

Unspeakable the Settler: “The Indian Today” in International Perspective

Chadwick Allen

The occasion for this essay is the fortieth anniversary of the publication of “The Indian Today,” the Fall 1965 special issue of the *Midcontinent American Studies Journal*.¹ The special issue was edited by the regular editor of the *Journal*, Stuart Levine, a professor of American studies at the University of Kansas, and by his guest co-editor, Nancy O. Lurie, a professor of anthropology at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Following a positive reception, the special issue was revised and expanded into *The American Indian Today*, a collection of scholarly essays with the potential for popular appeal, which was published in 1968 by the commercial press Everett Edwards.²

The titles of both versions of the special issue are striking in their apparent simplicity and transparency. Of immediate note is that each title unselfconsciously deploys an authoritative definite article and a universalizing singular noun, suggesting that these collections will offer a comprehensive overview—and suggesting as well that such comprehensiveness is indeed possible in a single volume. In addition, each title foregrounds the time marker “today,” declaring the collection’s focus on the contemporary. But “today” is notoriously ambiguous both temporally and spatially. Exactly when and where is this particular “today” meant to signify? Does it stand for the still-unfinished 1960s and the continental United States? Or is it rather the entire post-World War II era and all U.S. states and territories? (Alaska and Hawai’i had entered the Union only recently

in 1959.) Or does it mean something else, a broader expanse of time and space or a briefer moment that is more immediate and geographically specific? Moreover, the time marker “today,” which typically evokes the “modern,” is juxtaposed with “The Indian” or with “The American Indian,” terms heavily freighted with stereotypes and misconceptions in both popular and scholarly U.S. discourses. It thus indexes a comparison with an implied past that is more primitive and therefore more authentically indigenous. Most non-Native Americans in the mid-1960s, including probably many of the well-meaning Americanist scholars who were the primary audience for the special issue, were confident that “real” Indians lived in a past that was safely distant from the current social and political concerns of the United States; certainly all of these “real” Indians had succumbed to the pressures of a superior civilization by the end of the nineteenth century.³

Juxtaposed, then, with “The Indian,” the time marker effects an extreme temporal compression: all the many possible indigenous pasts that might precede “today”—the ten years previous, or the twenty, thirty, one hundred, one thousand, or ten thousand—are flattened into a single past that can be recognized by dominant U.S. culture as “classic” and “real.” (Inevitably, these are the moments immediately preceding first European or American “contact.”) Thus, “today” functions not only as an ambiguous, even ambivalent marker of compressed time and shifting space; it also functions as the primary modifier for the monolithic term “The Indian” or “The American Indian.” In the context of an ongoing U.S. imperialist nostalgia, this “today” becomes too easily a synonym for the *unreal*, marking the descendants of indigenous North American nations as always-already dispossessed and as inherently inauthentic.⁴

Admittedly, I may be applying too much critical pressure to—and implying too much criticism of—these versions of the special issue’s title. The purpose of my remarks is not to condemn “The Indian Today” for being a product of its era; and I leave it to others more qualified than I to judge whether or not the group of scholars brought together in the 1965 special issue were fair or accurate in their assessments of the status, challenges, and aspirations of indigenous peoples living in the U.S. lower-forty-eight in the early 1960s (which turn out to be the general parameters for the various essays). Instead, I am interested in how the special issue engages the simplified and seemingly transparent phrasing of its title “The Indian Today” as a kind of code for the more complicated and, especially for non-Native readers, more disturbing idea of *ongoing indigenous-settler relations in the United States in the 1960s*, a phrase that more accurately describes its subject matter. As we shall see, the above phrase can be extended in several ways to indicate *by whom* these ongoing relations were being assessed, as well as *for whom* and *in whose interests*. Whose “Indian Today” is this?

My approach to this analysis, given the comparative methodology of my own research in indigenous literary production and reception, is to set the special issue beside similar overview texts about the contemporary status and aspi-

rations of indigenous peoples that were also produced in the mid-1960s, but in the new U.S. state of Hawai'i, across the northern border in the neighboring nation of Canada, and on the other side of the globe in the distant nation of Aotearoa/New Zealand. In other words, I read the special issue within a context of historically-situated international discourses about indigenous-settler relations, rather than within the more typical context of isolated and isolationist American discourses about the problems of U.S. "minorities." In this context, the special issue becomes more obviously a locus of primarily non-Native (not exclusively or exceptionally U.S.) obsessions, limitations, and contingencies. It also becomes more obviously a site of self-erasure by the dominant culture and by dominant power. In particular, it becomes more obviously a site in which the term "settler," from the indigenous-settler binary, is *unspoken* by predominantly non-Native academic researchers and writers. Nonetheless, or perhaps more so because of this erasure, "settler" continues to govern the focus, structure, and tone of this authoritative discourse on the contemporary status of indigenous peoples in the settler nation.

It may be the mid-1960s; the special issue may be "hip" and progressive by many academic standards of its day; but within the global settler-indigenous dynamic, it's pretty much business as usual.

Isolated in the Continental U.S.A.?

In the very act of glorying in the heritage which sets him apart, he in effect assimilates, for "glorying in one's heritage" is a respectable activity within the value system of the pluralistic society.

—Stuart Levine, "The Indian as American"

How does the special issue look when placed beside similar 1960s projects conducted in other settler states or nations? What questions might such juxtapositions raise?

