
Contents

DONALD L. FIXICO *Foreword* *vii*
 Acknowledgments *xi*

COLLEEN O'NEILL 1 Rethinking Modernity and the
 Discourse of Development in American
 Indian History, an Introduction 1

PART I COMMERCE AND INCORPORATION

PAUL C. ROSIER 2 Searching for Salvation and
 Sovereignty: Blackfeet Oil Leasing and
 the Reconstruction of the Tribe 27

DAVID LA VERE 3 Minding Their Own Business: The
 Kiowa-Comanche-Apache Business
 Committee of the Early 1900s 52

JESSICA R. CATTELINO 4 Casino Roots: The Cultural Production
 of Twentieth-Century Seminole Economic
 Development 66

NICOLAS G. ROSENTHAL	5	The Dawn of a New Day? Notes on Indian Gaming in Southern California	91
KATHY M'CLOSKEY	6	The Devil's in the Details: Tracing the Fingerprints of Free Trade and Its Effects on Navajo Weavers	112

PART II WAGE WORK

TRESSA BERMAN	7	"All We Needed Was Our Gardens": Women's Work and Welfare Reform in the Reservation Economy	133
DAVID ARNOLD	8	Work and Culture in Southeastern Alaska: Tlingits and the Salmon Fisheries	156
CLYDE ELLIS	9	Five Dollars a Week to Be "Regular Indians": Shows, Exhibitions, and the Economics of Indian Dancing, 1880–1930	184
JEFFREY P. SHEPHERD	10	Land, Labor, and Leadership: The Political Economy of Hualapai Community Building, 1910–1940	209
WILLIAM BAUER	11	Working for Identity: Race, Ethnicity, and the Market Economy in Northern California, 1875–1936	238

PART III METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

C. D. JAMES PACI AND LISA KREBS	12	Local Knowledge as Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Definition and Ownership	261
BRIAN HOSMER	13	"Dollar a Day and Glad to Have It": Work Relief on the Wind River Indian Reservation as Memory	283
DUANE CHAMPAGNE	14	Tribal Capitalism and Native Capitalists: Multiple Pathways of Native Economy	308
BRIAN HOSMER AND COLLEEN O'NEILL	15	Conclusion	330
		<i>About the Contributors</i>	335
		<i>Index</i>	341

*Rethinking Modernity and the Discourse of
Development in American Indian History,
an Introduction*

COLLEEN O'NEILL

Simon was world famous, at least famous on the Spokane Indian Reservation, for driving backward. He always obeyed posted speed limits, traffic signals and signs, even minute suggestions. But he drove in reverse, using the rearview mirror as his guide. But what could I do? I trusted the man, and when you trust a man you also have to trust his horse.

—SHERMAN ALEXIE, *The Lone Ranger and Tonto Fistfight in Heaven*¹

One afternoon several years ago I was browsing through the stacks in the library, and I stumbled on a book entitled *Stories of Traditional Navajo Life and Culture*. That book, published in 1977 by the Navajo Community College Press and edited by its director, Broderick Johnson, included stories from twenty-two Navajo men and women about their “traditional culture.”²

Traditional culture? My research was on twentieth-century labor and working-class history. I was interested in “the modern.” So the book sat on my desk for weeks while I tried to sort out the “modern” evidence I’d found in the archives, stories that were at best fragmented snapshots. Most troubling were the absences, the invisibility of Navajo workers in the documents. Where were the Navajo workers? Surely Navajo men worked in the coal mines in Gallup,

The author would like to thank Tisa Wenger, Flannery Burke, Michelle Nickerson, Benjamin Johnson, and John Nelson for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this chapter.

one of the most industrialized towns bordering the reservation in the mid-twentieth century. I pored over payroll and company housing records, newspaper accounts, and company correspondence and found little evidence that could help me describe the experience or even the existence of Navajo workers in Gallup in the 1930s and 1940s.

When I finally opened the book that promised, at least in my imagination, sacred stories of emergence and fables that stressed values of pastoral traditions, I found something that made me reexamine my assumptions: workers. Almost every narrator in the book told a story about some sort of wage work—working on the railroads, in the agriculture fields, for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or at a trading post. They remembered the everyday struggles they faced in their jobs, as well as their ongoing efforts to fulfill customary kinship and ceremonial obligations. For these Navajos, “modernity” and “tradition” were overlapping, not mutually exclusive, categories. Navajo people met their sacred responsibilities as well as the demands of the capitalist workplace.

This research vignette illustrates how one’s underlying assumptions about culture, tradition, and modernity shape modes of inquiry as well as the eventual narratives—large and small. The rigid modern/traditional dichotomy that too often marks historical writing is a by-product of a larger problem that renders American Indians invisible within the broad narrative of American history. That narrative, steeped in positivist assumptions, tends to embrace and naturalize a universalized notion of modernity.³

Modernity, as a guiding social principle or state ideology, emerged during the eighteenth century. Enlightenment thinkers challenged the basic worldview and social structures of Western European society, rejecting the absolute power of kings and the association of knowledge with the realm of Christianity. They advocated a rationalization of power, ideas, and social relationships. As geographer David Harvey explains, “It was, above all, a secular movement that sought the demystification and desacralization of knowledge and social organization in order to liberate human beings from their chains.”⁴ Part of that modernizing project involved seeking universal truths about human nature through scientific observation, logic, and reason. Proponents were, of course, assuming that there was *a* universal humanity to be revealed. In the search for a singular truth and the application of reason to political and economic realms, Enlightenment leaders generalized that which was “true” for Western European societies to the rest of the world. As states contested for power in Europe and in their colonial holdings abroad, the “appeal to reason” increasingly informed expansionist ideology, justifying conquest of indigenous peoples as

well as provoking opposition from nationalists throughout Europe in the mid-nineteenth century.⁵

“Rule by reason” had its price. As Eric Wolf argued in his final book, its practitioners became the “apostles of modernity,” and up to this day they “readily tag others as opponents of progress.” Wolf continues, “[T]hey have advocated industrialization, specialization, secularization, and rational bureaucratic allocation as reasoned options superior to unreasoned reliance on tradition.”⁶ Modernity has become synonymous with capitalism, and that narrative, a history in which Indians are portrayed as irrelevant victims of military and economic conquest, pronounces the “cultural death” of indigenous peoples in twentieth-century America.⁷ It seems there is no room for tradition in a modern context.

Yet the lived reality of American Indians in the twentieth century proves otherwise and makes us rethink the kinds of analytical categories that for so long have rendered them invisible. Like historian David Roediger, who helped us recognize whiteness, we need to lay bare the assumptions of what constitutes modernity.⁸ The chapters in this volume help us recognize how American Indians transcended these rigid categories and created alternative pathways of economic and cultural change that were not merely static renditions of some timeless past or total acceptance of U.S. capitalist culture. American Indians in the twentieth century blended their modern and traditional worlds as a matter of course and in the process redefined those categories in ways that made sense to them.

