

A Conversation with William F. Deverell, Damon B. Akins, and William J. Bauer Jr., about *We Are the Land*

A History of Native California

EDITOR'S NOTE: WHAT follows is an extended review, by William F. Deverell, of a new book by Damon B. Akins and William J. Bauer Jr., *We Are the Land: A History of Native California* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2021). We shared Deverell's review with the authors, who in turn share their responses with us below. Because we imagined this as a conversation, the authors' responses are woven throughout the review.

WILLIAM F. DEVERELL (WFD):

Without setting out to do so, I think this book reclaims a genre of historical writing. "Handbook" has a complicated history as a description of interpretive approach to, or toolkit for, a particular topic. The term carries a whiff of colonial baggage, as if the handbook compilation is what the explorer is expected to carry into lands foreign and confusing. Native Americans and Native American history have been "handbooked" frequently and regularly, and it would be a good scholarly exercise to line them up over time and study their execution, perspective, impact, and legacy.

California History, Vol. 98, Number 3, pp. 108–118, ISSN 0162-2897, electronic ISSN 2327-1485. © 2021 by the Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Reprints and Permissions web page, <https://www.ucpress.edu/journals/reprintspermissions>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/ch.2021.98.3.108>.

Having noted a caution, I think the term can yet be useful and reimagined, as with books such as this one. In short, this is a superb handbook to Indigenous California history: weighty, as thought-provoking as thoughtful, valuable in contemplating a topic too often hopped over in this or that investigation of California's past, present, or future. It has none of that implicit or explicit posturing of other, literal "Handbooks" that leaned toward ethnographic "othering" of Indigenous people, Californian or otherwise.

I will take my students, undergraduate and graduate, immediately to this book. I will draw upon its contributions, findings, and arguments for my courses and research. It has made me think. It strikes an even, thoughtful tone. It is well written and accessible across levels of knowledge and background.

DAMON B. AKINS (DBA):

The work that ultimately became *We Are the Land* began in 1997, when I started teaching high school social studies in the east San Fernando Valley. More than 90 percent of the school's student population was Latinx. The overwhelming majority of those students were born in Mexico, El Salvador, or Guatemala, or could trace their ancestry back to one of those places within one generation. The school was awash in various forms of indigeneity—in the popular culture, the murals, the curriculum, and the students themselves—yet, despite the fact that we were only a ten-minute drive from Mission San Fernando, I saw no visible presence of Tataviam, Tongva, or any Native Californians in the curriculum.

Since then, I've spent a lot of time thinking about why that was. State curriculum standards relegated *California* history to elementary school, and *California Indians* to the Spanish and Mexican period—they largely disappear from the curriculum with the gold rush and statehood. New *History–Social Science Content Standards for California Public Schools*, adopted in 1998, and a revised *History–Social Science Framework* adopted in 2016, addressed the *portrayal* of California Indians, especially in the Mexican period, but not their disappearance from the twentieth century, save for a critical (though insufficient) "and they are still here" addendum to lessons on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Our goal in writing *We Are the Land* was to provide a narrative that would help restore that erased past.

WILLIAM J. BAUER JR. (WJB):

In reading William Deverell's review of *We Are the Land*, I contemplated his discussion of handbooks. Initially, I did not know how to respond to Deverell's comment, but it struck me as important, since he began his lengthy and thoughtful review by ruminating on handbooks, their colonial legacies and usefulness. I looked at my bookshelf and saw the Smithsonian Institution's *Handbook of North American Indians*, edited by anthropologist Robert Heizer.¹ Gold script highlights "Volume 8: California" against a red stripe across the largely gray front cover, back, and spine. I then recalled another handbook: Alfred Kroeber's *Handbook of the Indians of California*.² Anyone who teaches California or California Indian history probably has, at one time, pulled one or both of these books off the shelf and flipped through to find a bit of information. Deverell's statement, though, made me consider how handbooks influenced *We Are the Land* and the ways that people teach California Indian history.