First, brief overviews of the publication and distribution histories of relevant international projects. In 1962, several years prior to the publication of the special issue, the Indian Affairs Branch of Canada's Department of Citizenship and Immigration published a short promotional booklet titled *The Indian in Transition: The Indian Today*. Addressed to "other," non-Native Canadians, this illustrated project highlights mid-twentieth-century Indian "progress" toward integration in a number of key areas and promotes the Branch's programs; its rhetorical strategies also work to engender good will among the general public toward First Nations peoples. In 1964, only a year before the publication of the special issue, when it would have been in copyediting and production, the Hawaiian writer John Dominis Holt saw his short book and photo essay titled *On Being Hawaiian* published with the Star-Bulletin Printing Company, an arm of Honolulu's major daily newspaper.⁵ This project, intended primarily for a

local audience of Hawaiian state citizens, residents, and tourists, was initiated as a response to the kinds of questions repeatedly posed by non-Hawaiians about the distinctiveness and value of Hawaiian identities “today.” (A second printing of the book, with a new introduction that offers an account of its origins, was issued a decade later in 1974 by Honolulu-based Topgallant Publishing.)⁶ Also in 1964, in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the government’s Department of Maori Affairs released an updated and expanded third edition of its illustrated booklet titled *The Maori Today*. Emphasizing a narrative of ongoing Maori “progress” alongside the maintenance of cultural traditions, this publication was aimed at both a national New Zealand audience and at educated and interested international visitors. Previous editions had been produced under the same title in 1949 and 1956. Between the release of the second and third editions, in 1960, the New Zealand National Film Unit, working in conjunction not only with Maori Affairs but also with the Departments of Information Services and Tourist and Publicity, completed a sixteen-minute documentary film version, also titled *The Maori Today*. The film was screened throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand in 1961. As with its publications, the government hoped that its film would help build a positive image of its programs; but it also hoped that its film would inspire Maori individuals and communities to work toward the “progress” that it desired. Over the rest of the decade, the film circulated among New Zealand’s international diplomatic postings, in both its original English language version and in several versions dubbed into European and Asian languages, for the purposes of building a positive image abroad and of promoting tourism. Finally, in 1968, the same year the revised special issue appeared in book form, the New Zealand commercial press Blackwood and Janet Paul, based in Auckland, published a substantial collection of essays titled *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties: A Symposium*, edited by Erik Schwimmer, who was a Pakeha (New Zealander of European descent), a former officer in Maori Affairs, and a former editor of the department-sponsored journal *Te Ao Hou/The New World*.⁷ The editors of the press had conceived this project back in 1964 as an updated version of the scholarly but popular 1940 publication titled *The Maori People Today: A General Survey*, edited by the Pakeha scholar I. L. G. Sutherland and published by the Auckland branch of Oxford University Press; although still popular, the 1940 publication had long been out of print. *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties* was expected to appeal, similarly, both to scholars and students and to educated lay people. And although it was published commercially, its production was assisted by a literary grant from the Maori Purposes Fund Board of the Department of Maori Affairs.

One immediate effect of placing the special issue of the *Midcontinent American Studies Journal* in a broader context of overviews of indigenous status produced in this period is to further highlight its editors’ choice of the time marker “today.” Levine and Lurie certainly were not alone in their decision to give ambiguous language a prominent place in their title. Is their “today” the same as that asserted for Maori people in Aotearoa/New Zealand in 1940, 1949, 1956,

1960, or 1964? And given their non-Native identities and secure locations within the U.S. academy, what is their “today’s” particular political and ethical valence? Is this a celebration of indigenous survivals and transformations, a celebration of people continuing to “be” indigenous “today” despite change, or is it a sad accounting of communities and individuals who are judged “today” to be increasingly and inevitably less native than their ancestors?

Another immediate effect of placing the special issue in a broader context of similar discourses, however, is to raise questions about which individuals and which institutions possess the material power to have their versions of “accurate” and “up-to-date” assessments of contemporary indigenous peoples published in the dominant media and circulated widely. Whose voices are able to speak within the expressive field of the provocative phrase “The Indian Today”? And who ultimately controls their selection, arrangement, tenor, and volume?

Consider even these basic comparisons of the six written texts described above:

1) “The Indian Today” (USA, 1965)

- Co-edited by two non-Native scholars, one man and one woman.
- Composed of eleven pieces (one of which is co-written) by a total of twelve contributors, six men and six women, all but one of whom has an academic affiliation.
- Two contributors are American Indian, one man and one woman, though they are not identified as such; both have academic affiliations.
- Eleven of the contributors, including the two Indians, work within anthropological or sociological methodologies; one contributor, the regular editor, works in the interdisciplinary field of American studies.
- A small cartoon is used at the head of each essay; two essays include as illustrations several black and white photographs of older Indian individuals and of Indian artifacts.
- Front cover includes a photograph of a “Sioux dance and give-away” on the Rosebud Reservation, taken by the regular editor.

2) *The American Indian Today* (USA, 1968)

- Co-edited by the same non-Native scholars.
- Now composed of thirteen pieces (one of which is co-written) by a total of thirteen contributors, six men and seven women.
- Essays are now arranged into five titled sections, including an overview section on American Indian history.
- Book version includes a section titled “About the Authors,” which identifies two contributors as American Indians, one man and one woman.
- Book version includes a brief bibliography and, as an insert, a fold-out map of the North American Indian population distribution in 1950.⁸

- Book version includes illustrations for only one essay.
 - Same photograph on the front cover.
- 3) *The Indian in Transition: The Indian Today* (Canada, 1962)
- “Anonymous” government publication.
 - Divided into eight titled sections.
 - Primarily sociological perspective.
 - Illustrated with black and white photographs of mostly contemporary Indian men, women, and children in a variety of relevant scenes: labor, housing, education, government, and health.
 - Front cover uses stark black and white contrasts and incorporates a subtle graphic design of arrows and teepee.
- 4) *On Being Hawaiian* (Hawai’i, 1964)
- Single male author of Hawaiian descent, with no academic affiliation.
 - Essay-length text followed by fifty-three illustrations, historical and contemporary black and white photographs of Hawaiian landscapes, artifacts, and men, women, and children in a variety of scenes.
 - Insider’s perspective and a primarily literary rather than a primarily anthropological or sociological voice.
 - Front and back covers feature thousand-year time line of Hawaiian history, illustrated by a contemporary mural of relevant Hawaiian scenes.
- 5) *The Maori Today, 3rd Edition* (NZ, 1964)
- Mostly “anonymous” government publication.
 - Composed of a Forward by the Minister of Maori Affairs, a male Pakeha, followed by thirteen titled chapters. Includes several maps and a table of Maori population figures from the 1961 Census. Generously illustrated throughout with contemporary black and white photographs of Maori men, women, and children.
 - Only one chapter is attributed to a specific author, who is a male with an academic affiliation, and who is identified as being “of Maori descent.”
 - Predominantly sociological approach, but includes chapter on Maori language written by a linguist.
 - Front cover features detail of a Maori feather cloak; back cover features same cloak with a greenstone hei tiki (jade carving).
- 6) *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties: A Symposium* (NZ, 1968)
- Male academic Pakeha editor supported by editorial board comprised of two male Pakeha scholars and one male Maori consultant who works in the fields of broadcasting and continuing education.
 - Composed of sixteen pieces (one of which is co-written) by a total of fifteen contributors, twelve men and three women, nine of which are identified as having academic affiliations in New Zealand (the editor moved to Canada during production).