This introductory chapter is an attempt to rethink the modern/traditional dichotomy and to consider how that construct has informed ethnohistorical thinking about American Indian economic development. It is an effort to stimulate a conversation that examines the relationship between American Indian culture and capitalism by suggesting ways American Indian histories challenge underlying assumptions about modernity itself. Revisiting the terms of the debate may inspire scholars and policy makers to see American Indian cultural and economic innovations as neither “modern” nor “pre-modern” nor even “antimodern.” Instead, we are suggesting that American Indians have crafted alternative pathways of economic development that transcend linear analytical categories. This chapter will explore that intellectual history and raise questions that complicate our notions of modernity to reveal a much more complicated past—a past vividly described by the contributors to this volume.

Authors in *Native Pathways* represent a variety of disciplinary approaches and theoretical models, each engaging the literature on culture and economic

development in critical new ways. They examine how class formation, gender, race, and cultural practices shaped capitalist incorporation of American Indian communities—a historical process that influenced the nature of wage work, the ways indigenous people produced “for the market,” and how they weathered shifts in federal policy. We hope this volume inspires a meaningful dialogue among academics, activists, and policy makers, those who are developing new ways to understand American Indian historical struggles and who are initiating new pathways toward decolonization.

TRADITION AND MODERNIZATION

The categories “modern” and “traditional” have survived a long and sordid history of draconian and paternalistic federal policies, as well as internal debates among American Indian communities. Those categories describe a cultural position wherein American Indians define and are defined by their relationship to the American capitalist economy, with all its political, cultural, and economic features. “Tradition” acquires meaning in relation to the “modern.” The modern is the benchmark against which tradition is measured. And at least since the Enlightenment, the concept of the modern has been linked to the notion of “progress.”⁹

The modern and traditional dichotomy is a product of modernization theory, a linear way of thinking about economic change that has shaped ideas about development as well as our understanding of dependency. Embraced by development “experts” in the post-World War II era, its underlying assumptions about culture and economic development date back to the mid-nineteenth century.¹⁰ “Building on positivist notions of Western Enlightenment and 19th-century conceptions of evolution,” according to historian Kathy Le Mons Walker, at the heart of modernization theory are the social evolutionary notions “that all cultures follow unilinear and evolutionary stages of development.”¹¹ Infused with ideological notions of the “white man’s burden,” modernization theory linked the expansion of capitalist relations into nonstate, indigenous societies as a measure of progress. It was a self-congratulatory embrace of capitalist values and logic that legitimized the expansion of Western imperialist powers worldwide.

Modernization theory has had a lasting impact on development policy, shaping intellectual paradigms and policy initiatives well into the twentieth century.¹² Scholars and policy makers concluded that the “neoclassic modeling of economic behavior that described the logic of incentive, disincentive, and growth in the advanced West could also describe the logic of economic

backwardness and felicitous take-off in non-Western regions."¹³ Developing countries would have everything to gain and nothing to lose from following the example of the West. In fact, these theorists argued that clinging to those "archaic and outdated structures" kept American Indians poor and at the margins of the U.S. economy.¹⁴ Clearly ethnocentric and, at best, paternalistic, modernization theory shaped the foundations of American Indian policy from the development of the first boarding schools and reservation land allotments to the Indian New Deal and Termination.¹⁵ The central thread that connected these sometimes contradictory policies was that success, or, for that matter, survival within the capitalist economic system, required cultural change. Western society became synonymous with the "modern" and therefore was not only desirable but also the ultimate cultural destination on the road to economic development.

DEPENDENCY AND THE DISCOURSE OF DEVELOPMENT

Dependency theory emerged as a counterbalance to modernization theory as the debates over development and modernization were taking shape in the midst of the decolonization struggles in Africa and Latin America.¹⁶ Instead of viewing the inevitable capitalist transformation as a purveyor of prosperity, dependency theorists saw the extension of the capitalist economy to developing regions as one of the causes of poverty and cultural degradation.

Underdevelopment was more than an early stage of capitalist progress. Impoverished regions in the Third World were not just lagging behind the industrialized West. Borrowing from Latin American critics of dependency theory and incorporating the core-periphery concept, Andre Gunder Frank argued that capitalist development and underdevelopment were part of the same process. Coining the phrase "development of underdevelopment," he called for a global analysis of the historical development of capitalism, suggesting that capitalism's success hinged on the underdevelopment of peripheral countries. Feudal relationships in Latin America were a product of capitalist expansion, not a "backward" stage of economic development. Capitalist world markets had determined Latin American class relations ever since the Spanish arrived on American shores in the late fifteenth century.¹⁷

The use of dependency theory to explain Native American history in the United States has had extraordinary staying power for American scholars, activists, and officials.¹⁸ Drawing on the work of Latin Americanists and African scholars, dependency theory offered intellectuals, policy experts, and community activists an explanatory model for understanding why Native Americans

suffered such extreme poverty on Indian reservations in the United States. They found that, like African and Latin American peasants, American Indians suffered from a legacy of colonial exploitation. For example, dependency theorists argued that unequal trade restrictions between countries at the “core” and those in the “periphery” undermined the development of Latin American economies. Advanced capitalist countries siphoned the financial surplus from developing nations, preventing them from accumulating sufficient capital to develop an internal industrial base.

In 1971 anthropologist Joseph Jorgensen incorporated Frank’s dependency model to show that incorporation into the U.S. political economy created desperate economic conditions on Indian reservations. Writing against the functionalist paradigm, an anthropological approach primarily concerned with American Indian assimilation, Jorgensen stated that “Indian poverty does not represent an evolutionary stage of acculturation.” Contrary to what the functionalists assumed, incorporation into the U.S. market was not a solution. It was the root of the problem.¹⁹

Jorgensen described the relationship between the United States and American Indian communities as a history of super-exploitation. Drawing from Frank’s metropolis-satellite model, he applied his analysis of the relationship between developing nations and advanced industrial states to the relationship between the United States and its Native American environs. Jorgensen argued that “the conditions of the ‘backward’ modern American Indians are not due to rural isolation nor [to] a tenacious hold on aboriginal ways, but result from the way in which United States urban centers of finance, political influence, and power have grown in expense of rural areas.” The growth of the metropolis, Jorgensen explained, depended largely on the wealth farmers, ranchers, railroads, and mining companies expropriated from Indian lands. Although rural people of all races suffered from the underdevelopment of the countryside, Indians remained formally disenfranchised, under the tutelage of a bureaucratic system—“special neocolonial institutions such as tribal governments which exercise[d] only a modicum of control over their affairs.”²⁰

