

Historiography

PHILIP J. DELORIA

In 1997, Native historian Donald Fixico observed that more than 30,000 books had been written about American Indians. The number may have been conservative then, and it has certainly been surpassed since. Visit the call numbers between E51 and E99 in even the smallest library and marvel at the prodigious outpouring of writing on Native people. As you browse those impressive stacks, however, don't forget that books and libraries are not the only ways of recording and communicating a past. It's worth bearing in mind one of Fixico's other calculations: roughly 90 percent of those books were written by non-Indians (Fixico, 1997: 3). Fixico's observations suggest at least three central historiographical problems. First of all, how do we make sense of this vast library of texts, this Western canon of Indian history? Second, even if we could order this canon, how would we then situate it in relation to the multiplicity of Native histories, each of which poses political and epistemological challenges to the Western tradition of history-telling itself? And third, can we imagine histories that problematize or perhaps even transcend dualisms like Indian/non-Indian, linear/cyclical, or oral/literate?

These problems defy easy solution, particularly in the course of a short essay. Indeed, the very notion of historiography – a history of history-writing – immediately raises an even deeper horizon of critical questions. How do people use their pasts to perceive, imagine, and perpetuate ideas about cultural and social difference? How have historical narratives reflected the relations of power between various groups of Native people and various groups of Europeans? Can we even begin to perceive the complex connections between social, political, economic, and environmental transformations and the psychic and cultural changes that are refracted through the historical consciousness of the writer or the storyteller?

Historiography – and particularly in a cross- or multicultural context – requires us to think about epistemology – how we know what we know – in complex ways. First, one has always to confront the epistemology of *difference*: how have non-Indian writers understood Indians to be different? And, by extension, how have Indians

conceptualized non-Indian difference? Second, one has to think about the ways that epistemologies have changed across *time*. How was the historical consciousness available to Francis Parkman in the mid-nineteenth century different from that available to John Neihardt in the early twentieth? And how were they both different from subjects like Black Hawk and Black Elk, both of whom narrated their own histories? In this essay, I plan to think first about grappling with the Western tradition of historical writing. The essay will then raise the question of Native historiography, before finally trying to come to terms with the hybrid understandings of the past that inevitably characterize our contemporary acts of history-telling.

Let us return first to the library. Traditional historical categories offer one useful way of ordering the material. We could parse those 30,000-plus books using words like military, political, diplomatic, social, cultural, women's, race, class, gender, sexuality, environmental, family, and so on. "Indian" would mark a kind of commonality, but "Indian histories" would fit into other categories as well. One can see the opportunities and the problems with books such as Walter Williams's *The Spirit and the Flesh*, Will Roscoe's *The Zuni Man-Woman*, and *Two Spirit People*, edited by Sue-Ellen Jacobs, Wesley Thomas, and Sabine Lang. All are "Indian histories" that, one might argue, fit more easily into the broader categories of gender and sexuality. Alternatively, we might use an ordering scheme that relies more directly on discipline or method. The categories would be different: archaeology, ethnology, ethnography, ethnohistory, myth and symbol, folklore, sociology, policy studies, and so on. But both kinds of categorizations, while useful, don't generally meet the requirement laid down by the "history" in the word "historiography" – the explanation of change over time.

Historical periodization creates different kinds of categories, divisions that are temporal rather than methodological or topical. Like all categories, these necessarily do harm to their subjects – in this case, the continuity and flux of change over time. Historiographical periodization implies, for example, that one can distill complex historical consciousnesses down to recognizable definitions and examples. We know this to be untrue. Yet periodization can also be an exercise in ordering that makes change visible in productive ways. In that spirit, I want to suggest four broad historical periods in Indian history-writing, each of which has overlaid, rather than supplanted, those that have come before. Each suggests changes in social, political, and epistemological positions within non-Indian societies that have helped to produce new kinds of history-writing. Obviously such crude paradigms will obscure shifts and subtleties, but it is also true that additional historiographical inquiry will derive its analytical power by breaking down these and other categories. With that caveat and invitation, let us proceed:

- 1 Frontier History: In which spatial metaphors explain Indian–non-Indian difference in simple terms of geography, conflict, and eventual (and often predestined) conquest (from contact to the present).
- 2 Racial/Developmental Hierarchy: In which more complex structures result from scientific efforts to explain difference within a larger human landscape (from the late eighteenth century to the present).

- 3 Modernist History: A post-frontier paradigm in which people imagine social boundaries to be fixed, while simultaneously retaining the possibility of their transcendence (from the late nineteenth century to the present).
- 4 Postmodern/Postcolonial: Contemporary writing in which texts and histories seek to deal with the tension between the liberating dissolution of boundaries and the constant reshaping of them as political memories of the colonial past (roughly, post-World War II to the present).

Frontier

Frederick Jackson Turner's 1893 formulation of "the frontier" serves as a useful starting place, for if it marks the beginning of a series of academic "frontier" histories, it also represents the supposed *end* of the conditions that powered a long tradition of popular history-writing (Turner, 1920). Turner saw American history in spatial terms, a moving boundary between European civilization and Indian savagery. He didn't talk much about Native people, but he did codify the very old notion of a line that separated Indian and non-Indian. That line defined the terrain of physical, political, economic, and social struggle and it carried with it the expectation that white America would inevitably triumph. Turner's address – and his subsequent scholarship – insisted that Americans had arrived at the endgame of a national teleology. In that sense, it also serves as a useful marker of the modernist tradition of Indian historiography.