- Five contributors are of Maori descent, three men and two women; two of the men have academic affiliations.
- Approaches are dominated by anthropological and sociological methodologies, but also include linguistics, literature and arts criticism, indigenous history, and creative writing. Pieces are arranged alphabetically by author rather than by subject matter or approach.
- Four groups of contemporary black and white photographs are interspersed among the chapters and organized into relevant categories. Book includes a glossary of Maori words, an extensive general bibliography, and separate comprehensive bibliography of literary representations of Maori.
- Front cover includes photo of a contemporary Maori wood carving; back cover lists contributors and their affiliations.

None of these projects includes significant comparisons with other contemporary settler states or nations. Each is equally concerned only with its own situation, and if certain contributors occasionally glance outward, it is to engage the example of better-known “minorities,” such as African Americans, or of “immigrants,” primarily from Europe. (Although Holt does mention, in passing, the history of American Indian conquest.) In other words, none of these projects is more internationally comparative than the others. Their broad outlines do draw attention, however, to significant differences among them. Moreover, taken together they draw attention to what is either minimal in the special issue of the *Midcontinent American Studies Journal* or completely absent from it: an individual and personal indigenous perspective on contemporary indigenous identity, status, challenges, or aspirations; a diversity of methodological approaches; maps, statistical data, and comprehensive bibliographies made available for readers’ study; a broad range of photographs of indigenous men, women, and children in a variety of contemporary scenes; a keen interest in language, literature, and the arts as vital aspects of indigeneity.

Let us consider briefly the implications of these differences.

On Being An Indigenous Citizen

They tell us we are all kinds of things, but what do we think of ourselves?

—John Dominis Holt, *On Being Hawaiian*

Distinguished Maori scholars have been among the best writers on these subjects. These scholars have both sustained and revived the interest of their people in their own culture.

—NZ National Film Unit, *The Maori Today*

Although it lists the academic affiliation of the author at the end of each article, the special issue of the *Midcontinent American Studies Journal* includes no list of contributors, and therefore no indication of individual contributors' racial, ethnic, or tribal affiliations. Two of the issue's twelve contributors, Shirley Hill Witt (Mohawk) and Robert K. Thomas (Cherokee), identified personally and professionally as American Indians during the mid-1960s, but their names do not mark them as indigenous, and it is likely that many original readers of the special issue would have been unaware of their status or of their links to specific Indian nations. Witt and Thomas's placement in the special issue is therefore of particular interest, as is the tenor of their voices and how these voices are framed. Witt's and Thomas's essays are positioned directly after those of co-editors Levine and Lurie, giving them a certain prominence. The topics of their essays, which are titled "Nationalistic Trends Among American Indians" and "Pan-Indianism," respectively, are related to each other but, at first glance, stand out as distinct from the topics of the seven essays that follow, all but one of which are based on localized anthropological or sociological field work in reservation or rural settings and which offer accounts of how an issue or set of issues affect specific (isolated) Indian communities. However, Witt's and Thomas's essays are more similar to the others than they may first appear: both work comfortably within anthropological or sociological methodologies, which means in this period, among other things, that they assume a more-or-less "objective" stance toward their subject matter and do not emphasize their personal perspectives, experiences, or feelings as individuals. It appears that the editors worried about Witt's essay in this respect. Hers is one of only two essays in the special issue (the other is by the non-Native researcher Carol K. Rachlin) that is preceded by an official head note written by the journal's regular editor. Levine draws attention to the potentially polemical nature of Witt's position and voice, suggesting that a certain level of anthropological "objectivity" is the expected norm. Levine's head note also can be read as subtly suggesting Witt's indigenous identity: "[. . .] The paper which follows is not only a review of the historical antecedents of Indian nationalism, but also a *characteristic statement* of the point of view of the highly vocal National Indian Youth Council.—SGL" (51, emphasis added). Witt is not identified as actually belonging to this activist organization, and the actual content and tone of her essay appear nothing but professional. There is no indigenous *personal* voice in this scholarly essay, marked or unmarked; in fact, it is carefully avoided.

The inclusion of an indigenous personal voice, whether as the primary voice or as one kind among several, has a profound effect on the discourses of *On Being Hawaiian* and *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties*. Holt's rumination on the 1960s experience of "being" Hawaiian was originally intended for newspaper publication, and his words fill only twenty of the published book's ninety-five pages, the others being devoted to fifty-three illustrations. But although brief, Holt's rumination is powerful both as a personal statement on

contemporary indigenous identity and as an ethical statement on human dignity and the rights of colonized peoples to produce knowledge about themselves. Though well educated, Holt was not an academic, and he confronts the complexity of his own and others' identities as Hawaiians from an unapologetically insider's perspective and in a decidedly literary voice.⁹

Holt begins his essay by posing two related but distinct questions: "What is a Hawaiian?" and "Who is a Hawaiian in the modern state of Hawaii?" (7). In the course of his extended answer, it becomes clear that Holt's intended audience includes other Hawaiians, perhaps especially those, like himself, who are in a position to influence the sentiments of the dominant culture. Holt's arguments are not those of a nationalist; early in the essay he concedes the loss of a sovereign Hawaiian nation (11). Instead, he positions himself as a patriotic citizen of both the state of Hawai'i and of the United States of America who is "statistically, as well as ethnically, a *keiki hanau o ka aina*—a child born of the land—and a part-Hawaiian" (9). Like other indigenous writers in the post-World War II era, a large part of his project is to respond to the body of "exaggerations, misrepresentations, half-truths, and sentimental images" produced about his ancestors and about his contemporary community by various outsiders to the culture (23).