Historian Richard White, in his examination of how U.S. policies undermined Native American subsistence strategies, not only incorporated the broad dependency frameworks suggested by Frank and Jorgensen but also examined how “underdevelopment” impacted the land and indigenous cultural practices. Drawing from the work of anthropologists and other social scientists who were thinking about capitalist development and underdevelopment in the Third World, his work shows the existence of similar types of historical

dynamics in the United States. In the Navajo case, he argues that federal restrictions and non-Indian settlement patterns circumscribed Navajo land-use methods. Confiscation of livestock and enforcement of strict grazing limits undermined the subsistence base for many Navajo families and forced them into the wage labor market, into a dependency relationship with the federal government, or both.²¹

Dependency theory supplied an emerging Pan-Indian, nationalist movement with a fundamental explanation for what caused Native American impoverishment and connected that struggle with other liberation movements in the United States and abroad. But like nationalist discourse in general, it was rife with internal tensions and contradictions. As Partha Chatterjee has suggested, nationalist discourse both contests the “alleged inferiority of the colonized peoples” and asserts “that a backward nation could ‘modernize’ itself while retaining its cultural identity.” The result is a discursive trap. According to Chatterjee, nationalism “produced a discourse in which, even as it challenged the colonial claim to political domination, it also accepted the very intellectual premises of ‘modernity’ on which colonial domination was based.”²² By contesting the legitimacy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and demanding control over natural resources, the discourse of dependency and the discourse of development were two sides of the same coin. Activists and advocates demanded an end to super-exploitation but did not challenge the goal of capitalist development. The dependency paradigm provided a compelling set of political objectives, including control over land, political sovereignty, and a moral case for retribution, but it prohibited a discussion of alternative models of development. Scholars and activists then faced the prospect of choosing between “tradition,” which relegated culture to a timeless past, or “modernity,” a homogeneous future within the dominant capitalist society. The dichotomy is preserved, only in reverse as “romantic primitivism or crude nationalism.”²³

Scholars and policy specialists employing a dependency paradigm have revealed much about exploitation of indigenous people in the United States. Whereas the dependency paradigm offered insight into the structural causes of poverty on Indian reservations, universal assumptions about the relationship between capitalism and Native American culture embedded in that framework obscured the role of indigenous people in crafting alternative strategies or pathways of development. If capitalism required a specific set of historical experiences, including alienation from the land, dependence on wage labor, and a culture that valued individualism, then how could a people like the

Navajo create their own version of that system without losing all that was central to their cultural identity?

Even the noted anthropologist David Aberle, a strong advocate of Navajo rights and an expert in Navajo affairs, could not imagine alternatives that fell outside the parameters of the dependency paradigm. In 1969 he explained to the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress that "Navajo country is an underdeveloped area." According to Aberle, "[I]ts historical and current relations with the larger polity, economy and society" caused such impoverishment. Like the dependency experts designing programs that would allow Latin American countries to "catch up" to the more industrialized world, Aberle argued, federal policies deprived the Navajo of capital and needed serious reform.

With "a good deal of reflection on the condition of underdeveloped economies in the world today," he recounted how the BIA had underdeveloped the Navajo Reservation. First and foremost, the Navajos did not have "the capital or the know-how to achieve development." Second, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was in no position to help, since Congress and the states were unwilling to supply the agency with adequate funds. Finally, private industry had expressed little interest in investing in industrial development on the reservation.²⁴ Like development experts who were fashioning programs for the Third World, Aberle saw the Navajo economy as something that could be fixed to follow the well-worn path toward capitalist development. But much to his credit, Aberle knew Navajos themselves would determine the success of development efforts. Although he shared the view that the ultimate goal was industrialization, he believed the Navajos needed to control that process. Academics and specialists were there to offer the Navajo people their services, not to dictate policy. The Navajos should not be just part of a planning team, stressed Aberle: "The solution is for Navajos to plan for themselves, drawing on such advice as they wish, whether from the Bureau and other Federal agencies, Congressmen, universities, management consultants, private industry and whatever experts they need."²⁵

Aberle's perspective, although sensitive to Navajo cultural imperatives, fell well within the development discourse of the post-World War II era. Latin American anthropologist Arturo Escobar argues that development experts of that generation conceived of Third World "problems" in ways that suggested limited solutions. According to those scholars and policy specialists, Third World communities suffered from a lack of capital and insufficient industrialization. For these experts "[t]he only things that counted," according to Escobar, "were increased savings, growth rates, attracting foreign capital, developing

industrial capacity, and so on." This narrow discourse, then, prohibited alternative solutions that conceived of social change in egalitarian and culturally specific terms. Escobar concludes that this postwar climate preempted an analysis of economic development "as a whole life project, in which the material aspects would be not the goal and the limit but a space of possibilities for broader individual and collective endeavors, culturally defined."²⁶ Aberle's analysis and the solutions he proposed for improving economic conditions on the Navajo Reservation implied (like his counterparts described by Escobar who were devising plans for Latin America and Africa) a model of development measured by the "yardstick of Western progress."²⁷ That Aberle could at once critique the system he found responsible for the impoverished status of Indian reservations and yet find solutions for those problems within that same system demonstrates how this paradigm prevented alternative ways of thinking about the past, understanding current problems, and planning for the future.

Since the 1970s, cultural anthropologists and other social scientists studying Africa and Latin America have generally rejected modernization frameworks, but they have yet to reexamine their assumptions about modernity.²⁸ As William Roseberry and Jay O'Brien suggest, even scholars who are careful not to reproduce positivist paradigms still assign analytical categories that are only meaningful relative to a universal capitalist narrative. Thus, "traditional" only acquires meaning in relation to the modern; forms of exchange that do not conform to capitalist definitions are defined for what they are not. According to Roseberry and O'Brien, an analysis of "non-Western economics and politics . . . founders on the unrecognized use of capitalist categories or categories designed to illuminate Western capitalist life."²⁹ The traditional remains part of the unchanging past, and culture occupies a temporal space that exists outside of history. Modernity becomes the moment when history begins, and culture remains the product of precapitalist memory. Capitalist categories remain the historical benchmarks that define the significant moments, elements, and actors that bring about social change.

In the 1980s, Native American activists and scholars moved beyond the dependency paradigm to question Western-style industrialization—a goal all participants in the development discourse seemed to accept as a given. At the heart of the problem, according to Ward Churchill, were the assumptions about modernization that Marxists as well as liberal scholars had failed to examine. He argued that Marxists refused to consider issues that countered a positivist understanding of history, a perspective that saw industrialization as a necessary

step toward human liberation.³⁰ Churchill's comments condemned leftist scholars in the United States for applying "European ideology" to American history. He argued that American Marxists' inability to offer a satisfying analysis of Native American history centers on their refusal to accommodate questions of land, culture, and spirituality. Churchill found that a materialist approach, one that assumes a fundamental division between nature and culture, lacks explanatory depth for Native Americans. As he and other Native American leaders and scholars have suggested, many Native Americans have historically articulated a more holistic and cyclical vision of human relationships to the land and to the past.³¹ Churchill's critique echoes Escobar's analysis of the postwar development discourse. Because industrialization remains the final goal among Marxists as well as more conservative agency officials, alternatives that do not embrace an industrial worldview are shut out of the debate.