As Francis Jennings has pointed out, this spatial reading of Indian history as a contest between the savage and the civilized has origins as old as European colonization itself (Jennings, 1975: 6–12). Frontier paradigms suggest a relation between the ways in which Europeans understood cultural and racial difference and the ways in which they understood empire and colony. Imagined around race, faith, economy, gender, and geographical expansion, frontier oppositions mapped space and human difference together in ways that used the past to naturalize European dominance. The distinct colonial experiences of different European powers produced, within this paradigm, different kinds of histories. In New France, historians such as Gabriel Sagard (*Histoire du Canada*, 1636), Pierre Boucher (*Histoire Véritable et Naturall*, 1633), and François DuCreux (*Historia Canadensis*, 1664) began recording frontier pasts characterized by economic and religious encounters. Spanish colonial historians had to confront pasts marked by greater violence and more frequent conflict. Their uses of history are perhaps best illustrated by the famous 1550–1 debate between Bartolomé de Las Casas, who criticized the excesses of Spanish conquest, and Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, who argued that one could easily conceive of a "just war" against Indians who were "slaves by nature." Likewise, Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdés (*Historia general y natural de las Indias*, 1537, 1557) and Francisco López de Gómara (*Historia de las Indias*, 1552) offered prominent historical readings of the Spanish colonial past that naturalized both conquest and Indian difference.

European writers, be they French, English, Spanish, Dutch, Russian or other, assumed that Indians and Europeans confronted each other across a vast social chasm, and their histories link Indian difference together with European expansion.

In New England, Increase Mather's *Brief History* (1676), John Underhill's *Newes from America* (1638), William Bradford's *Of Plymouth Plantation* (1620–47, published in 1856), and John Winthrop's *History of New England* (2 vols., 1825–6) all represent early American histories that rely on the notions of an Indian–white boundary and physical conquest for their analytical and narrative force. Further south, Samuel Purchas, William Byrd, John Smith, and others offered regionally inflected histories using the same model.

Perhaps the most powerful American genre in this tradition was the captivity narrative, a form that produced writings as diverse as Mary Rowlandson's 1682 captivity and Sarah Wakefield's 1864 book, *Six Weeks in the Sioux Teepees*. The early captivity narrative prefigured later modernist writing in its use of the metaphor of culture-crossing, but it ultimately insisted upon a cultural difference understood through a geography of conflict. Captivity, as Richard Slotkin has observed, offered one of the few legitimate excuses for being on the far side of the frontier boundary. To know Indian society and history, one had to learn it under duress. Even a sympathetic figure like Daniel Gookin, who crossed the boundary as a missionary, proved unable to escape the dualist visions of the frontier. Along with Slotkin, Christopher Castiglia and June Namias, among others, have offered significant analyses of this literature. Wilcomb Washburn and Alden Vaughan have both edited collections of captivity narratives.

Nineteenth-century historians made only subtle alterations to the formula that placed opposed societies fighting across a frontier boundary. And indeed, their writing reflected the prerogatives of American manifest destiny itself, as much a colonial and imperial project as those of England, France, and Spain. Timothy Flint (*Indian Wars of the West*, 1833), James Hall (*Letters from the West*, 1828, among others), and Francis Parkman were among the multitude of nineteenth-century historians captured by a clear and simple sense of boundary. Parkman's *Conspiracy of Pontiac* (1851), for example, used an Indian-war past to help explain a nineteenth-century present, Indian wars both recent and impending. Seeing white America as “metal,” combining flexibility and strength, Parkman viewed Indians as metaphorical rock, their inflexibility explaining their eventual doom. “You can rarely change the form without destruction of the substance,” he argued. “Races of inferior energy have possessed a power of expansion and assimilation to which [the Indian] is a stranger; and it is this fixed and rigid quality which has proven his ruin. He will not learn the arts of civilization, and he and his forest must perish together” (p. 63). Parkman later went on to write the monumental seven-volume study *France and England in North America* (1865–92) which, along with the works of George Bancroft and William Prescott, make up the dominant nineteenth-century histories of American frontier colonialism.

The story of Indian frontier conflict became a staple of popular history, with frequent retellings in a variety of forms. These included drama, the penny press, Indian-fighter autobiographies, memoirs of overland trail migration, Wild West show performances, historical paintings, such as those of Frederic Remington, and “serious” popular histories, like Theodore Roosevelt's *Winning of the West* (1889–96), which portrayed American development as one long Indian war.

Turner was Roosevelt's contemporary, and his famous thesis essentially founded the twentieth-century field of Western American history, which has been the subsequent

resting place for this particular historical paradigm and a frequent location for the study of Indian history. Although the Turnerian frontier has been attacked by numerous historians and transformed by neo-Turnerians and cultural pluralists, the notion of a line or zone that demarks Indian–white conflict has continued to resound as a key trope in Indian–European history. Popular history continues to use frontier models. And one can continue to find scholarly studies that focus on unambiguous conflict between Indians, settlers, and the federal government. Several publishers have established core constituencies of both historians and readers who continue to find in this particular category a meaningful history. Among many others, Kerwin Lee Klein (*Frontiers of Historical Imagination*, 1997) has written an excellent survey of the transformations of the frontier idea in relation to Indians.

An equally interesting part of this tradition is the body of scholarship that has looked critically at the ways the relation between a spatialized sense of racial and cultural difference and the act of conquest have been expressed in history, literature, and art. Roy Harvey Pearce's classic *Savagism and Civilization* (1953) was one of the first modern works to examine this discourse of difference in American history, and Pearce has been ably followed by Richard Slotkin (particularly *Regeneration through Violence*, 1973 and *The Fatal Environment*, 1985), Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr. (*The White Man's Indian*, 1978), Brian Dippie (*The Vanishing American*, 1982), and others. Each of these writers seeks to show how the frontier metaphor was both product and precursor of the various kinds of social dislocations Indian people have suffered throughout American history. Gordon Sayre (*Les Sauvages Américains*, 1997) and Olive Dickason (*The Myth of the Savage*, 1984) expand this treatment to cover the French. Benjamin Keen (*The Aztec Image in Western Thought*, 1971) and, from a moralist literary-critical position, Tzvetan Todorov (*The Conquest of America*, 1984) have examined the discourses in Spanish examples. Among others, Anthony Pagden (*European Encounters with the New World*, 1993; *Lords of All the World*, 1995) has discussed European ideologies broadly and comparatively.