Holt offers two paradigms for understanding and articulating 1960s Hawaiian experience. The first is "sentiment," "aesthetics," and "consciousness," which we might group together under the idea of epistemology, particularly epistemology of the self, by which I mean ways of organizing knowledge and self-knowledge. Holt writes, "I am a Hawaiian in sentiment, perhaps in a sense aesthetically, for I am governed in my feelings as a Hawaiian by an ideal, an image, a collection of feelings fused by the connecting links of elements that go deep into the past, and which play in my consciousness with the same result produced by great music, painting, or literature" (11). His analogy with the effects of experiencing the arts—psychological, emotional, and embodied—evokes the affective aspects of culture and inheritance. These are perhaps the most difficult to measure in anthropological or sociological terms, but they are often considered the most important aspects of culture by community members. Moreover, in Holt's formulation these important "felt" aspects of culture are transhistorical and intergenerational: "To think as a Hawaiian of the fantastic navigational feats of our ancestors [. . .] inspires awe . . . respect! I gain a *vicarious sense* of courage" (13, emphasis added). It is this difficult-to-describe "thinking as a Hawaiian" and connecting to the indigenous past that Holt is most interested in expressing for his mixed audience.

Holt's second paradigm concentrates attention on the land itself and, inseparably, the Hawaiians' relatively long tenure in the Hawaiian Islands. In this way, Holt's ideas about land are related to his ideas about epistemology: "The land quivers," he writes, "from the southern tip of Hawaii Island to Kauai's far western shores, with living elements of the ancient past" (22). Holt asserts that

everyone who lives in Hawaii is “in one degree or another, affected by the impact of the abstract force of past events” (22). But for indigenous Hawaiians, this impact is a particular “burden”: “We are, to some extent, the walking repositories of island antiquity; living symbols of a way of life long dead, but which strangely persists in shaping the character of life in the fiftieth state” (23). Relationship to the vital force of the land distinguishes contemporary indigenous experiences. In Holt’s terms, this relationship, this particular “burden” of sensitivity to local history, has been violated by outsiders’ representations of Hawai’i and Hawaiian culture, which have become dominant to the point that many Hawaiians are “confused” and “do not know how to think about the past, even if we have some glint of knowledge of what happened then” (21, 22).

Having discussed at some length how Hawaiians are inextricably linked to the land and to history, Holt ends his essay by focusing on the possible Hawaiian future: “All around I see the evidence among Hawaiians of a renewed interest in themselves, and the future, and their community. I see scores of handsome children who will grow up to be less the victims of their heritage than I and my generation were; and who will be somewhat less able to enjoy the aesthetic lift we enjoyed for being Hawaiians; but who will be less hampered, less bound to the fragmented, but imposingly powerful, image of the past” (26). Although optimistic, Holt’s vision of the local indigenous future is, in 1964, tinged with the melancholy of what he sees as an inevitable loss of cultural feeling as part of the next generation’s material and social gains. For our comparative purposes, of particular note is Holt’s focus on contemporary children and the coming generations as he closes his rumination on his own identity as Hawaiian.

An indigenous personal voice is also part of the essay collection *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties*, and it is even more conspicuously focused on the experiences of contemporary indigenous children. One of the contributions by a Maori writer, Arapera Blank, is titled “One Two Three Four Five” and presents the experience of a five-year-old Maori child entering the New Zealand school system. Blank uses the genre conventions of the short story rather than those of the academic essay, writing from the first-person perspective of the child and in the colloquial Maori English of rural Aotearoa/New Zealand. Her fictional discourse allows her to express the psychological and emotional effects of dominant (colonial) institutions on Maori children—both positive and negative—in a personal, highly expressive, and dramatic manner. Blank ends her story with a section titled “Postscript: *O nga ao e toru*,” which can be translated as “Postscript: Of Three Worlds.” This section is set later, when the child has grown into a young man and is better able to express and reflect upon the complexities of his experiences of leaving his Maori-speaking home for school, where only English is allowed: “I am older now. I have finished school. And now I like everything. That’s what’s wrong with me. I am a three-legged creature. I can’t put my three legs down at once either. The world isn’t ready for

such a creature. But this is what education in a European world has given me. Three legs” (94). He goes on to explain the significance of these three “legs”: Maori, Pakeha, and a third leg “fashioned from looking at the other two” (95). In the mid-1960s, this third leg is “too much of a nuisance” and brings mostly confusion and pain for the educated young Maori who no longer feels fully at home in the Maori world but is not fully of the Pakeha world, either (95). Blank’s story refuses easy resolution and ends with the conundrum of her protagonist’s situated anguish: “No one wants to see two sides of the question. Only liars can see two things at once. [. . .] And now nobody wants me. All three legs are a curse. I wish I could have had only one as I would have had if I had never turned five” (96).

Like Holt, Blank valorizes the affective and deeply personal areas of indigenous experience that are often excluded from standard anthropological accounts. The indigenous personal voice takes non-Native readers especially—and perhaps uncomfortably—out of the more familiar terrain of indigenous statistics, “types,” and highly managed informants, insisting that indigenous peoples be understood as complex, contemporary individuals as well as members of indigenous communities. If the indigenous personal voice is successful, it offers these readers the potential for a different kind of experience of engagement and possibly for a different kind of empathy.