Critics have argued that world systems and dependency analysis tend to minimize the historical specificity of capitalist development. More important, they suggest, are the ways local historical dynamics shaped incorporation into the capitalist market, from the development of commercial markets to the creation of colonial labor systems. The ensuing debates over dependency theory, world systems, and mode of production analysis moved the literature on the colonial and developing world beyond the mechanistic formulas critics often characterized as teleological or economically deterministic.³² Scholars influenced by social history and anthropological methodology stressed the importance of scrutinizing the historical specificity of colonial expansion and the internal dynamics of "receiving" societies.³³

The problem is not necessarily with the concepts of the traditional and the modern but with the dichotomous manner in which they are employed. That dichotomy paints a picture of American Indian history in polar extremes, leaving very little room to act in ways that defy the rigid and static construct.³⁴ It is a false dichotomy for American Indians. They exist in a world where the two cultural categories fold into one another. So why not discard the categories once and for all? The notion of "tradition" as a cultural indicator of "difference" is primarily a Euro-American construct. Yet it would be wrong to discard these terms altogether, since the categories themselves have become important cultural markers for American Indians. "Modern" and "traditional" retained significant currency among native communities throughout the twentieth century. Asserting their "traditional" rights has become a significant strategy for American Indian communities as they struggle over decolonization. Navajos who have resisted relocation at Big Mountain since 1974 serve as a relatively

recent example of American Indians' political use of "tradition." Their spiritual and cultural strategies powerfully frame their opposition to relocation in ways that endow them with moral authority and symbolize the essence of Navajo-ness. Part of their efforts has included documenting sacred places to support claims to the land under the 1978 American Indian Religious Freedom Act. Although Indian activists have insisted that this law is ineffective, it has provided Big Mountain residents with some strategic advantage and postponed relocation, at least for the near future. Setting aside those terms ignores the ways American Indians have engaged those concepts, a process that at times amounts to a dynamic history of cultural reinvention.³⁵

Asserting the "traditional" as a political strategy or as an alternative way of living and seeing the world has had measured success in forcing the U.S. and Canadian governments to cede physical and epistemological terrain to native peoples.³⁶ As Chris Paci and Lisa Krebs demonstrate in their insightful discussion of traditional ecological knowledge in this volume, indigenous peoples, in Canada in particular, are shaping development policies in their homelands by insisting on access to their land and meaningful incorporation of their perspectives into conservation measures. Native peoples are asserting the value of local knowledge in land-use planning, as well as the importance of decentering notions of conservation and other concepts about nature steeped in Western scientific tradition.

Despite the efforts of some American Indian communities to evoke "tradition" in their struggles to gain political rights and power over land and resources, their frame of reference remains a kind of universalized modernity, a development discourse that emerged out of nineteenth-century economic theory and policy applications that were devastating to American Indian existence. Whereas asserting "tradition" may be a useful resistance strategy, a way to maintain cultural and economic sovereignty and to counterbalance the impact of colonialism on American Indian culture, the modern/traditional dichotomy nonetheless remains problematic for those concerned about issues of culture and economic development. Some scholars have addressed this issue by examining the ways subaltern groups have evoked "imagined and archaic pasts" as a strategy to resist modernizing forces.³⁷ But is it enough to view indigenous cultures as socially constructed within modernizing contexts or to see cultural traditions as constituting "imagined communities"? Roseberry and O'Brien argue that seeing the "natural as historical" or the "traditional as modern" merely preserves the dichotomous paradigm. Rather, they contend "that there have been a variety of modern tracks toward the traditional [so]

that with the construction of different household economies, different ethnicities, and so on, the (combined and uneven) development of the modern world has created worlds of social, economic, and cultural difference."³⁸ Tradition and modernity are expressions of "difference" rather than historical benchmarks that distinguish a particular community's place in time. Indigenous peoples have developed new traditions in modernizing contexts and in the process have contested the terms of modernity itself. These efforts are not necessarily conservative rejections of capitalist change. In some cases American Indian communities have embraced capitalist forms. Yet as the chapters in this volume show, they have done so in ways that cultivate and support their traditional ways, demonstrating that many paths to capitalist development might exist.

UNIVERSALIZED MODERNITY

Modernity is a culturally specific, historical construct, yet the concept remains stubbornly reified as some sort of natural historical phenomenon. As Joseph Gusfield described in 1967, "We cannot easily separate modernity and tradition from some *specific* tradition and some *specific* modernity, some version which functions ideologically as a directive. The modern comes to the traditional society as a particular culture with its own traditions."³⁹ The use of universal categories of capitalist development defines a particular kind of historical narrative. Theoretical paradigms that posit subsistence ways of life against proletarian experiences and the traditional versus the modern render historically invisible economic systems that do not fit within those dualistic parameters. Recognizing the coexistence of modernity and tradition within the same historical time and space and refusing to think of culture as purely a terrain of resistance reveals a much more complicated and compelling story. As historian Kathy Walker suggests from her study of Chinese peasants, "Alternative pasts indicate a counter-appropriation of history that simply cannot be reduced to a logic of capitalist development or universalized modernity. They must be explained on their own terms."⁴⁰ Reaching for historical specificity does not mean ignoring the bigger picture or abandoning the work of capitalist theory. On the contrary, moving beyond the "discourse of development," to use Arturo Escobar's term, means creating new theoretical models to help make sense out of the multiple histories that are bound to emerge once we remove the paradigmatic blinders.

American historians can learn a great deal from scholars studying the ways rural peoples in the Third World have shaped and been shaped by capitalist

development. Peasant and subaltern studies scholars have chipped away at assumptions that had previously characterized peasant societies as undifferentiated, or “traditional,” and peasant uprisings as reactive and conservative. In effect, they opened Marx’s “sack of potatoes” to look inside. What they found were complex societies divided along wealth, gender, and age hierarchies and united by kinship and other socially constructed identities. Third World social scientists found that peasants, a social category once defined as “precapitalist,” existed within capitalist structures as well as on the periphery of the world system. These scholars wondered how the internal dynamics of peasant cultures mediated their interactions with the world economy, how they resisted absorption into the capitalist market, as well as how they accommodated to it. This type of scholarship produced a nuanced view that expanded definitions of resistance beyond collective uprising and revolution to oppositional popular culture, nationalism, gender antagonism, and subtle subversion encoded in “hidden transcripts.”⁴¹ Still, revealing the agency of historical actors does not necessarily shed light on the power structures within which they operate. However, these types of studies revealed how complex the dance between power structures and historical agents can be.⁴²

NATIVE PATHWAYS: COMMERCIAL INCORPORATION

The capitalist market has taken its toll on American Indian communities, particularly since incorporation has usually meant a devastating loss of land and other natural resources—elements of central economic and cultural significance. Yet the way indigenous communities recovered in the twentieth century shows a creative engagement with the market. By contesting the terms of incorporation, either as laborers or as tribal capitalists, American Indians are challenging the cultural assumptions of modernity itself.