As Damon and I began to write *We Are the Land*, we recognized the dearth of surveys of California Indian history. Two major works of Indigenous scholars, *Native Americans of California and Nevada* by Renape-Lenape scholar Jack Forbes and *Natives of the Golden State: The California Indians* by (Cahuilla) Rupert Costo and (Cherokee) Jeannette Henry Costo, stand alongside George Harwood Phillips's *The Enduring Struggle: Indians in California History* as the existing overviews of California Indian history most likely to be consulted, along with Heizer's and Kroeber's handbooks.³

Still, the aforementioned books have limitations. First, all were published before 1995, which makes them difficult for instructors to find and use. Second, the books give only cursory coverage to the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Luiseño-Cahuilla scholar Ed Castillo contributed two essays on California Indian history and political movements in the twentieth century to the *Handbook of North American Indians: California*.⁴ Still, the bulk of the book describes tribal cultures and focuses on the period before sustained contact with Europeans and Americans. Finally, some handbooks contributed to colonial processes in California. In the late nineteenth century, Ohlones reoccupied land near Pleasanton and took on the name "Verona Band of Alameda County." Although Ohlones revitalized their ceremonies and sustained their economy through wage labor, in his handbook Kroeber declared that the Verona Band of Alameda County were extinct.⁵

Considering the existing literature, then, we hope that *We Are the Land* will fill a void for people teaching California and California Indian history. We moved away from the anthropological and, at times, colonizing perspectives of other handbooks. Rather than focusing on precontact cultural practices, we explored how California Indians thrived in the eighteenth, nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries, often against the odds. We strived to make the book as timely as possible. Several chapters are devoted to the latter two centuries (including a limited discussion of the COVID-19 pandemic). We could not address all relevant topics of the past twenty years—the political activism targeted at the removal of dams on the Klamath River stands out as an area for further discussion in a second edition—but this book will hopefully provide a springboard for scholars to pursue other topics related to California Indian history in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.⁶

W F D :

The book begins with the authors noting that their book is *a* history, not anything approaching *the* history of Indigenous California and Indigenous Californians. That respect for multiple narratives, not to mention the trickiness of history, sticks with the reader throughout the volume.

D B A :

As Deverell notes, we very intentionally called our book *a* history, and we hope it will be one among many. Many other histories already exist, and we look forward to still others that will offer different perspectives.

W F D :

In the same thoughtful way, the authors offer up another key point in the opening pages of the book. This history of Indigenous California is a history of California, or what became California. It is not the appendage “Native American History” that is so often—still!—stuck with the adhesive of afterthought to historical texts, lesson plans, or lectures. As Akins and Bauer note with admirable succinctness: “People misunderstand the settler invasion of Indigenous California *as* California history rather than as an unsustainable and disruptive episode in it” (4).

We—scholars, students, the wider public—will better understand loss by way of this volume’s extended historical view and coverage. Two maps complement the book’s introductory passages, maps that extend the argument of Indigenous California’s complexity, breadth, and perseverance. So much has been lost. Scholars know a good deal about this—and, we hope, so do other audiences, in California and beyond. Indigenous Californians know loss firsthand, by way of ancestral histories, by way of land theft, and otherwise. But perseverance comes powerfully to the fore here too, as the book’s narrative and much of its imagery carry that critically important “we are still here” insistence. I want to emphasize how hard this is to do: the practice of keeping one eye on the past and one on the present brings writing challenges not easy to surmount.

Bauer and Akins know all too well that we history educators still encounter students who place Indigenous Californians *only* in the past, consigned to the “back then” and far removed from the “right now.” Here’s a book that fiercely and regularly puts both epochs together. Despite history’s abominations, California Indigeneity persists—does far more than persist—across space and circumstance. All our students will be better educated for this book’s straightforward insistence upon that fact.

Keeping Indigenous people close to the land, in presence and knowledge, is the major theme of this book and one of its major accomplishments. Establishing that relationship and regard makes the wrenching removal from the land, by way of missions, Anglo conquest, and basically everything since the eighteenth century forward, stand out obviously and painfully. Along the way, Akins and Bauer steer successfully clear of any essentializing of Native Californians as *part* of nature because of fundamental Indigenous ties to land. That care, too, deserves mention in the ways in which a book like this can be taught: we still see, in other venues and writings, that reflex to regard Indians as one with nature, though I believe the tendency to do so has faded over the course of the last generation.