Demonstrating the Indigenous Modern

This book tells the story of the dramatic advance of the Maori people in recent years. It should inspire Maori and pakeha New Zealanders and give the world a lead in showing how two ways of life can become one, each enriching the other.

—Hon. J. R. Hanan, Minister of Maori Affairs, Forward to *The Maori Today*, 3rd ed.

We decided not to study the Maori as though they formed a self-contained group, but to concentrate on the relationship between the Maori minority and the Pakeha majority. . . . Starting from this premise, the editors invited a number of scholars and writers, whose interests were known to be diverse, to choose an area of inter-cultural stress and analyse it.

—Erik Schwimmer, “The Aspirations of the Contemporary Maori”

Holt’s and, especially, Blank’s work points up the potential for analytical and discursive methodologies other than the typical anthropological or sociological approaches of their day to evoke key aspects of 1960s indigenous experience, in particular, the potential to evoke those aspects of experience considered most important by indigenous peoples themselves. Their work also high-

lights the inescapable reality that individuals and communities that identified as indigenous in Hawai'i and in Aotearoa/New Zealand in the 1960s lived their lives in multiple forms of relationship with non-Native peoples and with the dominant culture and its institutions. As their pieces demonstrate, these relationships are necessarily complex and diverse, and they defy easy categorization into a simple binary of positive and negative effects. These and other texts produced in the 1960s point to the limitations of the overwhelming reliance on anthropological and sociological methodologies in the special issue of the *Midcontinent American Studies Journal*. They also point to the limitations of the attempts by the regular editor to frame the special issue as an analysis of "The Indian" in isolation rather than as an analysis of ongoing indigenous-settler relations.

Like its 1949 and 1956 predecessors, the 1964 third edition of *The Maori Today* endeavored to showcase the recent history of race relations between Maori and Pakeha New Zealanders as a story of Maori "progress" for which both Maori and Pakeha could take credit and be proud.¹⁰ Such stories were meant to meet two, distinct aims of the New Zealand government: to "inspire" Maori to better themselves and to fully participate in mainstream New Zealand society, and to promote an international image of Aotearoa/New Zealand as a progressive nation. (The Canadian government's 1962 publication *The Indian in Transition: The Indian Today* had similar goals and used similar strategies, if on a smaller scale.) The booklet's chapters highlight Maori "progress" in a range of areas: in government administration; in farming and land development; in housing, health, and education; in apprenticeship, occupational, and career opportunities; in welfare programs and community building; in participation and success in men's and women's sports; in language revival and instruction; and, perhaps especially, in a record of exemplary participation in the military and in civil defense during two World Wars, the Korean campaign, and the Malayan emergency.¹¹ Each chapter is generously illustrated with black and white photographs of contemporary Maori men, women, and children participating in all aspects of New Zealand society. The booklet includes maps of the North Island showing traditional Maori tribal areas and contemporary Maori demographics, as well as Maori population tables from the 1961 Census. The booklet ends with a section titled "The Future," which acknowledges (albeit briefly) that Aotearoa/New Zealand's record on race relations is, in fact, not "without blemish," but focuses mainly on the rich promise of the future that Maori and Pakeha will both share. The Maori cultural heritage is described as "fine and noble"; the expectation expressed here is that that culture will not die but will continue to be "adapted to the conditions of the times."

The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties: A Symposium, published in 1968 and edited by Erik Schwimmer with the assistance of an editorial board comprised of John Forster, a Pakeha lecturer in Education at Victoria University; William Parker (also known as Wiremu Parker), a Maori broadcaster and edu-

cator; and James E. Ritchie, a Pakeha sociologist, explicitly expresses a similar focus on ongoing Maori-Pakeha *relations*. When the project was originally conceived in 1964, the proposed title was “Aspirations and Stresses of a Minority,” and the editor imagined commissioning essays on nineteen relevant topics by “some eighteen of the best qualified people in New Zealand,” including both professional scholars and community researchers and educators, and including seven writers of Maori descent (John Rangihau, Jacqueline Baxter [also known as J. C. Sturm], Hugh Kawharu, Hei Rogers, William [Wiremu] Parker, Katarina Mataira, and Pei te Hurinui Jones).¹² During the first meeting of the advisory committee, the projected table of contents was revised from nineteen to twenty essays (with the committee hoping to actually receive at least eighteen of these), now arranged into five sections: 1) General Survey, 2) What Do the Statistics Mean?, 3) Personality, 4) Community, and 5) Forms of Expression. Two of the original Maori authors were dropped from the list, but two others, Arapera Blank and Bruce Biggs, were added, maintaining a total of seven. Due to a number of factors, several of the authors, Pakeha and Maori alike, were delayed or were unable to complete their commissioned essays before the publishing deadline. Including Schwimmer’s introduction, “The Aspirations of the Contemporary Maori,” and a brief Postscript written in 1957 by the Pakeha anthropologist Ernest Beaglehole, who had agreed to write a new essay for the volume but who died before its completion, the published volume is composed of sixteen pieces written by fifteen contributors (Schwimmer contributed an essay as well as his lengthy introduction). The sections have been removed, and the essays, which cover a wide range of topics—including Maori language, education, social conditions, intermarriage, the Maori King Movement, urbanization, new trends in art, the Maori and literature, development, health, labor and employment, Maori children, and relationships with government institutions—are arranged alphabetically by author’s surname. Of the fifteen published authors, five are of Maori descent: Biggs, who writes about language; Blank, who writes about education; Jones, who writes about the Maori King Movement; Kawharu, who writes about urban immigration; and Mataira, who writes about art. Four groups of photographs are interspersed among the chapters, under the headings “Family Life and Education,” “Maori Leaders,” “Artists in the Community,” and “The Maori in the Community.” Finally, the book also includes a three-page glossary of Maori words, an extensive General Bibliography, and a separate Bibliography to the essay by the Pakeha scholar Bill Pearson titled “The Maori and Literature 1938-65.” Pearson’s bibliography is divided into three major sections, “Writing By Pakeha,” “Writing By Maori,” and “Other References”; the first two sections are then sub-divided by genre.