Native Pathways reflects much of the exciting scholarship done by Third World scholars since the mid-1980s. This volume helps to flesh out what historian Florencia Mallon has described as “that skeleton historians call the development of capitalism.” She examines how Andean peasants used “traditional relationships” to shape their villages’ transition to a capitalist economy, and in the process those “weapons of the weak” transformed the villagers and their communities.⁴³ Paul Rosier’s chapter on Blackfeet oil leasing demonstrates the importance of understanding the “culture of political economy” implicit in the incorporation of indigenous societies into the capitalist market economy. Even though American Indians do not dictate the terms of their incorporation, they may in fact shape its impact. For example, Rosier shows that the revenue

earned from oil leasing did not necessarily subvert Blackfeet culture. Instead, tribal members incorporated it into their established cultural practices, such as giveaways, which helped to “mitigate against incipient class conflict” through a redistribution of tribal income. Cultural practices changed, but they remained no less Blackfeet in their reincarnation.

Whereas cultural practices might temper the effects of incorporation, Tressa Berman describes ways informal women’s networks served as a buffer against the surrounding capitalist market, helping to “spread the risks of survival across households.” American Indian women on the Fort Berthold Reservation intermixed their production for the market with ceremonial use so that those realms have become interdependent. Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara women pooled resources such as commodity food issued by the federal government, wages, or star quilts and redistributed them for ceremonial purposes or to aid kin who were in need. As a result, Berman states, “[in] both their structural adaptation and their community-based resistance the core cultural life remains intact, such that new strategies emerge from the maintenance of traditional practices.”

David Arnold’s chapter on Tlingit fishermen describes a similar cultural dynamic. Although development of a commercial salmon industry in southeastern Alaska drew Tlingits into the market economy, it did not necessarily undermine their subsistence practices. Indeed, customary fishing traditions and seasonal cannery work allowed Tlingits to retain some autonomy from the market. And like the Blackfeet, the revenue they earned in the commercial market and from wages in the canneries could be redistributed through ceremonial activities and community feasts.

David La Vere’s analysis of the Kiowa-Comanche-Apache Business Committee in the early twentieth century shows a similar use of “tradition” to build, protect, and enhance tribal resources. In this example, kinship obligations remained central to the goals of the Business Committee “as a way of navigating the white man’s road.” In this vein, the council developed a process of adopting people into the tribes—a well-worn tradition among the Comanche and the Kiowa—as a way to build tribal membership and resources. Jeffrey Shepherd’s history of the Hualapai describes a similar dynamic. Like the wealthier peasants Mallon describes in Yanamarca Valley, who drew on their influence at the village level to fashion a system of wage-based, commercial agricultural from a kinship-based system, participation in the market economy as labor contractors provided Hualapai elites with a new avenue of power and prestige. According to Shepherd, incorporation into the market economy actu-

ally encouraged tribal cohesion and strengthened Hualapai identity instead of eroding it.⁴⁴

The history of American Indians' relationship to the developing capitalist market involves multiple strands of analysis. Although it is important to think about how Indians responded to the cultural and economic demands of incorporation and how they fashioned strategies that rejected the incipient cultural logic of twentieth-century capitalism, the more compelling story involves the new institutions they created out of the conflict. Duane Champagne's chapter raises these issues in important ways. As he suggests, although American Indians formed tribal governments under pressure from the federal government, those tribal councils did not always behave in the ways the federal government had hoped. He argues that in fact, many "[t]ribal governments continue to operate within the holistic orientations of native community life. Unlike U.S. society, institutional relations among economy, community, kinship, and politics are not separated." For example, whereas the federal government created many of the modern tribal councils in an effort to extract valuable natural resources such as oil, timber, or other resources Western capitalists coveted, the tribal councils became something else indeed. Champagne's examples show that American Indians embraced capitalism yet developed a system that embodies native values. As American Indians have been drawn into the capitalist economy, they have also been able to transform the institutions originally intended to control and exploit them.

Jessica Cattelino's and Nicolas Rosenthal's chapters on gaming offer interesting examples of what tribal capitalism looks like. Although American Indian sovereignty and the morality of gaming dominate the public debate, how and why those operations are "different" from the gaming establishments in Las Vegas or Atlantic City are often overlooked. Yet as Cattelino and Rosenthal demonstrate, American Indians have crafted a new pathway of development. For the most part, American Indians have crafted capitalist endeavors that redistribute and redirect profits for community benefit. The success of gaming is unparalleled. However, these chapters show that gaming did not emerge in a vacuum. The Seminoles and the southern California tribes developed gaming enterprises as one in a long line of development initiatives.

NATIVE PATHWAYS: LABOR

Rethinking "modernity" also means reexamining standard notions of class. For some scholars the historical development of a working class is the foundation on which capitalism rests. It is a historically complex process, one labor historians

have been debating for decades. On a basic level, a working class develops when economic and political forces transform people into workers, a population that has nothing but its labor to sell to make a living. This historical process distinguishes "class" from other forms of coerced labor, and capitalism from other types of economic systems. The debate in labor history centers on how and when workers understand their fate and what they do with that knowledge.

Much of labor history has focused on the development of "class identity," a collective self-perception workers derive from their common experiences on the shop floor. This model for understanding "class" is particularly limiting, since it privileges the industrial, waged workplace and imposes a historically specific construct on populations for whom it may not be particularly relevant. And according to this definition, American Indians and other workers who move in and out of the workforce and who may perform labor that is marginal to the "shop floor" fall outside the definition of "class" and, by extension, exist beyond the realm of modernity.

Other labor historians turn to "culture" to explain the development of class identity. This paradigm assumes a contradiction between "culture," or "old-world ways," and the demands of the "modern" workplace.⁴⁵ At first glance this seems to provide a possible way to bring American Indians into the narrative. But this approach tends to reproduce the modern/traditional dichotomy that freezes American Indian culture in the preindustrial past. Since cultural practices that contradict a capitalist worldview not only persist but may be created by capitalist development, a paradigm that equates culture with a precapitalist existence cannot accommodate the persistence of American Indian tradition within the framework of an industrialized economy. Furthermore, privileging culture tends to neglect the role of trade unions and the shop floor, conflates class with ethnic and racial identity, and thereby obscures class divisions and other hierarchies that may divide ethnic communities.

