dynamic prescription of what the Movimiento could be if expanded to include all marginalized voices within its fronteras.

Larry J. Estrada
Western Washington University


As a white scholar of American Indian autobiographies, I approached this collection of essays edited by Devon A. Mihesuah, Associate Professor of History at Northern Arizona University, with both anticipation and trepidation. Conversations about the place of white scholars in all areas of ethnic studies has crested again recently and is appearing in many academic journals. In the May 1998, *PMLA* (113.3), the Guest Column by Nellie Y. McKay, Professor of American and African American Literature at University of Wisconsin, Madison, states that too many qualified white scholars are not being asked to fill positions, which results in African American Literature either not being taught at all or by being taught but by unqualified professors already on staff. McKay is concerned about this situation, stating that there is “nothing mystical about African American literature that makes it the sole property of those of African descent” (366). Similarly, Louis Owens tells John Purdy in an interview published in the Summer 1998 *Studies in American Indian Literatures* (10.2): “I don’t have any patience at all with the essentialist attitudes that say non-Indians shouldn’t read things [written] by Indians or talk about Indian literature or whatever” (16).

Two individual scholars writing in disparate journals do not carry as much impact as an entire collection of essays specifically addressing the researching, writing, and teaching about American Indians. Mihesuah has edited an impressive collection of essays by American Indian scholars including Angela Cavender Wilson, Paula Gunn Allen, Vine Deloria, Jr., Donald L. Fixico, Susan A. Miller, Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, Laurie
Anne Whitt, Theodore S. Jojola, Duane Champagne, and Karen Gayton Swisher. Mihesuah states in the “Preface” that “One reason for the anthology was to remind scholars that many Indians are not satisfied with the manner in which they have been researched or with how they and their ancestors have been depicted in scholarly writings” (x). Thus, this collection offers “suggestions scholars might use to produce more critical, creative, and well-rounded interpretations of Indian histories and cultures” (xi). The main point made by all the contributors to the anthology is that the Indian perspective must be included in any research. The purpose of the essays, then, is to provide some direction and possible parameters for scholars.

Some of the essays are general in their scope, while others refer to specific works. Paula Gunn Allen discusses issues involved in teaching Ceremony by Leslie Marmon Silko, especially regarding “sacred” issues. This essay is extremely informative and eye-opening, for it shows a Puebloan professor attempting to deal with her role as a teacher and her role as an Indian who must respect her tribal traditions and rituals. Vine Deloria Jr. also discusses one specific work: The Invented Indian: Cultural Fictions and Government Policies, a collection of essays edited by James Clifton. Deloria finds fault with the collection, but his critique is beneficial in that he explains in detail what the problems with the essays are and how they could have been better handled. It is an essay all scholars of American Indian studies should read.

While I found these and other essays extremely helpful, some point out problems but do not provide definitive suggestions for correcting the problems or changing scholarship. Angela Cavender Wilson’s suggestion that scholars “slowly” develop “acquaintances with Indian people” and give “people from the community they are studying the opportunity to comment on their work” (25) is valid advice, but she does not explain how one would go about behaving in such a manner. And, what does she mean by “slowly?” Further, when giving people from the community an opportunity to study the research, does she mean official tribal council approval, or does she mean getting verbal approval of a few folks one has met during one’s research? The latter has proven to be prob-
lematic for some scholars in the past. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn's essay is interesting in that it points out how our view of Indians has been shaped by the writings of non-Indians, and she provides a mini-historical overview of American Indian Literature. However, while she praises Indian writers she admires and takes to task non-Indian scholars and mixed blood writers/scholars, she does not provide any suggestions for fulfilling her demand that "We must work toward a new set of principles that recognizes the tribally specific literary traditions by which we have always judged the imagination" (137). While the information contained in both these articles should be added to the knowledge of all scholars of American Indian History and Literature, neither provides kind of direction I had hoped to receive from this collection.

The essay I admire most in the collection is Duane Champagne's "American Indian Studies Is for Everyone." Early in the essay he states: "In my view, there is room for both Indian and non-Indian scholars within American Indian studies..." (181) and that "One does not have to be a member of a culture to understand what culture means or to interpret a culture in a meaningful way" (182). Champagne provides concrete suggestions for regulating the field of Indian studies by describing how the program at UCLA is run. He also seriously discusses the issue of a national regulatory board for scholarly review, although in the end he decides it would probably be unsuccessful.

In summary, it is the humble opinion of this non-Indian scholar that this collection of essays should be read by all scholars of American Indians but particularly by non-Indian scholars. It has definitely made me consciously sensitive to issues of which I had heretofore been only unconsciously aware.

Susan L. Rockwell
Arizona State University