. It succeeds on both counts.

The authors of the seventeen essays in Feest's book are drawn from a range of disciplines, including anthropology, art history, and museum studies, and the topics they address demonstrate Feder's foundational contribution to what has become a vital interdisciplinary scholarly field. At the same time, they serve to demonstrate the limitations of Feder's approach. Recognition of these limitations does not constitute a criticism of Feder's scholarship or of Feest's book. Rather, it serves to demonstrate the historically situated nature of scholarship. Feder was a product of his time, and his scholarship reflects