While the five essays written by Maori authors are of particular interest for their range of subject matter, discursive style, and political tone, *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties* as a whole is remarkable, when compared to the special issue of the *Midcontinent American Studies Journal*, for its variety of

methodological approaches. The non-Native editors of both collections had definite ideas about what they saw as the contemporary state of indigenous peoples in their nations in the mid-1960s and about what they thought should be the proper course of future indigenous development. A striking difference in the two projects, then, is that Schwimmer, arguably the better informed of the two editors, either encouraged or allowed competing voices and alternative visions to be included in the collection under his charge. A number of the pieces in *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties* potentially challenge or at least shift emphasis away from the arguments expressed in Schwimmer's introduction, which lays out a detailed model for national "inclusion"—from Blank's representation of the potential negative effects of the dominant school system on Maori children, to Jones's deployment of Maori epistemological traditions to record an indigenous history that extends into contemporary times, to Kawharu's focus on the complexities of ongoing relations *among Maori* living in urban centers, where new immigrants to the city find themselves in potential conflict with well-established *tangata whenua* (people of the land, or "hosts"; those Maori indigenous to the specific area). The result is a wide-ranging collection of essays that aspires to the ideals of a "symposium." It offers a vision of a contemporary and "modern" indigenous people living in a settler nation in the 1960s that, while not exhaustive, is more diverse and more complex than that offered by "The Indian Today."

Picturing Possible Indigenous Futures

Art is a subject in which Indian students excel.

—Photo caption, *The Indian in Transition:*
The Indian Today

A mother shows children at Te Ahu Ahu Play Centre how to build with wooden blocks. This kind of activity was not part of the mother's role in traditional Maori society, but will make Maori children adapt more easily to the New Zealand school system.

—Photo caption, *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties*

The 1960 documentary film *The Maori Today* was produced to fulfill similar promotional goals as the 1949, 1956, and 1964 government publications of the same title, and its content is largely similar to that of the 1964 booklet.¹³ However, the New Zealand government is less effective in its presentation of the story of Maori "progress" in the visual and aural medium. The film's narration is generally too vague or too simplistic to convey the complexities of contemporary life for Maori adults and children, and the film's lack of a central

storyline or building theme make it appear like a random collection of scenes. More so than in the print publications, too many of the film's images feel dated or less than representative.¹⁴ That said, it is important to note what the film does well despite these significant problems, which is to provide viewers with concrete images of younger Maori men and women participating in all aspects of New Zealand society, including "traditional" cultural practices as well as contemporary occupations and leisure pursuits, and to provide viewers with concrete images of happy and thriving children—the future generation of Maori.

This power of photographic representation to emphasize the possibilities of the near and more distant future is also evident in many of the print texts described above. The fifty-three illustrations included in *On Being Hawaiian* are exemplary in this respect. Holt orders his diverse photographs so that they disrupt the strict time line depicted on the front and back covers of his book.¹⁵ Supporting his essay's primary theme of Hawaiian epistemological continuity despite material change, grounded in Hawaiian relationships to the land, Holt mixes both historical and contemporary photographic images, including photographs of his own ancestors, with representations of scenes of early contact with Europeans and photographs of Hawaiian artifacts and landscapes. The distant past, the recent past, the contemporary, and the possible future—in the form of photographs of contemporary children—are related by principles other than a strict chronology or a narrative of cause and effect. Importantly, the final two photographs in the book are captioned "Keikis—A Trio of Hawaiian boys" (91) and "Crew of an outrigger canoe. This is still a popular Hawaiian sport" (92). *On Being Hawaiian* ends with images of smiling children at play and robust young men participating in an innovated "traditional" sport, suggesting a Hawaiian future that will be "new" but still linked to the Hawaiian past.¹⁶ Other print texts include almost exclusively photographs from the late 1950s and early 1960s to illustrate their analyses of First Nations or Maori "progress."¹⁷ Children and young people participating in contemporary activities—at school, at play, at work, and at home—feature prominently in the photographs included in *The Indian in Transition: The Indian Today*, *The Maori Today 3rd Edition*, and *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties*.

In contrast, the special issue of the *Midcontinent American Studies Journal* employs a limited range of photographs that emphasize not the vibrant present or possible future but the waning or stereotypical past. Both versions of the special issue feature the same photograph on their covers, taken by Levine on the Rosebud Reservation in South Dakota, which depicts a "Sioux dance and give-away honoring a boy leaving for Haskell Indian Institute [in Lawrence, Kansas]."¹⁸ The photograph contributes to the problematic of juxtaposing the monolithic term "The Indian" with the time marker "Today," in that it fulfills U.S. and overseas stereotypes of "authentic" Indians as (only) Sioux; its caption rehearses a colonial scene of indigenous children being removed to boarding schools that is typically associated with the nineteenth century; and its most

prominent figures are young men in feathered dance regalia in an outdoor setting. Although the photograph and its caption inside the book's cover potentially reveal the proximity of the University of Kansas to Haskell, a less stereotypical photograph of contemporary Indian students actually attending Haskell in the 1960s, with an appropriate caption, would have made this connection more clear and, arguably, more vital.¹⁹ Only two of the essays in the original special issue, and only one essay in the expanded book version, include photographs as illustrations. These are striking in their almost exclusive depiction of Indian elders and Indian artifacts. Younger adults and children are visible in only one of the thirteen photographs included in the original special issue, and in this photo they are part of the background and are obscured by the central figure of an elder who is described in the caption as being deceased.²⁰ Whatever the intentions of the individual authors or of the special issue's editors, the effect of this photographic representation is to reify stereotypes of "authentic" American Indians either as existing only in the past or as existing on the very brink of extinction.

Arts and Indigenous Communities "Today"

The carving especially is the most expressive form of our cultural beginnings, of which we hope we shall never lose sight.