As it moves through time and space, almost always hewing close to the land, *We Are the Land* covers a broad range of Indigenous themes and disparate histories well. Communities are given respectful, discrete differentiation while, at the same time, the totalizing consequences of colonial, Catholic, imperial, and other designs upon people, land, and nature are weighed, measured, and criticized across Indigenous California. The Indigenous acorn economy is addressed with close attention to labor, gender, and region. Shells and beads knit economies together by way of exchange, a web of astonishing scale and reach. Terrestrial, ocean, and riparian trade and travel networks get established and utilized with efficiency (though I would have liked to see some more data and detail on Indigenous trail systems, which, as these authors well know, remain active and

recognizable across the state). Languages, dialects, names of people, and names on the land run through the pages, testament to the erudition of the two authors. Livestock, horses, crops: all are here, tended and labored upon by Indigenous communities keenly aware of ecological rhythms and systems.

Any assumptions of equilibria are shattered, as they must be, by the successive waves of outsider intrusion: missionaries, microbes, gold rush adventurers, land speculators, exploiters, murderers. As Akins and Bauer note, what had been bad during the mission period worsened once Manifest Destiny fell in love with gold and, thus tied together, made Indigenous California the enemy of progress. “It is exceptionally difficult to see the middle of the nineteenth century as anything but horribly destructive to California’s Native Peoples” (6). This marks the era for what it was. But the book moves past this abundant trauma into the intervening decades with close attention to Indigenous survival and, more than that, Indigenous culture beyond the reach of postconquest hegemony. This part of the book is far more than a display of here-and-there agency—which, were it to be offered as such, would be patronizing and insufficient. On the contrary, what takes up the twentieth- and twenty-first-century coverage of *We Are the Land* is notable for Indigenous resiliency, activism, political sophistication, and sheer cultural power.

All is not great in California Indian Country—of course not—and the ravages of the global coronavirus pandemic prove that, in city and countryside alike. But Akins and Bauer make clear that stopping the narration of Indigenous history at a mission period or the 1850 nadir—which still happens in classroom settings at all levels of instruction—is irresponsible and malfeasant.

It is very interesting to see how these scholars put the book together, as some of their interpretive and coverage decisions show clearly through the text. For example, there is a common trope—still!—of teaching Indigenous California history, whereby the topic is given a non-Indigenous centerpiece, in the form of Junípero Serra or a Franciscan mission. That centerpiece often holds chronology in place, in that Indigenous California can be seen to start and stop with the mission system’s arrival and decline. Akins and Bauer have—clearly deliberately—avoided this: Serra is here in these pages, but neither much nor often. Yet there is a slight downside here, I think, in that the text glosses over the intricacies of secularization (ca. 1830s and 1840s). We need more thinking and writing about what it meant, not only to the land and to land possession, to have the mission system of industry, belief, and power dismantled some fifty years after it had been hammered into place.

I have some minor criticisms of the way the narrative unspools, mostly tied to editing issues. It feels as though the authors split the writing of the chapters and “Native Spaces” sections, which makes labor-distribution sense but leads to some unnecessary repetition, in which we may encounter an episode or individual at one point and then be reintroduced to the same many pages later. This is a small thing. At times, the terrible violence meted out by this or that individual or institution of empire and settler colonial racism reads like a catalog. This may be deliberate: victim after victim after victim, lives and culture swept away before the scythe of conquest. Even so, I think the narrative scaffolding in and around the horror could have been “thicker”; their scholarly authority well established, the authors might have chosen to provide fuller narration when all the death and

destruction leans toward litany. Each chapter closes with a brief bibliography of relevant sources, an accessible and well-curated format that one wishes other books would adopt.

D B A:

[Providing a narrative that included Indians in the twentieth century] meant moving back and forth in time, which posed challenges. Willy and I are both historians, so we organized the book chronologically, but we developed the “Native Spaces” vignettes as a way to step out of *time* and emphasize *place* as well as the living Indigenous *present*. We have been pleased by readers’ initial reactions to these vignettes. We acknowledge, however, as Deverell notes in his review, that moving back and forth in time resulted in some repetition of material. However, we believe that the vignettes’ ability to stand alone gives instructors the option to use them as discrete teaching tools or alternate routes into the book.

