UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Defining American Indian Literature: One Nation Divisible. By Robert L. Berner.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8jn2n93q

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 24(4)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Donohue, Betty Booth

Publication Date
2000-09-01

DOI
10.17953

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

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

US government's written materials. Ball spent time interviewing Apaches born during the twenty-seven-year incarceration period; Turcheneske based his writings solely on the government's written material.

Still, the factual components of this book are magnificent, as the detailed accounts expressed in letters are vital to understand fully what motivated the US government. A letter from President Theodore Roosevelt's office clearly points out the complete lack of respect for Native culture, arguing that the incarceration would be a time for the Apache to realize the error of their ways. The fact that hundreds of Apaches were living substandard lives and dying was disregarded; it was considered necessary for the United States to grow and prosper.

The book clearly exposes the shared ideas of the US Army and government and their plan to rid the land of "savage" people. Turcheneske details how women and men were separated and the children were moved to schools outside the incarceration area. One of the strengths of this book is the information on where the United States planned to relocate the tribe, including North Carolina and Oklahoma. Once the US government realized the various problems with each area considered, many memos were written with a sense of desperation, demonstrating the loss of confidence in their plans.

In most history books that focus on Native Americans, this sense of desperation is not exposed. Turcheneske conveys the anxiety accurately. Though this book would be a poor choice as an introduction to the Apache incarceration, it is helpful for the scholar who is familiar with the situation and wants to know more about the US government's attitude.

Elizabeth J. Hernandez (Mescalero Apache)
College of Notre Dame

Defining American Indian Literature: One Nation Divisible. By Robert L. Berner. Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1999. 153 pages. $79.95 cloth.

Defining American Indian Literature prefaces its task of defining American Indian literature in a rather curious way. The title, *Defining American Indian Literature: One Nation Divisible,* seems to equate American Indian literature with nationhood, presumably tribal nationhood since American Indian nations are divided in terms of tribal traditions. From the title the reader might assume that this volume will discuss the impact that tribal differences produce in American Indian works.

Such is not the case, however. What *Defining American Indian Literature* does in its prefatory pages is set up a polemic in which Euro-American literature, the canonical standard, confronts American Indian literature with the intention of undermining its integrity by calling into question issues of race and ethnic legitimacy as they pertain to American Indian writers and their various treatments of traditional cultures. This work sees American Indian literature as a highly problematic literary form which can, if not properly defined,

certified by culture quantum, and restrained, undermine not only the sacred canon, but also the entire "American" culture as well (p. iv).

In the foreword to *Defining American Indian Literature,* Robert L. Berner, professor emeritus at the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, makes clear that he is part of the academic community that sees the present state of American culture as "dismal" (p. iv), referring to the growth of multiethnic studies programs in American universities and to the intellectual validity of the discourse these programs have generated. Berner laments what he calls the passing of the ideals of the pledge of allegiance and the demise of the notion of America as a melting pot. He calls for a return to the search for a common American identity and consciousness, a task seemingly predicated on the notion that American Indians vocal about their histories and cultural backgrounds are un-American. Any valorization of American Indian history and experience threatens his notion of a united America and a patriotic canon. Apparently, part of his quest for American emotional and intellectual indivisibility depends on a thorough trouncing of several American Indian writers. For the good of the country, the Euro-American literary canon must be protected from Indian attack, Berner argues, and it must ensure that any American Indian writer admitted to the canon be civilized, with emphasis on the *civil,* and culturally authentic.

Berner admits that his "provocative" remarks will surely "irritate" some readers, and he does not apologize for his "occasionally testy tone" (p. iv). He qualifies as arbiter because he has taught and written articles about American Indian literature for twenty-five years. He confesses that his efforts to understand the scope and nature of American Indian literature have left him "increasingly perplexed," resulting in this book (p. iv).

In an effort to make sense of American Indian writings, *Defining American Indian Literature* defines an American Indian writer to delineate the American Indian literary tradition, to determine the legitimate use of Indian culture in both Indian and non-Indian writings, and to explore the relation of American Indian literature to America's Euro-American tradition. In seeking to accomplish these objectives, *Defining American Indian Literature* strays from American Indian literary works and plunges into a discussion of American Indian activism and rhetoric of the 1970s and 1980s in order to substantiate many of its claims. Other presumably literary points are proven by debunking demographic and ethnohistorical works considered revisionist. This decision weakens the book's stated resolve to keep literature out of a political milieu dominated by issues of race, ethnicity, and gender.

Persons familiar with American Indian history know that attempts to define who is an American Indian is difficult given the agonies of intermarriage, genocide, reservations, decrees of severalty, official blood quantum counts, presidential orders, the Dawes Act, varying tribal registration proclivities, Bureau of Indian Affairs bungling, and five hundred years of running and hiding. *Defining American Indian Literature* sidesteps all these concerns, which have been debated ad infinitum by those who came before it and concludes that authentic American Indian writers are those with the most tribal experience. *Defining American Indian Literature* insists that blood quantum, or

race, doth not an Indian make. Tribal experience does. Diane Glancy was not a real Cherokee until she researched her tribal history. Jim Barnes is not a Choctaw writer because he chooses not to assert his mixed-blood status. Barnes's book about Thomas Mann confirms that he is not truly an Indian writer.