—Katarina Mataira, "Modern Trends in Maori Art Forms"

Read alongside similar 1960s texts from other settler states and nations, perhaps the most glaring absence of the special issue of the *Midcontinent American Studies Journal* is its lack of sustained interest in contemporary indigenous languages, literatures, and arts. In this respect, again, *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties* provides the obvious contrast. Scattered among this symposium's anthropological, sociological, and historical pieces are Biggs's essay on Maori linguistics and language revival, Mataira's essay on new developments in Maori art practices, and Pearson's essay on the Maori and literature, which looks at the work of both non-Maori and Maori writers. Also included are a range of photographic images of contemporary Maori poets, singers, carvers, painters, and sculptors, and several examples of contemporary Maori art work. The latter, especially, demonstrate concretely some of the ways Maori artists innovate both indigenous and settler traditions in their contemporary practices. The inclusion of these essays and photographs may reflect Schwimmer's personal interest in language, literature, and the arts, or his broad knowledge of these fields based on his experience as editor of the Department of Maori Affairs journal *Te Ao Hou/The New World* from 1952 through 1961. They may also reflect a general awareness in Aotearoa/New Zealand of the high quality of Maori artistic and performance traditions, or a greater degree of comfort with

depictions of a “modern” indigenous people, at least within education and government circles. But whatever the specific reasons, the effect is similar to that of the inclusion of personal voices and of a variety of photographs in this collection and in Holt’s *On Being Hawaiian*: a greater sense of contemporary—and future—indigenous vitality. As I argue above, the latter offer a greater potential for developing a different kind of understanding and a different kind of empathy among Native and non-Native readers than do anthropological and sociological approaches on their own. Sustained attention to language, literature, and the arts can help to engage even more fully the complex and even contradictory realities of indigenous experiences and aspirations. This is true for any historical period, but certainly for twentieth-century periods marked “today.” And these elements potentially do more, as well. They can help to challenge outmoded ideas about indigenous peoples and their representation that were developed over the course of many “yesterdays.” Surely this should be a primary aim of any project in the field of indigenous studies that claims comprehensiveness among its goals. Such inclusion seems little to ask of the mid-1960s, even less to ask, forty years on, of our own mid-decade, or of the new century’s many decades ahead.

Notes

Research for this essay was made possible by an NEH Summer Institute on “Re-imagining Indigenous Cultures: The Pacific Islands,” held at the East-West Center in Honolulu, Hawai’i, and by a CIES Fulbright Research Fellowship to the Turnbull Library in Wellington, Aotearoa/New Zealand. Kathy Dean of the Ohio State University library offered invaluable assistance in obtaining relevant materials while I was overseas.

1. The *Midcontinent American Studies Journal* was associated with the University of Kansas and the Midcontinent American Studies Association, now the Mid-American American Studies Association.

2. The Everett Edwards Press was based in Deland, Florida. A paperback edition was published by Penguin Books in 1970.

3. Vine Deloria, Jr. (Standing Rock Sioux) begins his groundbreaking critique of dominant conceptions of American Indian identity and experience, *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1969), by noting that “To be an Indian in modern American society is in a very real sense to be unreal and ahistorical” (2). He argues, further, that “The deep impression made upon American minds by the Indian struggle against the white man in the last century has made the contemporary Indian somewhat invisible compared with his ancestors. . . . Indians are probably invisible because of the tremendous amount of misinformation about them” (12). Writing about the representation of American Indians in popular discourses and dominant media in the 1950s and 1960s, the noted historian Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr. notes in *The White Man’s Indian: Images of the American Indian From Columbus to the Present* (New York: Random House, 1978) that “No matter how new the media were, the old White stereotypes of the Indian generally prevailed in their presentations” (103).

4. For a definition of “imperialist nostalgia,” see Renato Resaldo, *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* (Boston: Beacon, 1989).

5. I am intentionally referring to the indigenous Polynesian inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands and their descendants as Hawaiians rather than as Native Hawaiians.

6. A third printing appeared in 1976, the year of the U.S. Bicentennial celebrations, and a fourth in 1995; the most recent editions have been published by Ku Pa’a Publishing. Holt was also the author of *Today Ees Sad-dy Night and Other Stories* (1965), *Monarchy in Hawaii* (1971), *Kaulana Na Pua! Famous are the Flowers* (1974), *Waimea Summer: A Novel* (1976), *Princess of the Night Rides and Other Tales* (1977), *The Art of Featherwork in Old Hawai’i* (1985), and *Recollections: Memoirs of John Dominis Holt 1919-1935* (1993).

7. By the time of the book's publication in 1968, Schwimmer was a professor of anthropology at the University of Toronto. For a history and analysis of *Te Ao Hou*, see my *Blood Narrative* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).

8. Of the two copies of the first edition of *The American Indian Today* that I have been able to examine, from two different libraries, only one retains the map insert. Curiously, the map is not listed in the book's table of contents or front matter. The map itself is titled "The North American Indians: 1950 Distribution of Descendants of the Aboriginal Population of Alaska, Canada and the United States." It was prepared between 1956 and 1959 under the direction of Professor Sol Tax of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Chicago and originally published in December 1960 in preparation for the 1961 American Indian Chicago Conference, which Tax and Lurie helped to organize. In the Penguin paperback edition of *The American Indian Today*, first published in 1970 and reprinted in 1972, the map is listed in the table of contents and is integrated into the final pages of the book itself, rather than included as an insert.

9. In terms of style and approach, as well as in terms of sentiment, Holt's essay has more in common with some of the work of the American Indian writers who published in the 1940s and 1950s—Ella Deloria, Ruth Muskrat Bronson, D'Arcy McNickle, John Joseph Mathews—and with the work of the writers of the so-called American Indian renaissance who began publishing in the late 1960s and 1970s—N. Scott Momaday, Vine Deloria Jr., James Welch, Leslie Silko, Gerald Vizenor—than it does with the anthropological work gathered together by Levine and Lurie.