Feminist labor historians offer insights into class that might prove instructive to those exploring the issue of wage work among American Indian communities. The use of gender as an analytical category has encouraged historians to think about class in radical new ways. As Alice Kessler-Harris argues, we "must lay siege to the central paradigm of labor history," namely, we must

challenge the notion that paid work, as a fundamentally male activity, inevitably reproduces itself in a closed system in which men derive their identity from the process of production (and then reproduce themselves by training other men), while women act in the household and in the workplace as the handmaids of the male reproductive system.⁴⁶

The shop floor paradigm not only excludes women from the defining experience from which workers derive their class identities, it also marginalizes others who are not permanent wage workers. Since working-class women, both white and American Indian, may not fit the "shop" floor criteria, their experience of class remains at best derivative of male industrial workers' history or at worst invisible. American Indian men are as marginal to the industrial formula as are white women and women of color. And as a result their story remains similarly obscure.

Other lines of inquiry might explore the impact of wage work on American Indian ideas and social practices that define men's and women's gendered social worlds. Yet gendered relationships take on different meanings in varying cultural and historical contexts. So the gender impact of wage work might mean something very different for American Indian households than it does for non-Indian communities. For example, in the Navajo's "matricentric" culture, a man's identity may be closely linked to how well he attends to his mother's or his wife's needs, and, as a result, he may remain somewhat ambivalent to the demands and rewards of the wage labor market. In this case women retain a great deal of power and respect regardless of the increasing lure of the wage economy.⁴⁷

More work needs to be done on the issues of gender and class in American Indian communities. Scholars have ignored the history of American Indian women workers, leaving a great deal of empirical work to be completed, particularly for the twentieth century. Historians and anthropologists have explored gender in American Indian communities in some depth, but not within a class context.⁴⁸ Several chapters in this volume examine the role of women in reservation economies, a contribution to the field that serves as a significant starting point. For example, the Navajo women in Kathy M'Closkey's chapter were not actively involved in the wage labor market, yet their work contributed significantly to the Navajo household economy. Navajo women made important economic decisions in which they found ways to deal with the drop in the global wool market by weaving wool into rugs rather than selling it unprocessed. They could get a much higher price for the finished product. Those decisions, according to M'Closkey, inadvertently provided traders with a buffer from the volatile wool market, an advantage they did not necessarily pass on to the weavers.

An examination of the division between the sacred and the secular might yield significant insights on the gendered work experience of American Indians. Severing the secular from the sacred obfuscates the cultural significance

of economic behavior, or, as Berman terms it, the “ceremonial relations of production” in American Indian life. Much of that is women’s work. M’Closkey shows that Navajo women’s work has largely been ignored, both as a source of income for Navajo families and in the central role it has played in maintaining Navajo cultural identity. Characterizing Navajo weavers’ work as secular fails to acknowledge the cultural significance of the work itself and, as M’Closkey suggests, furthers the notion that pre-trading post-era rugs—rugs that supposedly remain untainted by the traders’ edict or the demands of non-Indian consumers—are more culturally “authentic.”

To understand cultural production and to fully comprehend indigenous people’s experience with wage work, we need to think about questions not often addressed by labor historians. For example, how do American Indian households or kinship networks shape the meaning of work, for themselves as well as their employers? Or, how have cultural practices influenced Indian performance of work, when and where they work, and for how long? How do reservation communities and nonreservation workplaces exist within a larger universe of “making a living”? How have federal, state, and tribal governments participated in “creating” wage work for American Indians? Other issues worth exploring include examining the relation of wage work to sovereignty questions.⁴⁹ For example, how have tribal governments regulated labor relations on their reservation lands? Have federal labor laws threatened the rights of tribal governments to govern?

Research on American Indian definitions of work might yield conclusions similar to what Keletso Atkins found in Natal, South Africa. In one rich case she examined the stereotype of the “lazy Kafir” and found that, contrary to British Colonial impressions, the Zulu had developed a strong work ethic. From their experience performing agricultural labor in their own village communities, they defined a fair day’s work as beginning at sunup and ending at sundown, and they kept track of their wages and workdays on a lunar cycle. British officials who attempted to impose rationalized time regimes were dismayed when the workers demanded: “The moon is dead! Give us our money!” Those officials who did not conform or at least adjust to the Zulu work ethic were subject to labor shortages.⁵⁰ Like the British Colonial officials who wanted to ensure they would have a supply of laborers in Natal, South Africa, employers of American Indian laborers have had to adjust to their workers’ cultural demands in order to get their crops picked, their railroads cleared, and their coal mined.⁵¹

To search for answers to these questions means moving away from a concept of universalized modernity. The place where “modernity” and “tradi-

tion" overlap most dramatically is in the commodification of American Indian culture. Much has been written about the exploitive relationship between non-Indian consumers and Indian producers, including studies that explore the impact of tourism on American Indian cultural expressions and the creation and consumption of the colonial "exotic."⁵² Contributors to *Native Pathways* look at this issue from the artists' perspective, as a way to make a living. Since the collecting of Native American cultural objects began, non-Indians have bemoaned the impact of commercial interests on American Indians, preserving the primitive in all its imagined innocence. As Cattelino suggests, the demand for authentic Indian artistic expression assumes a fundamental notion that culture is a thing that can be tarnished. When we look at the issue from the perspective of the American Indian artist or performer, it is much more complicated. As Clyde Ellis points out, "[D]ancing for pay revealed that the relationship between victimization and agency rested on complex negotiations and mediations in which an either/or paradigm had little meaning." Jessica Cattelino's study shows how producing cultural artifacts and wrestling alligators, although rooted in the tourist industry, provided cohesiveness to the Seminole culture. And although gaming infused the Seminole Nation with significant capital, Seminoles do not see those enterprises as defining their cultural production. Dancing for five dollars a day, making sweetgrass baskets, or wrestling alligators may seem exotic to the non-Indian consumer, but from the perspective of the workers they were meaningful ways to make a living—ones that strengthened rather than eroded their cultural identities.

This is not to say that wage work did not profoundly affect American Indian communities. The kinds of jobs available to American Indians, such as railroad, agricultural, and domestic labor, usually required them to leave their reservation communities for extended periods. The absence of loved ones, the migration experience, and the dependence on wages rather than subsistence strategies influenced Indian communities in ways we are just beginning to understand.⁵³ William Bauer's work on Round Valley demonstrates that working for wages was a mixed experience for American Indians. Employers reinforced stereotyped notions of "Indianness," which fortified the racialized labor market. Yet American Indian workers used their wages to strengthen their distinct Indian identities. Brian Hosmer's work adds an even more complicated picture to the narrative. Instead of migrating off the reservation to enter the world of wage labor, in Hosmer's chapter wage work came to them. Working for the Civilian Conservation Corps introduced many American Indians to wage work for the first time in the U.S. West. For American

Indians living on the Wind River Reservation, going to work for the Civilian Conservation Corps meant entering into a lifetime of wage work. Hosmer's interviews with Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho elders show that the memories of those experiences continued to shape American Indian cultural and class identities.