Defining American Indian Literature's discussion of American Indian culture's place in Indian and non-Indian works is interesting. The presentation is varied and covers both anthropological and literary appropriations of Native cultures. Berner approves of Frank Hamilton Cushing's work among the Zuni (1857–1900) and, appropriately, chastises Jerome Rothenberg's *Shaking the Pumpkin: Traditional Poetry of the Indian North Americans.* The book rejects Paula Gunn Allen's body of work on the grounds that it is cultural "hocus pocus," but accepts Gerald Vizenor's output because it is comic (p. 29). According to *Defining American Indian Literature,* the comic view of American Indian life portrayed by Vizenor is more valid that the impact of centuries of genocide noted by Allen.

Defining American Indian Literature asserts that American Indian tradition is best summarized by Black Elk. To that end the author discusses three American Indian works—N. Scott Momaday's *House Made of Dawn* (1968), Momaday's *The Way to Rainy Mountain* (1969), and Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony* (1977)—in terms of Black Elk's explanations of the significance of the number four and the symbolic import of four directions: east, south, west, and north. This section is arguably the book's most cogent.

Defining American Indian Literature's discussion of the relation of American Indian literature to the Euro-American literary tradition hinges on the premise that a great literary work must speak to our universal human condition. Generally the thrust is that American Indian writers are at their finest when they speak to the universal psyche in a language it can understand (English). After all, American Indian writers are English speakers no matter what they say about finding the language inadequate to express their thoughts. For example, Berner castigates Joy Harjo for articulating dissatisfaction with English because, in her words, English is "'very materialistic and . . .very subject-oriented,'" and praises her when she says that she has "'learned to love the language'" (pp. 82–83). At no point in the book is Joy Harjo's poetry discussed. Of sole interest to *Defining American Indian Literature* are Harjo's random, uncontextualized sentiments about the English language.

Defining American Indian Literature is not comfortable when American Indian writers find fault with English, and when they stand outside the pale and hurl insults at their non-Indian readers. For example, the author is appalled by Jimmie Durham's "'**I HATE AMERICA**'" (p. 81). He is, however, appreciative of American Indian writers who call for a melding of people and their differences. For example, *Defining American Indian Literature* commends Simon Ortiz when he writes that "'[w]e are all with and within each other'" (p. 94).

American Indian writers' insistence on difference begotten by race and circumstance makes *Defining American Indian Literature* uneasy. The work takes great pains to insist that there is really nothing special about being Indian. Any human experience in the United States is essentially an

American experience. People the world over have been tribal at some point in their existence, so there is no privilege in primitivism.

Defining American Indian Literature is hopeful that a new American consciousness, a "syncretic vision" will emerge when Indian writers rise above the superficialities of race and history and identify themselves thematically with true Americans (p. 95). When this blending happens, the "old American dream of becoming brothers and sisters at last" will prevail (p. 95).

Defining American Indian Literature is important to students of American Indian literature because it brings several problems to light. It may be fair to say that the field of American Indian literature is in intellectual disarray at this particular time, and Berner has made this confusion quite clear. Relatively speaking, given the brief period of time in which American Indian literature has been studied in the academy, there is an understandable paucity of well-reasoned, insightful criticism written by persons who understand American Indian literary theory; therefore, it is difficult for scholars to find answers to their questions and to contextualize the responses they do find. Berner's reliance on off-hand remarks by writers giving interviews underlines this point. *Defining American Indian Literature* reminds all those working in the field that questions regarding American Indian thought are legitimate and deserve respectful consideration.

Berner's book is important to American Indian writers and critics because it is a brutally honest depiction of how some established academicians view American Indians, their histories, and their literary endeavors. Berner has the fortitude to say in print what many American Indian writers and critics have only sensed. There is a resistance to American Indians in today's academy and in today's society. This book has done much to articulate the nature and scope of that resistance, since it not only takes on American Indian writers, but also calls into question the works of many recent scholars in other fields who have produced works sympathetic to American Indians. Researchers such as Henry Dobyns, David Stannard, Tzvetlan Todorov, Donald Grinde, Vine Deloria Jr., and Bruce Johansen come under fire in this volume. *Defining American Indian Literature* is a book that must be read and responded to by scholars interested in American Indians and their literature.

Betty Booth Donohue
Bacone College

Indians and Colonists at the Crossroads of Empire: The Albany Congress of 1754. By Timothy J. Shannon. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000. 268 pages. $39.95 cloth.

This book is the winner of the Dixon Ryan Fox Prize from the New York State Historical Association, and the author, Timothy J. Shannon, is an assistant professor of history at Gettysburg College. His subject is the 1754 Albany Congress, where a plan to unite the American colonies was debated in Albany, New York. The stated purpose of the meeting was to address Mohawk Indian