Finally, as probably the most familiar tradition in American history-writing, the notion of frontier conflict between spatially defined civil and savage societies has been a significant target for Native historians as well. In addition to the classic Native writers of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (see Hafen, this volume) more recent Indian critiques have invariably had to confront various elements of the frontier paradigm. Vine Deloria's *Custer Died for Your Sins* (1969) offered a model for the historically inflected polemic. The works of Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, Jack Forbes, Ward Churchill, Donald Grinde, Scott Momaday and others have utilized the idea of coherent cultural boundaries, while at the same time criticizing the way those boundaries have been called into being.

Racial Science and Hierarchies

Implicit – and often explicit – in the frontier tradition has been the question of race, which has been inextricably linked to notions of savagery and civilization. If frontier writing has its roots in the colonial encounter, then more complex, hierarchical

considerations of race might be seen as having a slightly later starting point. In this second tradition, one sees a change in structure from dualism and a single firm boundary between two societies to social evolution, with its concomitant rankings of the racial endowments of multiple peoples. If the first tradition has been aptly suited to explain continuing colonial conflict, the second has been just as useful for thinking about the scattering of people *within* the boundaries of the United States and the world at large. Indians, Africans, whites, the black Irish, Latinos, and Asians – where did each of these groups of people fit in relation to each other? And how did one come to the knowledge that would allow one to make the necessary distinctions?

The practices and procedures that characterized the scientific study of race inevitably influenced Indian history-writing. These represent a diverse range of ideas, from early speculation concerning Indian origins to amateur ethnology to the classic Social Darwinism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to today's tortured debates over racial difference. Particularly in the early cases, ethnologists and historians assumed that different peoples could be ranked on a scale (rather than an absolute boundary) that ran from varying levels of primitivism and savagery to varying levels of civilization. And while this tradition has its own popular historical representations, it more significantly signals the beginning of the ongoing relation between science and history in the creation of knowledge about Indian people (Bieder, 1986; Hinsley, 1981; Pagden, 1993).

One mode of scientific racialism revolved around the question of origins (see Darnell, this volume, for a discussion of mono- and polygenesis). James Adair's *History of the American Indians* (1775) might be seen as an early example in this particular historiographical tradition. Adair, who traded with several Southeastern tribes and married among the Chickasaw, hypothesized that Indian people occupied a unique racial position as the remnants of the lost tribes of Israel. Similarly, in the early nineteenth century, artist George Catlin suggested that the Mandans were "white," the survivors of a Welsh expedition. Later historians would look for origins among the Norse, Greeks, Egyptians, and others. *The Book of Mormon* (1829–30), for example, constructed a thorough American prehistory for Indian people, placing them squarely within the "lost tribes" tradition. Like these other treatments, *The Book of Mormon* had then to account for racially "superior" Indian people (that is to say, "white") who occupied positions near the savage bottom of the developmental scale. The *Book* explains this inconsistency historically, offering a North American past of devastating war and cultural declension.

Some scholars – and more particularly, the popular media – continue today to speculate about Indian origins and development in racial terms. The flurry over Kennewick Man, a supposedly "caucasoid type" found amidst material 9,300 years old, suggests the ongoing nature of this racist tradition. The semantic slippages between the technical term "caucasoid," the racist term "caucasian," and the popular media gloss "white" raise loaded questions about Indians, Europeans, and North American history. The tension in such instances results from complementary instincts – either the sympathetic naming of Indians as "white" or the less-benign claiming of North America for Anglos. In the first instance, non-Indian accounts might elevate

“noble” Indians above other races by granting them whiteness. In the second, they might relegate Indians to the bottom of the hierarchy by positing a North American prehistory crudely colored “white.” In either case, the linkages between science, racial hierarchy, and history can be surprisingly consistent across time. David Hurst Thomas’s *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity* offers a brilliant reading, placing Kennewick in larger historical context (2000).

Early ethnology often narrated Indian pasts in similar ways. As they sought to understand Indians, writers like John Heckewelder, Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, Peter Duponceau, and Samuel Morton wrestled with the tension between the absolute difference of the frontier model and the hierarchical difference suggested by natural science. Lewis Henry Morgan, for example, made what would become a classic anthropological move, from the detailed descriptive study of difference found in *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois* to the comparative racial and linguistic studies of *Ancient Society* (see Darnell, Miller, this volume). In *League*, Morgan (like proto-ethnographer Heckewelder before him) investigated and described the customs, beliefs, rituals, structures, and histories of a single group of native people. According to Morgan, the Iroquois were “advanced” in relation to other Indians, but they lacked the progressive spirit to ascend the racial hierarchy. “The hunter state,” Morgan insisted (despite abundant evidence of Iroquois agriculture), “is the zero of human society and while the red man was bound by its spell, there was no hope of his elevation” (p. 141). In passages such as this, Morgan saw a hierarchy that connected the “zero” of Indianness with the agricultural civilization of Euro-Americans. Samuel Morton’s *Crania America* (1839) sought to reveal the nature of American racial hierarchies through a combination of physical anthropology (measuring the cranial capacity of different racial groups) and phrenology (finding markers of racial character in skull formations).