These chapters do more than fill in the gaps in existing American Indian scholarship; they challenge the very categories we use to define our questions. Writing about capitalist development in a way that includes American Indians as historical agents requires pushing past the discourse of development to incorporate multiple perspectives. Those histories raise many questions about the role of indigenous peoples in the history of capitalism, as well as about the nature of that economic system itself, and provide insights American Indian communities will likely find useful. These case studies demonstrate that American Indians have found creative ways to engage that "modern world," and the complexity of their experience defies the static dichotomy of "modernity" and "tradition." Their stories provide the vehicle for understanding modernity, in all its complex forms. Like Simon in *The Lone Ranger and Tonto Fistfight in Heaven*, driving forward in reverse may not alter the road's destination, but the travelers themselves make the journey meaningful. As Jimmy Many Horses concluded, "[W]hen you trust a man you also have to trust his horse."⁵⁴

NOTES

1. Sherman Alexie, "The Appropriate Size of My Favorite Tumor," in *The Lone Ranger and Tonto Fistfight in Heaven* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1994), 156.

2. Broderick H. Johnson, ed., *Stories of Traditional Navajo Life and Culture* (Tsaile, Navajo Nation, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1977).

3. A full discussion of modernity, including its numerous manifestations in art, literature, and architecture, is beyond the scope of this essay. In this chapter I am primarily concerned with how the social, economic, and political assumptions of the concept have shaped underlying notions about American Indian history and the implications of that thinking for federal Indian policy.

4. David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 12–13.

5. Eric R. Wolf, *Envisioning Power: Ideologies of Dominance and Crisis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 25–28.

6. *Ibid.*, 25.

7. Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989); Frederick E. Hoxie, *Parading Through History: The Making of the Crow Nation, 1805–1935* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 2.

8. David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (New York: Verso, 1991).

9. Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, 12.

10. For an insightful analysis of the politics of anthropology and anthropologists' involvement in development policy in the postwar era, see Thomas C. Patterson, *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States* (New York: Berg, 2001), 105–123.

11. Kathy Le Mons Walker, *Chinese Modernity and the Peasant Path: Semicolonialism in the Northern Yangtze Delta* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 255.

12. Brian C. Hosmer, *American Indians in the Marketplace: Persistence and Innovation Among the Menominees and Metlakatians, 1870–1920* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999), 7–9; Thomas D. Hall, "Patterns of Native American Incorporation into State Societies," in *Public Policy Impacts on American Indian Economic Development*, ed. C. Matthew Snipp (Albuquerque: Institute for Native American Development, University of New Mexico, 1988), 23–38; David E. Wilkins, "Modernization, Colonialism, Dependency: How Appropriate Are These Models for Providing an Explanation of North American Indian 'Underdevelopment'?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16 (July 1993): 390–419.

13. Frederick Cooper, Allen F. Isaacman, Florencia E. Mallon, William C. Roseberry, and Steve J. Stern, *Confronting Historical Paradigms: Peasants, Labor, and the Capitalist World System in Africa and Latin America* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993), 12.

14. Hosmer, *American Indians in the Marketplace*, 8.

15. *Ibid.* Scholars such as Robert Berkhofer and Fred Hoxie, who have done extensive studies on the impact of federal assimilationist efforts on American Indians, make similar points about Eurocentric notions of progress and civilization. Robert Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian From Columbus to the Present* (New York: Knopf, 1978); Fred Hoxie, *The Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880–1920* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984). For an overview of modernization theory and American Indians, see Wilkins, "Modernization, Colonialism, Dependency," 390–419; Hosmer, *American Indians in the Marketplace*, 8–13.

16. Stern et al., *Confronting Historical Paradigms*, 12.

17. André Gunder Frank, "The Development of Underdevelopment," in *Dependence and Underdevelopment: Latin America's Political Economy*, ed. James D. Cockcroft, André Gunder Frank, and Dale L. Johnson (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1972), 3–17. For an intellectual history of the dependency theory debates, see David Goodman and Michael Redclift, *From Peasant to Proletarian: Capitalist Development and Agrarian Transitions* (New York: St. Martin's, 1982), 24–67, and Joseph Love, "The Origins of Dependency Analysis," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 22 (February 1990): 143–168.

18. One of the most notable examples of dependency theory in American Indian history is Richard White, *The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change Among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983). For policy applications, see, for example, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Navajo Nation: An American Colony* (Washington, DC: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, September 1975). Other writers who examine how colonial models apply to Native American history include Vicki Page, "Reservation Development in the U.S.: Peripherality in the Core," in *Native American Resurgence and Renewal: A Reader and Bibliography*, ed. Robert N. Wells Jr. (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1994), 354–388; Lawrence D. Weiss, *The Development of Capitalism in the Navajo Nation: A Political-Economic History* (Minneapolis: MEP Publications, 1984); Cardell K. Jacobson, "Internal Colonialism and Native Americans: Indian Labor in the United States from 1871 to World War II," *Social Science Quarterly* 65 (1984): 158–171; Gary C. Anders, "Theories of Underdevelopment and the American Indian," *Journal of Economic Issues* 14 (September 1980): 681–701;

Joseph Jorgensen and Richard O. Clemmer et al., *Native Americans and Energy Development* (Cambridge: Anthropology Resource Center, 1978); Joseph Jorgensen, "Indians and the Metropolis," in *American Indian in Urban Society*, ed. Jack O. Waddell and O. Michael Wilson (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971), 66–113; Joseph Jorgensen, *Oil Age Eskimos* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

19. Joseph Jorgensen's critique in "Indians and the Metropolis," 84. Functionalism dominated anthropological research on Native Americans in the 1950s and 1960s and tended to reinforce federal policy that favored the termination of Indian reservations. Anthropologists employing this paradigm generally favored Native American acculturation of dominant American values and behavior. They conducted various studies that explored Native American adaptations to urban contexts, including how they transcended cultural "obstacles" that prevented their full incorporation into non-Indian communities. Also see Brian Hosmer's explanation of functionalism in his PhD dissertation, "Experiments in Capitalism: Market Economics, Wage Labor and Social Change Among the Menominees and Metlakahtlans, 1860–1920" (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1993), 14.

20. Jorgensen, "Indians and the Metropolis," 85.

21. White, *The Roots of Dependency*.

22. Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World—A Derivative Discourse* (London: Zed, 1986), 30. Thanks to Kathy Le Mons Walker for leading me back to Chatterjee's work.

23. William Roseberry and Jay O'Brien, *Golden Ages/Dark Ages: Reimagining the Past in Anthropology and History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 10.

24. David Aberle, "A Plan for Navajo Economic Development," in *Toward Economic Development for Native American Communities: A Compendium of Papers Submitted to the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969), 237.

25. *Ibid.*, 250.

26. Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), 83.

