

—local historians in particular—can assist Woodland people in their struggle to retain or regain their heritage. He writes, “There’s a lot of information available, but we need help. You are talking about a minimum of twenty-five to thirty tribes that people should have the privilege of being able to study and learn more about who inhabited the eastern part of the United States, the people we call the Great Lakes tribes” (277). Introducing the general public and especially students to *Always a People* can go a long way toward meeting that goal.

*Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology*, edited by Thomas Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997. x, 226 pp. Notes, index. \$45.00 cloth, \$17.95 paper.

REVIEWED BY CHRISTINA M. TAYLOR, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

In 1969, in his book, *Custer Died for your Sins*, Vine Deloria Jr. delivered a scathing critique of the discipline of anthropology. In the ensuing decades, anthropologists have been forced both to acknowledge and to discuss his critique and to seriously examine our motives, intentions, and results when working with American Indian populations. Biolsi and Zimmerman’s edited volume, *Indians and Anthropologists*, includes essays written for a “sort of roast” of Deloria on the twentieth anniversary of his 1969 critique. This excellent collection features an impressive array of scholars, all of whom have clearly taken Deloria’s critique to heart. While each of the essays included in the volume is excellent in its own right, the entire book speaks with rare finesse to both Deloria’s specific critique and to the critique by other American Indian groups. Zimmerman and Biolsi have managed to be sensitive to and inclusive of many strains of contemporary anthropological thought as well as to the voice of American Indian writers who speak eloquently from the traditionally “Othered” standpoint.

The book is broken into three distinct sets of essays. Part one, “Deloria Writes Back,” includes essays by anthropologists who “cut their teeth” on Deloria’s groundbreaking critique. Each of the three articles candidly discusses Deloria’s impact on the authors’ choices of both research and writing. Part two, “Archaeology and American Indians,” includes two essays that critically discuss the ever-present issue in North American archeology in the 1990s—the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Who gets to dig, where digging is done, and what is to be done with the artifacts, especially the human remains, is a contentious subject between and among

anthropologists and Indians. There are no neat answers to be found, here or anywhere, but at least the authors have raised and addressed a number of critical issues. Among a wide range of essays from both American Indians and anthropologists in part three, "Ethnography and Colonialism," readers will find discussions of topics ranging from the rights of Indian peoples to refuse to be "researched" to the anthropological construction of the "authentic Indian" earlier in this century. Again, there are no neat answers in this century-long quagmire of relations, but the essays here invite both the casual reader and the serious scholar to immerse themselves in the current debates.

The Indians and anthropologists represented in this book all speak to the tremendous impact Vine Deloria Jr. has made on scholarship over a thirty-year period of upheaval in the academy. I highly recommend the book to all readers with an interest in current trends of scholarship by, for, and about American Indians.

*Rethinking American Indian History*, edited by Donald L. Fixico. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997. x, 139 pp. Notes, index. \$35.00 cloth, \$16.95 paper.

REVIEWED BY JOSEPH E. TAYLOR III, IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Since the launching of the journal *Ethnohistory* in the early 1950s, American scholars have been asking new questions and applying new research methods to Indian history. Their efforts have transformed our understanding not only of Indians but also of colonial, southern, mid-western, and western history. The image of the vanishing Indian has itself faded away, replaced by a remarkably active and ambiguous figure. The old dichotomy of tradition versus acculturation has also faltered. Indian societies and cultures now seem far more complex, diverse, and historical than previously assumed, and, as strange as Indians and non-Indians sometimes were to each other, cultural exchanges nevertheless occurred all the time. The result, we are learning, was occasionally the creation of "middle grounds" where mutual incomprehension gave way to shared understanding and a new reality for both groups.

Unfortunately, what has occurred in American history generally has not extended to Iowa. Iowa historian L. Edward Purcell recognized this as early as 1976 when he lamented that "Indian history is one of Iowa's neglected stepchildren" (*Indian Historian* 9 [1976], 13). Sadly, Purcell's complaint is still valid. Even Dorothy Schwieder's recent and much heralded *Iowa: The Middle Land* (1996) relegates Indians

Copyright of Annals of Iowa is the property of State of Iowa, by & through the State Historical Society of Iowa and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.