The writings of a third ethnologist, Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, offer a complex sense of the mingled development of three strands in the intellectual history of race and Indians. In *Western Scenes and Reminiscences* (1853), Schoolcraft’s early impressions of Indians followed the oppositional logic of the frontier. “The word ‘Indian,’” he recalled, “was synonymous then, as perhaps now, with half the opprobrious epithets in the dictionary” (p. 65). But Schoolcraft found himself working among Indian people, and saw an opportunity for scientific investigation. After a cross-racial marriage, and years as an Indian agent, natural historian, and collector of Indian stories and histories, Schoolcraft claimed he had learned to reject much of the frontier model. Indians, he said, should be studied as a distinct branch of the human race. Focusing on language, government, and religion, Schoolcraft undertook, in several different projects, an ethnological and literary catalogue of the culture and history of the native people of the Great Lakes and prairies. His output included *Algonic Researches* (1839), *Oncota* (1844–5), *Notes on the Iroquois* (1846), and *Historical and Statistical Information* (1851–7). When thinking comparatively, he was able to place racially defined Indians in relation to a white society parsed along hierarchical class lines. “As a class of men,” he observed, “native speakers, without letters or education, possess a higher scope of thought and illustration, than the *corresponding class* in civilized

life” (p. 67). And this insight nudged Schoolcraft toward a third notion, that of evolutionary change. “The old idea that the Indian mind is not susceptible of a high or advantageous development,” he argued, “rests on questionable data” (p. 67). Schoolcraft, one should note, concluded his remarks with a return to frontier dualism, insisting that native religion kept Indians “beyond the pale of civilization” (p. 68). Elsewhere, he argued that it was not simply that Indian societies could not advance – they had actually declined.

And yet, with the notion of evolutionary change, Schoolcraft pointed to future permutations of racialist thinking. With the publication of Darwin’s *Origin of Species* in 1859, intellectuals began wondering not just about racial difference, but about its historical development. Anthropological writers such as Edward Tylor (1871) formally posited a single “culture,” with people moving along a prescribed evolutionary path that led from the savage to the civilized. Indians represented a stalled branch. “They,” anthropologists argued, are what “we” once were – a living representation of an earlier history (Stocking, 1968). The potted histories offered by late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century government policy makers, missionaries, and anthropologists, for example, placed Indians on such a social evolutionary trajectory.

Much of the writing on Indians from the latter part of the nineteenth century is oriented toward policy. The Indian Rights Association, for example, was only one of many groups who naturalized the idea of a developmental hierarchy. Taking a social evolutionary past for granted, they looked toward a future characterized by rapid Indian development, and they made this narrative concrete through the so-called “Assimilation” policies. With white assistance, Indians could, in effect, escape the frontier model and move up the hierarchy to become civilized, Christian, and economically rational (Hoxie, 1984). Although tempered by the rise of cultural relativism after World War II, such developmental assumptions continue to live on today, underpinning federal and state policy, church missionary activity, and educational dogma.

Modernist History

Turner’s 1890 ending of the frontier marked another, equally significant moment of change in white historical consciousness concerning Indians. The Wounded Knee massacre, also in that year, seemed to many to be the final battle of the imperial struggle for North America. Indians immediately looked different when seen through the lens of what Renato Rosaldo has called “imperialist nostalgia” (Rosaldo, 1989). With a modern sensibility tuned toward regret, much Indian history-writing continued to see the past through the metaphor of boundaries – only now those boundaries were not so much spatial and impenetrable as they were temporal and permeable (P. Deloria, 1998).

Nostalgia permeates this tradition and it led writers to invert and to dissolve older, “frontier” boundaries while at the same time retaining the racial privilege that came with the developmental hierarchy. Helen Hunt Jackson’s 1881 *A Century of Dishonor*, for example, did not engage the scientific concern with race that continued to mark much historical writing. And while it accepted the dualistic division that

characterized the frontier school, it flip-flopped the values assigned to civilization and savagery. Jackson offered a history of white American barbarism, an empathetic inversion that would frequently mark modernist writing.

But if inversion was one component of this historiographical tradition, so too was the anthropological notion that one might participate in an Indian world, at least on a small scale. Columbia anthropologist Franz Boas and his students led the way in replacing the rigid racial divisions of the nineteenth century with the more permeable cultural boundaries of the twentieth. Salvage anthropology – the logical descendant of a Social Darwinian linking of history and science – proved most amenable to the notion that one could cross time and culture to gather up an Indian past (Stocking, 1968). Yet most ethnographers were not thinking historically, for salvage anthropology insisted upon Indians frozen in an “ethnographic present.” Rather, amateur historians such as Stanley Vestal, E. A. Brininstool, George Hyde, and Walter McClintock went among Indian people and gathered information for biography and history.

Perhaps the quintessential expressions of this modernist boundary-crossing revolve around the Lakota holy man/Catholic catechist Black Elk. In 1931, poet John Neihardt visited Black Elk in search of the historical material that eventually became *Black Elk Speaks* (1932), and later, *When the Tree Flowered* (1951). Neihardt’s writing (or is it Black Elk’s speech? – the relations of literary production are confused, to say the least) overflows with modernist regret, nostalgia, and the inversion of civil and “savage” sympathies. In 1947, Joseph Epes Brown, deeply moved by Neihardt’s book, made a similar visit to Black Elk’s home, where he stayed for several months. The result was *The Sacred Pipe* (1953), which, like *Black Elk*, blurs the boundaries between subject and recorder. Neihardt’s author tag, for example, reads “as told through,” while Brown simply writes “recorded and edited by...” In such writing, culture-crossing tended to be an individual issue, and so many similar works are biographical in nature. William Wildschut and Two Leggings, Frank Linderman and Pretty Shield and Plenty Coups, Brininstool and Luther Standing Bear, Vestal and White Bull, Walter Dyk and Left Handed, Leo Simmons and Don Talayesva, among many others – these biographies and “as-told-to” histories all bear the mark of the relationship between writer and anthropological informant. And this form has continued to have resonance and power, particularly when adapted by historically minded anthropologists such as Paul Radin (*Crashing Thunder*), Nancy Oestreich Lurie (*Mountain Wolf Woman*), and Margot Liberty (*John Stands In Timber*). Recent popular writings include, among others, the various collaborations with Richard Erdoes (*Lame Deer, Seeker of Visions*, 1972; *Lakota Woman*, 1990; *Obitika Woman*, 1993; *Crow Dog*, 1995; among others), Vada Carlson (*No Turning Back*, 1964), and Mark St. Pierre (*Madonna Swan*, 1991).