10. Information pertaining to the publication history and promotion of the various editions of *The Maori Today* comes from files held at Archives New Zealand in Wellington. (File GPI W2714 5/32/2, Maori Affairs: "The Maori Today.")

11. New Zealand sent troops to Malaya in 1956 as part of a Commonwealth effort to fight communist insurgents. The so-called "emergency" lasted until 1960.

12. Information pertaining to the publishing background for *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties* comes from files held in Archives New Zealand in Wellington. (File ABJZ 869 W4644 18 9/3/28 1, Maori Purposes Fund Board—Publications, "Aspirations and Stresses of a Minority.")

13. Information pertaining to the production of the film *The Maori Today* comes from files held in Archives New Zealand in Wellington. (Files AAPG W3435 16 3/2/87, "The Maori Today," and AAMK 869/1160A 52/1/8 1, "The Maori Today—16 mm film.")

14. In 1968 the New Zealand Ambassador to Germany sent a memo to the Secretary of External Affairs in Wellington complaining that the film was of little use to his office as a promotional tool, since, in his opinion, it is too misleading for foreign viewers. In particular, he notes the lack of a specific theme, the episodic nature of the film, the use of both too-obviously posed shots and shots that were fortuitous but will be seen by foreign viewers as typical, the fact that Maori are on show in the film but are never seen speaking to each other or speaking the Maori language, and that the film does not indicate what the Maori are doing to help themselves. The Ambassador ends his memo by suggesting that the film "be re-made in the near future." (25 September 1968, file AAPG W3435 16 3/2/87, "The Maori Today," Archives New Zealand, Wellington.)

15. A one-thousand-year Hawaiian time line runs down one side of each cover, beginning with the year 960 and ending with 1960. A one inch margin above 960 and a quarter-inch margin below 1960 indicate that Hawaiian history extends before and after these markers of a Hawaiian millennium. Five other designated years punctuate the space between these markers, dividing this millennium into rough periods; these are illustrated in a vertical mural on each cover. At the top of the mural, corresponding to the period around 960, are images of double-hulled Polynesian canoes with triangular sails; next, spanning the period 1350 to 1630, are images of well organized and highly developed Hawaiian villages; below these, corresponding to the period around 1770, are representations of the first appearances of European sailing ships, as well as representations of classic Hawaiian artifacts; further down, near 1820, are images of the Hawaiian kingdom, Euro-American architecture, and plantations; finally, in the period between 1920 and 1960, the mural illustrates the contemporary situation of the co-existence of rural communities and the large modern city of Honolulu, complete with images of an airplane and a cruise ship to indicate the importance of modern travel and tourism.

16. It is a surprise, then, that the more recent editions of *On Being Hawaiian* appear with a strikingly different cover. Instead of the time line and mural, the later printings use one of the historical sketches included in the original edition, a representation titled "Masked Kahuna" that is described in the 1964 edition as "Secret alii sect in gourd helmets, sketched by Webber at the time of Captain Cook's last visit to Hawaii." The sketch depicts a group of Hawaiian leaders paddling a double-hulled canoe, suggesting that *On Being Hawaiian* is about Hawaiian identity in the historical past. Moreover, the later editions include only forty-four illustrations rather than the fifty-three of the first printing; the final images are now "Pa'u Riders, after annexation" (63) and "Unidentified singers of the early 20th century" (64), which also locate the text in the past rather than in the present or possible future.

17. *The Indian in Transition: The Indian Today* does include a somewhat comical (by “today’s” standards) sequence of photographs captioned “Yesterday . . .” and “Today.” The photo labeled “Yesterday . . .” depicts a staged camp scene of staked tents and drying meat (it could even be a cropped photograph of a museum diorama), while the photo labeled “Today” depicts several modern wooden houses (12, 13).

18. It is striking that the 1970 Penguin paperback edition of *The American Indian Today* uses a different photograph on its cover. In this black-and-white photograph, an apparently Plains Indian woman wearing a “traditional” beaded and fringed buckskin dress, moccasins, and headband stands inside the doorway of a decorated teepee, cooking on a modern range and looking down at an Indian child wearing a “modern” girl’s party or perhaps church dress and white shoes. No caption accompanies the photograph, and it is unattributed. Gilda Kuhlman is credited with cover design.

19. Levine mentions Haskell in his introduction to the special issue only in passing: “A colleague of mine and his wife hired a teen-age girl from Haskell Indian Institute to do house-cleaning” (13). The anecdotes he tells about this Pima girl and her interactions with the “modern” world of Lawrence, Kansas, are meant to suggest her difference as Indian, but the stories are awkward in their telling and they say more about Levine’s assumptions about what counts as difference in the American Indian context and why difference might or might not matter than they do about the lives of American Indian young people in the 1960s.

20. The book version features a total of only nine photographs, including the photo described above. Younger adults and children are also visible in a second photo in the book version, which was not included in the original special issue, captioned “Polyethylene Indianism.” Similar to the first photo, the central figure here is also an older individual.

Works Cited

- Allen, Chadwick. *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Holt, John Dominis. *On Being Hawaiian*. Honolulu: Star-Bulletin Printing, 1964.
- _____. *On Being Hawaiian*. Second printing, with new introduction. Honolulu: Topgallant Publishing, 1974.
- The Indian in Transition: The Indian Today*. Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 1962.
- Levine, Stuart, and Nancy O. Lurie, eds. “The Indian Today.” *Midcontinent American Studies Journal* 6 (Fall 1965).
- _____. *The American Indian Today*. Deland, FL: Everett Edwards, 1968. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1970, 1972.
- The Maori Today*. New Zealand National Film Unit, 1960.
- The Maori Today*. Third Edition. Wellington: Government Printer, 1964.
- Rosaldo, Renato. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon, 1989.
- Schwimmer, Erik, ed. *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties: A Symposium*. With the co-operation of John Forster, William Parker and James E. Ritchie. Auckland: Blackwood and Janet Paul, 1968.