27. *Ibid.*

28. For a brief description of modernization theory, see Stern et al., *Confronting Historical Paradigms*, 11.

29. Roseberry and O'Brien, *Golden Ages/Dark Ages*, 3.

30. Ward Churchill, "Introduction: Journeying Toward a Debate," in *Marxism and Native Americans*, ed. Ward Churchill (Boston: South End, 1983), 14.

31. George Cornell, "Native American Perceptions of the Environment," in *Buried Roots and Indestructible Seeds: The Survival of American Indian Life in Story, History, and Spirit*, ed. Mark A. Lindquist and Martin Zanger (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993), 21–41; Winona LaDuke, "Natural and Synthetic and Back Again," in *Marxism and Native Americans*, ed. Ward Churchill (Boston: South End, 1983), i–iix; Russell Lawrence Barsh, "Contemporary Marxist Theory and Native American Reality," *American Indian Quarterly* 12 (Summer 1988): 205.

32. Frederick Cooper, Allen F. Isaacman, Florencia E. Mallon, William C. Roseberry, and Steve J. Stern, *Confronting Historical Paradigms*.

33. Steve Stern, "Feudalism, Capitalism and the World System in the Perspective of Latin America and the Caribbean," *American Historical Review* 93 (October 1988): 829–872.

34. David Rich Lewis, "Reservation Leadership and the Progressive-Traditional Dichotomy: William Wash and the Northern Utes, 1865–1928," *Ethnohistory* 38 (Spring 1991): 141.

35. James Treat, "Intertribal Traditionalism and the Religious Roots of Red Power," in *Native American Spirituality: A Critical Reader*, ed. Lee Irwin (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), 270–294.

36. Contemporary American Indian activists have often framed their struggles over fishing rights, against relocation, and for the preservation of sacred landscapes in terms of "tradition." See, for example, Hopi, Lakota, and Wintu efforts to preserve sacred lands chronicled in the film by Christopher McLeod and presented by the Independent Television Service and Native American Public Telecommunications, *In the Light of Reverence* (Oley, PA: Bullfrog Films, 2001); also see Winona LaDuke, *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life* (Cambridge: South End Press, 1999).

37. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983); Terrence Ranger and Eric Hobsbaum, *The Invention of Tradition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

38. Roseberry and O'Brien, *Golden Ages/Dark Ages*, 11.

39. Joseph R. Gusfield, "Tradition and Modernity: Misplaced Polarities in the Study of Social Change," *American Journal of Sociology* 72 (January 1967): 361.

40. Walker, *Chinese Modernity and the Peasant Path*, 4.

41. Drawing from Marx's treatment of the French peasantry in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Marxists have often portrayed peasants as conservative or backward, without revolutionary potential. But with the renewed interest in peasants kindled by the Vietnam War, Third World scholars consistently challenged that characterization. For example, see the body of literature inspired by Eric Wolf's *Peasants* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966) and his *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), as well as Teodor Shanin, ed., *Peasant and Peasant Societies* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987); James Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990). See, for example, Stephen Vlastos's treatment of the ideology and popular culture of Japanese peasants in *Peasant Protests and Uprisings in Tokugawa Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986) and the writings of the "subaltern group," in particular Partha Chatterjee, "More on Modes of Power and the Peasantry," in *Selected Subaltern Studies*, ed. Ranagit Guha and Gayatri C. Spivak (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 351–390.

42. See Wolf, *Envisioning Power*, 1–15. Richard G. Fox and Orin Starn, *Between Resistance and Revolution: Cultural Politics and Social Protest* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997).

43. Florencia Mallon, *The Defense of Community in Peru's Central Highlands: Peasant Struggle and Capitalist Transformation, 1860–1940* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983), xi.

44. Peter Iverson makes a similar case for the impact of the Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act in *The Navajo Nation* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1981), 56.

45. See the Gutman/Montgomery debate derived from the classic works, Herbert Gutman, *Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America* (New York: Vintage, 1976); David Montgomery, *The Fall of the House of Labor* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

46. Alice Kessler-Harris, "Treating the Male as 'Other': Redefining the Parameters of Labor History," *Labor History* 34 (Spring–Summer 1993): 195.

47. On the concept of "matricentric," see Marsha Weisiger, "Diné Bikéyah: Environment, Cultural Identity, and Gender in Navajo Country" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 2000); Colleen O'Neill, *Making a Living and Working Elsewhere: Navajo Workers in the Twentieth Century* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, forthcoming).

48. Laura F. Klein and Lillian A. Ackerman, *Women and Power in Native North America* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995); Nancy Shoemaker, *Negotiators of Change: Historical Perspectives on Native American Women* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

49. Robert B. Campbell, "Newlands, Old Lands: Native American Labor, Agrarian Ideology, and the Progressive-Era State in the Making of the Reclamation Project, 1902–1926," *Pacific Historical Review* 71 (May 2002): 203–238; Rolf Knight, *Indians at Work: An Informal History of Native American Labour in British Columbia, 1858–1930* (Vancouver: New Star, 1978); Daniel L. Boxberger, "In and Out of the Labor Force: The Lummi Indians and the Development of the Commercial Salmon Fishery of North Puget Sound, 1880–1900," *Ethnohistory* 35 (1988): 161–190; Albert Hurtado, "Hardly a Farmhouse or a Kitchen Without Them: Indian and White Households on the California Borderland Frontier, 1860," *Western Historical Quarterly* 13 (1982): 245–270; Joseph Mitchell, "Mohawks in High Steel," in *Apologies to the Iroquois*, ed. Edmund Wilson (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1959), 1–36; Martha Knack and Alice Littlefield, *Native Americans and Wage Labor: Ethnohistorical Perspectives* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996); Hosmer, *American Indians in the Marketplace*.

50. Keletso Atkins, *The Moon Is Dead! Give Us Our Money!: The Cultural Origins of an African Work Ethic, Natal, South Africa, 1843–1900* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1993), 78–98. Atkins's approach is reminiscent of June Nash's work on Bolivian tin miners. See June Nash, *We Eat the Mines, and the Mines Eat Us: Dependency and Exploitation in Bolivian Tin Mines* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979).

51. Colleen O'Neill, "Navajo Workers and White Man's Ways: Negotiating the World of Wage Labor, 1930–1972" (PhD diss., Rutgers University, 1997).

52. Molly H. Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace: Gender, Art, and Value in the American Southwest* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001); Laurie Ann Whitt, "Cultural Imperialism and the Marketing of Native America," in *Contemporary Native American Cultural Issues*, ed. Duane Champagne (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 1999), 169–192; L. G. Moses, *Wild West Shows* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996); Phil Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

53. Knack and Littlefield, *Native Americans and Wage Labor*; Colleen O'Neill, "The 'Making' of the Navajo Worker: Navajo Households, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Off Reservation Wage Work, 1948–1960," *New Mexico Historical Review* 74 (October 1999): 375–405.

54. Alexie, "The Appropriate Size of My Favorite Tumor," 156.