Perhaps the most significant moment in the modernist tradition, however, was the formal linking of history and ethnography, two disciplines that had been dancing together for over one hundred years. Founded in 1954, the American Society for Ethnohistory focused on bringing the methods of ethnographic fieldwork and the documentary evidentiary bases of American Indian history into explicit interdisciplinary dialogue (Axtell, 1981). Ethnohistory has thrived in the years since, and many of the classic recent works of Indian history have come from its adherents. Indeed,

many of the chapters in this volume reflect the productive historical investigations undertaken by ethnohistorians in fields such as demography, commerce, religion, law, land tenure, and politics, among many others. Ethnohistorians have, in addition, brought an increasing historiographical self-consciousness about their field, its direction, and its basis of knowledge and authority. Among the many noteworthy texts are edited collections like Nancy O. Lurie and Eleanor Leacock's *North American Indians in Historical Perspective* (1971), William R. Swagerty's *Scholars and the Indian Experience* (1984), Calvin Martin's *The American Indian and the Problem of History* (1987), Colin Calloway's *New Directions in American Indian History* (1988), Jennifer S. H. Brown and Elizabeth Vibert's *Reading Beyond Words* (1996), Donald Fixico's *Rethinking American Indian History* (1997), Devon Mihesuah's *Natives and Academics* (1998), and Russell Thornton's *Studying Native America: Problems and Prospects* (1998).

In many ways, however, ethnohistory is simply the logical development of modernist boundary-crossing traditions. As Kerwin Klein has argued, the blurring of genres that finds historians doing fieldwork and anthropologists writing "library dissertations" has "emptied ethnohistory of its methodological content" (Klein, 1997: 212). Ethnohistory now confronts issues that problematize its familiar practices and call out for new approaches to the telling of an Indian past. Those changes have come, in part, from epistemological shifts that have altered recent understandings of history. And they have come, in part, out of the critical presence of native people in the familiar practices surrounding the production of knowledge.

Native Narrative

Before we can grapple with these issues, however, it is vital that we return to the question, bracketed so many pages ago, of native narration of native pasts. As white Americans have created a library of Indian history, native people have themselves been engaged in the ongoing production of Indian histories. And if we insisted on thinking about this first body of historiography in terms of accreting layers, each driven by historical shifts in the conditions under which history was produced, we should do no less for native histories. The historiography that emerges is every bit as complex, if perhaps less easily captured, for native historical traditions are as diverse as tribes themselves. Indian people have persistently maintained oral records. Some of those records have changed; others have remained relatively unchanged. Native people have meticulously preserved the past in spiritual understandings and collective memories of place. They have recorded the past in various written forms, including mnemonics, images, and books. And they have reshaped it in order to meet social, cultural, and political challenges. Indian history – as possessed and produced by native people – has been as complicated and time-bound a process as it has been for non-Indians. In this, they have been no different from any group of people in the world.

Native historians have insisted that, simply because the practice of oral tradition and oral history has been so often invisible to the library, does not mean that it lacks legitimacy. While academic debates concerning the nature of orality and literacy

continue, scholars such as Jan Vansina have demonstrated that oral tradition can preserve information across broad spans of time (Vansina, 1985). And native oral histories have their own social and cultural legitimacy outside of academic judgements, which have often been less concerned with meaning and context and more focused on verifiable facticity. This is an ironic focus, given the problematizing of fact and the emphasis on context that has characterized the post-structuralist awareness so much a part of recent Euro-American history-telling. Nonetheless, as Angela Cavender Wilson points out, oral history – when seen in a Native context – has certain affinities with Euro-American history, operating, for example, under similar constraints (Wilson, 1997). Stories are repeated under certain conditions, at certain times of the year, in connection with certain landscapes, and, in many cases, are subject to the “peer review” of knowing audiences. The Navajo Blessingway, for example, is a history that, one might argue, has remained largely unchanged across significant spans of time and hundreds of retellings through exactly this kind of oversight.

And yet, it is clear that there are distinctions to be made between, for example, oral *traditions* that are held and renewed collectively and oral *histories* that may be personal and biographical. In a wide-ranging treatment of Indian history-telling, Peter Nabokov suggests complicating three familiar categories of native historical narrative: myth, legend, and folktale. “Myths” are sacred stories that take place in an earlier world and are held as absolute truths (Nabokov, 1996). As Keith Basso has shown, such stories continue to exist as vital collective narratives about the past – histories – that give explanatory meaning to the world of the present. Apache place stories, in this case, link contemporary landscape and culture to origins that have become essentially timeless (Basso, 1996). “Legends” maintain their link to what might be called “Western” historical time – they contain human characters and factual content. “Folktales” exist as fictional literature, educational and entertaining. They include “just so” stories, trickster tales, ghost stories, jokes, and other informal expressions. Nabokov includes within this category “trickster” histories that are explicitly constructed as tools for political struggle. Obviously the categorical lines are just as blurry in this accounting as they are in the Euro-American historical traditions already discussed. Apaches, to return to Basso’s example, do not simply live in a static, mythic world. They create new histories about newly created places, revealing the gaps and fissures in any scheme that would sift out temporal distinctions among native histories.

But Indian histories are not simply defined by forms, contents, and acts of narration. Oral traditions and histories (like written texts) have constantly had to confront the question of reading – a confrontation that origin stories always face: should they be heard as literal depictions of historical events, as some proponents advise? Or do they really function as metaphorical “pseudo-histories” containing renditions of cultural circumstances rather than history, as most academic scholars suggest? Roger Echo-Hawk (2000) has inquired into the historical content of origin stories, and he proposes to employ academic tools to excavate arguably historical settings from narratives that feature an accumulated overburden of culturally specific interpretive detail.

This endorsement of academic analysis as the basis for deciding historicity could easily be viewed as an affirmation of intellectual imperialism, a forced fitting of Western historical consciousness on histories that are not meant to be considered

so, and yet another attack on origin stories and oral history – the heart of Indian historiographical traditions. A counter to such critique might be to suggest that the major precepts of academic analysis, such as checks for veracity and questions of authorship, readership, and context, ought to be recognized as a vital part of the tradition of Indian history-telling and not as the sole domain of imperialistic non-Indian history. In the end, the search for common ground between distinctive historiographic traditions may yield insight into shared principles of history, bringing greater complexity into the creation of the stories we tell about the past. But encounters between deeply entrenched, coexisting worldviews are never easily negotiated. Where one observer sees common ground, another might see contested territory, a place of collision between imperialistic winners and victimized losers.

Native people have also recorded the past in ways that are not exclusively oral. Plains winter counts, for example, function as mnemonic devices, with each picture representing a memorable (oftentimes an idiosyncratic) event that allows the recollection of a given year (Mallery, 1883/1972). And though the counts are arranged in the form of a circle, they do in fact allow a “linear” conception of the relationship of one or more past events. In addition to recording personal and collective narratives, the Cherokee syllabary was sometimes used to record calendar information in a similar way. And of course, native people have recorded their own personal and collective histories, both in native language orthographies and in written English.

Nineteenth-century Indian historians tended to be exceptional figures such as William Apess, George Copway, Samson Occam, and a very few others. But by the twentieth century, many native people had worked their way inside mission Christianity and academic disciplines such as anthropology. Their cross-cultural writings, often inflected by the traditions of modernist history, frequently tried to use the past to make a case for contemporary Indians. Anthropologists Arthur C. Parker, Edward Dozier, J. N. B. Hewitt, and D’Arcy McNickle, writers Zitkala Sä, Pauline Johnson, Charles Eastman, and John Joseph Mathews – these were only a few of the native people who offered Indian histories as part of their literary output (Hoxie, 1992).

The diversity of tribal experience makes it difficult to attempt any general periodization of native history-telling. Nonetheless, one might suggest, as a starting point, three broad periods: (1) an “oral/traditional” period in which people used and recalled significant events as temporal markers imbued with historical and cultural significance, characterized, on the plains, for example, by the invention of winter counts; (2) a period shaped by Christianization, in which mergings of the ideologies and tropes of the Bible with those of oral traditions became relatively common, shaping the nature of historical discourse among Indian people; (3) a period shaped by academic and non-academic scholarship, in which detailed ethnographic and historical inquiry into Indian history helped reshape native conceptions and narrations of the past. Such a periodization is not meant to suggest wholesale rewritings of Indian pasts, but rather to cast into relief the subtle transformations in epistemology and narrative which inevitably accompany the passage of time and cultural transmission.

Since the 1960s, then, we have seen Indian people playing increasingly important roles in transforming the library of non-native histories. The political upheavals of the

1960s not only made non-Indian historians more sensitive to issues, they also created the social and political contexts for the development of an Indian academic history. In 1972, for example, D'Arcy McNickle was named the first director of the Newberry Library's Center for the History of the American Indian, which has offered a home to many native scholars ever since. The first American Indian Studies programs came of age in the early 1970s, and, like the McNickle Center, helped create native intellectual centers for new approaches to Indian history. The list is significant, for many of these scholars have been at the forefront of Indian history: Jack Forbes at the University of California, Davis; Duane Champagne at UCLA; Gerald Vizenor, Terry Wilson, and Clara Sue Kidwell at UC Berkeley; Vine Deloria, Scott Momaday, Tom Holm, Ophelia Zepeda, and others at the University of Arizona; Elizabeth Cook-Lynn at Washington State; Oren Lyons and John Mohawk at SUNY; Michael Dorris at Dartmouth; Rupert Costo and Jeanette Henry at UC-Riverside.

Yet it is also the case that one cannot track a clean trajectory for recent Indian history beginning in the late 1960s. In Chicano history, for example, one can point to a generation of Chicano Ph.D. recipients, the so-called "class of 75." Mario T. Garcia, Albert Camarillo, Oscar Martinez, Juan Gomez-Quinones, Ricardo Romo, Richard Griswold del Castillo, among others, have moved through their careers together, producing an initial burst of dissertation-based scholarship, sustained training of multiple generations of students, and the development of a Chicano historical canon. The products of a different political milieu, Indian intellectuals more frequently turned to law or literature than to history or anthropology. And so in many ways, it was not entirely the voices of Indian intellectuals that pushed history and ethnohistory to open up to native perspectives. It was also the presence of Indian subjects – informants, readers, and students – who insisted upon making themselves heard.

Postmodern and Postcolonial

With that, we can now turn to consider the present moment in Indian history-telling which, it strikes me, is one of achievement, activism, and uncertainty. Earlier, I used the words "postmodern" and "postcolonial" as descriptive terms, and, despite the shared trendiness of the "post" prefix, I suggested that one might see them as being in tension with one another. I've argued that "frontier," "hierarchical," and "modern" schools of history-writing can be visualized in terms of the boundaries between Indians and others that have been imagined, inverted, and problematized. A rigid and largely impermeable frontier boundary mirrored the ideologies of colonial and imperial contest. A set of ranked distinctions put the problems of racial and ethnic distinctiveness in a reassuring order. And if modernists have clearly marked the boundaries between Indian and other, they have done so in order to transgress those same markers of difference. However one defines "postmodernism," it seems apparent that sometime over the last few decades we've entered a moment in which such boundaries have essentially disintegrated (Jameson, 1991).

One can see this disintegration in a social sense, for example, as cross-racial marriage and mixed-blood identity have become important issues in both history and

sociology. One can see it in the most recent census data, in which the Indian population skyrocketed beyond any rational demographic explanation and which suggests that non-Indians, having rejected certain ethnic borders, are simply choosing an identity that suits them. One sees it in aesthetics, as “Indian” themes in art and literature have become accessible to the entire world. In politics and the media, we’ve watched the dissolution of distinctions between public and private and between news and entertainment. And among all the other places one might point, one also sees it in the telling of history.

In addition to traditional treatments of politics and law, recent scholarship has often focused more on the fluidities of culture and identity, particularly in socially ambiguous situations. Gerald Vizenor, Richard White, Tsianina Lomawaima, Alan Taylor, Craig Womack, James Merrell, Delphine Red Shirt, Alexandra Harmon, Greg Sarris, Margaret Connell Szasz, James Clifton, among many others, have looked at confused moments that have cast up individuals characterized by multiple identities (see Hinderaker, this volume). What to make of figures like Simon Girty or Hendrik Aupaumut or boarding school children or Wild West show performers? The answers have often revolved around the ways in which cultural and social borders have been confused or demolished. White’s *Middle Ground* (1991) and Merrell’s *Indians’ New World* (1989), for example, use structuring metaphors that suggest worlds characterized by shattered social structure and consequent rebuilding. *Contact Points* (Cayton and Teute, 1998), an important recent collection of essays, insists on a redefined frontier, one conceived around “contested spaces” where “kinetic interactions” create “new cultural matrices, American in their eclecticism, fluidity, individual determination and differentiation” (p. 2). Rather than considering the dynamics of visible boundaries, such studies gain their coherence by examining subjects or groups in a broad and multiplicitous “cultural field” in which clarity is lacking and identities are cobbled out of confusion and conflict.

Pomo writer Greg Sarris’s outstanding *Mabel McKay: Weaving the Dream* (1994) stands as an icon of this postmodern ambiguity. In the book, Sarris weaves coherence out of the blurred threads of his own identity, that of Mabel McKay, his personal and scholarly encounters with her, the space of the reservation and the city. By the time he is through, there is little left of the lines formerly used to distinguish Indian from non-Indian, historian from subject, literature from history, nature from supernatural. Many non-Indian writers have celebrated the general sense of liberation that comes with such an embrace of ambiguity. Others have rejected it, preferring a more conservative approach to questions of truth and difference. But except as they have included questions of “multiculturalism” and educational representation, the so-called “culture wars” being fought among non-Indian intellectual elites have often been irrelevant to many native writers. What has mattered has been the other context, that of postcolonialism (although one should note that many Indian writers hesitate over the term itself).

A full postmodern embrace of the individual subject can easily result in an attenuation of the importance of history. What comes to matter is not so much the cause-and-effect of the past as it is the ways individuals and groups have figured themselves out in the midst of trying circumstances. Postcolonial approaches also focus on the

individual, often the colonized person who finds a place and an identity through the institutions of those who have done the colonizing. But the postcolonial focus on the individual is different, for it requires a confrontation with the history that created those trying circumstances (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 1995; Bhabha, 1994). The youngest generation of Indian historians, it seems to me, is concerned to insure, in Kwame Anthony Appiah's apt phrase, that the "post" in postcolonial is not the same as the "post" in postmodern (Appiah, 1992). That is, in the midst of an incredibly productive historical focus on boundary dissolution and ambiguity, native historians are also insisting on recognizing and reshaping boundaries both in the past and in the present.

Any reinstallation of boundaries will, perhaps necessarily, include issues of identity politics in the production of history. Perhaps never more than now, the question is being raised: who should do Indian history? For what audience and for what reason? Young Indian historians such as Angela Cavender Wilson and Anton Treuer, who insist on the primacy of native language history and oral tradition, are passionate advocates for the preservation of cultural difference in a postmodern world. To argue otherwise would be to allow tribal people, histories, and traditions to dissolve into a global melting pot far more effective and pernicious than the failed program of assimilation of a century ago. But while these writers seek a certain purity – Indian histories largely devoid of the colonialist documents of the conquerors, researched in native languages among native elders – they also have to account for the impurities of histories written in a postmodern moment. The "pure products" as James Clifford has said, reworking William Carlos Williams, have "gone crazy" and there's no going back (Clifford, 1988). The desire for purity is, of course, a political desire. In that sense, native-originated history ought to be considered on the same terrain as the equally political non-native histories we've discussed. But if we choose to mark Indian history as political, let us make doubly sure that we mark the politics that underlie non-Indian histories as well, rejecting the claims to objectivity and truth that have empowered those histories.

This multivalent reality suggests to me that future Indian histories may well be produced in a self-conscious collision, the politics and epistemology of purity and difference clashing with the politics and epistemology of ambiguity and fluidity. Thus, one can see in Angela Wilson's work an assertion that Indian oral history functions in ways similar to European history, with specific checks and balances for something called "accuracy." At the same time, however, Wilson also insists that the epistemology of oral tradition is radically different and that, in its difference, it challenges Western ways of knowing. A paradox, then: histories overlap in method and practice. But histories are also written and told to reject such overlaps, for practice is always marked by power, and history has always been crucial to thinking about – and contesting – power.

The best evidence for the continued working of power in history lies in the fact that the frontier school of Indian historiography is alive and well, as are the proponents of modernist desire and the voices of scientific racialism. This essay has, in effect, been working through an ongoing set of authorial positions. Power relations continue to make it possible for Euro-Americans to choose to write history through

Euro-American lenses such as frontier, hierarchy, crossing. In challenging those power relations – both directly and through the maintenance of Indian distinctiveness – it's equally possible for native people to write history through a strictly native lens. Intellectually, however, neither position seems tenable, for neither does justice to what is, at least in terms of the last 500 years, a thoroughly cross-cultural history. The best contemporary scholarship treats Indians and non-Indians in a changing world, with historical consciousnesses that are the products of that world and of those changes. Such scholarship recognizes the need to both dissolve and reassert boundaries at the same time.

Writing contemporary Indian history requires a creative weaving together of contradictions. First, the political demands made by those concerned with colonial/postcolonial issues require any historian – Indian or non-Indian – to engage in a self-reflexive consideration of *difference* in the epistemology of history. How *are* Indian people and Indian histories different, both in terms of the past and in terms of the project at hand? Second, the realities of the postmodern moment require historians to engage in a self-reflexive consideration of *change* in the epistemology of history. How are the Indian histories of today *not* the Indian histories of the past? Somehow, historians – Indian and non-Indian alike – need to escape the tendency to force each other to choose loyalties from a dichotomous vision that splits history into two untenable camps.

In the end, the most interesting new Indian histories will come from Native people who have been able to look the Euro-American library full in the face, learning its politics, its lessons, and its secrets. They will also come from non-Native people who have been able to transcend the library and look Native people full in the face, understanding their politics and their pasts. And they will come from individuals who are naturally positioned in between and who work to develop their narratives with a full awareness of difference and ambiguity, and change and timelessness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony 1992: *In My Father's House: Africa in the Philosophy of Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin (eds.) 1995: *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge).
- Axtell, James 1981: "Ethnohistory: An Historian's Viewpoint," in *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Basso, Keith 1996: *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press).
- Berkhofer, Robert F. 1978: *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Knopf).
- Bhabha, Homi 1994: *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge).
- Bieder, Robert 1986: *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820–1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press).

- Brown, Jennifer S. H. and Elizabeth Vibert (eds.) 1996: *Reading Beyond Words: Contexts for Native History* (Orchard Park, NJ: Broadview).
- Calloway, Colin 1988: *New Directions in American Indian History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press).
- Castiglia, Christopher 1996: *Bound and Determined: Captivity, Culture-Crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Cayton, Andrew R. L. and Fredrika Teute 1998: *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750–1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture).
- Clifford, James 1988: *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Deloria, Philip 1998: *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Deloria, Vine 1969: *Custer Died for Your Sins* (New York: Macmillan).
- DeMallie, Raymond J. 1984: *The Sixth Grandfather: Black Elk's Teachings Given to John G. Neihardt* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press).
- Dickason, Olive 1984: *The Myth of the Savage and the Beginnings of French Colonialism in the Americas* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press).
- Dippie, Brian 1982: *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press).
- Echo-Hawk, Roger 2000: "Ancient History in the New World: Integrating Oral Traditions and Archeology in Deep Time," *American Antiquity* 65(2) (April): 267–90.
- Fixico, Donald (ed.) 1997: *Rethinking American Indian History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press).
- Hinsley, Curtis 1981: *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846–1910* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press).
- Hoxie, Frederick 1984: *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880–1920* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press).
- Hoxie, Frederick 1992: "Exploring a Cultural Borderland: Native American Journeys of Discovery in the Early Twentieth Century," *Journal of American History* 79 (December): 969–95.
- Jackson, Helen Hunt 1881: *A Century of Dishonor: A Sketch of the United States Government's Dealings with Some of the Indian Tribes* (New York: Harper Brothers).
- Jacobs, Sue-Ellen, Wesley Thomas, and Sabine Lang (eds.) 1997: *Two-Spirit People: Native American Gender Identity, Sexuality, and Spirituality* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press).
- Jameson, Fredric 1991: *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham: Duke University Press).
- Jennings, Francis 1975: *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture).
- Keen, Benjamin 1971: *The Aztec Image in Western Thought* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press).
- Klein, Kerwin Lee 1997: *Frontiers of Historical Imagination: Narrating the European Conquest of Native America, 1890–1990* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Leacock, Eleanor and Nancy Oestreich Lurie 1971: *North American Indians in Historical Perspective* (New York: Random House).
- Mallery, Garrick 1972: *Picture Writing of the American Indians* (Washington, 1883; New York: Dover).

- Martin, Calvin 1987: *The American Indian and the Problem of History* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Merrell, James 1989: *The Indians' New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture).
- Mihesuah, Devon 1998: *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press).
- Morgan, Lewis Henry 1851: *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois* (Rochester: Sage and Brothers).
- Namias, June 1993: *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).
- Nabokov, Peter 1996: "Native Views of History," in *The Cambridge History of the Native Peoples of the Americas*, eds. Bruce Trigger and Wilcomb Washburn, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Pagden, Anthony 1993: *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Pagden, Anthony 1995: *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500–c.1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Parkman, Francis 1962: *The Conspiracy of Pontiac* (Boston, 1851; New York: Collier).
- Pearce, Roy Harvey 1953: *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind* (Baltimore, 1953; Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Rosaldo, Renato 1989: *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* (Boston: Beacon Press).
- Roscoe, Will 1991: *The Zuni Man-Woman* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press).
- Sarris, Greg 1994: *Mabel McKay: Weaving the Dream* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Sayre, Gordon 1997: *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).
- Schoolcraft, Henry Rowe 1853: *Western Scenes and Reminiscences: Together with Thrilling Legends and Traditions of the Red Men of the Forest* (Buffalo: Derby, Orton, and Mulligan).
- Slotkin, Richard 1973: *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600–1860* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press).
- Slotkin, Richard 1985: *The Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization, 1800–1890* (New York: Atheneum).
- Stocking, George 1968: *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (New York: Free Press).
- Swagerty, William R. 1984: *Scholars and the Indian Experience: Critical Reviews of Recent Writing in the Social Sciences* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press for the D'Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian, Newberry Library).
- Thomas, David Hurst 2000: *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity* (New York: Basic).
- Thornton, Russell 1998: *Studying Native America: Problems and Prospects* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).
- Todorov, Tzvetan 1984: *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Harper & Row).

- Turner, Frederick Jackson 1920: *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt).
- Vansina, Jan 1985: *Oral Tradition as History* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).
- Vaughan, Alden and Edward Clark (eds.) 1981: *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676–1724* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press).
- Washburn, Wilcomb (ed.) 1975: *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities* (New York: Garland).
- White, Richard 1991: *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Williams, Walter L. 1986: *The Spirit and the Flesh: Sexual Diversity in American Indian Culture* (Boston: Beacon Press).
- Wilson, Angela Cavender 1997: “The Power of the Spoken Word: Native Oral Traditions in American Indian History,” in D. Fixico, ed., *Rethinking American Indian History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press).