W F D:

Each chronologically organized chapter has a smart and engaging subchapter addressing “Native Spaces.” The authors’ chapter-by-chapter investigation of themes and events in this or that historical period—for instance, violence or political economy or Indigenous political activism and resistance—is thus further illustrated “in place” with social historical acuity. To my mind, this is the book’s best feature, as we are taken around California into specific settings, with specific Indigenous populations, languages, and dialects, and we see both change and continuity at a granular level. I applaud the authors’ research abilities in bringing these places and people under close view and analysis. As regards teaching this book and this subject, the opportunity to focus on place accomplishes many pedagogical goals. When accompanied by good maps (the book’s two at the frontispiece are a starting point), the collection of “Native Spaces” case studies would insist that students reckon with the diversity of Indigenous populations, varying historical trajectories, and complex cultural and linguistic traditions. So, too, is this feature important for the Indigenous “landedness” of the book’s major argumentative thrust. These “Native Spaces” journeys—there are nine of them—help sustain the “we are the land” insistence of the authors’ interpretive schema. It works, and it is an illuminating way to teach big themes across more focused space and place.

D B A:

I am pleased that Deverell linked our “Native Spaces” vignettes to the book’s maps. Frustrated by the inaccessibility of maps depicting Native California, a few years ago I drew one for friends who were planning a drive across California (Figure 1). I identified territories and people and made suggestions at various points along their itinerary of what to read and why. The maps we commissioned for the book grew out of a similar impulse, as did the “Native Spaces” pieces. We hoped that both would make visible the continuity and persistence of Indigenous people in specific places, especially in places that may be familiar to readers. And while we did not explicitly design them as such, we came to see

Indigenous space,” and I agree: doing so undercuts their book’s major theme. It is fascinating to think of these two boys (Tac was twelve, Amamix a little older) so far from home, so far from the land of their youth and people. It’s arguable, of course, that, by their mere presence in Rome, they (and other Indigenous North Americans) transformed ecclesiastical environments into Native space, that they “remade” places such as Rome and London by being there. But by this point in the text, Akins and Bauer have already established that the way to understand Native California is to recognize and respect ties between people and land. Pablo Tac and Agapito Amamix both died young in Europe, as far removed from homeland places and “Native Spaces” as two teenaged Native boys could be. In this case, the authors’ argument for placemaking agency falls short, both as an example of that argument and as a takeaway from what the sojourning of these two Luiseño boys meant and means.

D B A :

Deverell is not alone in calling attention to our discussion of Indigenous Californians in Rome. Other early reviewers have as well. It stands out, in large part, because experiences like Tac’s and Amamix’s were so rare among California Indians, whose diaspora was more tightly regional than those of Native Peoples from other parts of what is now the United States. Rome is not a “Native Space” in the same way that San Diego or Sacramento are Native Spaces. But here I draw a parallel between Rome and Los Angeles, which are more similar than they might initially seem. We describe Los Angeles as a “place native to some and a place that other Native People made their own—a place as important to Indigenous People as it is to the people indigenous to it.” Native People from outside California came to Los Angeles (as well as other cities) and made it a Native Space. Kent Mackenzie’s 1961 film *The Exiles* captured some of those places in Bunker Hill and Chavez Ravine. While not an explicit outcome of our conversations about how to ensure that the category of “California Indian” was flexible enough to include those Native People who came to California, our redefinition of Rome as a Native Space grew out of the realization that we also had to leave that door open for those Natives who left California. Deverell argues that when Tac and Amamix died, they were as “far removed from homeland places and ‘Native Spaces’ as two teenaged Native boys could be.” His distinction is a critical one: it is hard to imagine a place less Luiseño than Rome. While Tac and Amamix may not have made Rome Native by being there, they certainly carried Native Spaces with them, and the possibility of creating Native Spaces there.

Terri Castaneda’s recent biography of Marie Potts [reviewed in this issue] illustrates this point well. Potts was Mountain Maidu, proud of her time at Carlisle Indian Institute in Pennsylvania and, through her work with the Federated Indians of California, a fierce advocate for the rights of the “Indians of California.” Rome’s Collegio Urbano was, in essence, a boarding school for Indigenous students from around the world and, as much great scholarship has shown, such schools often played important roles in developing Indigenous identity as well as reinforcing tribal connections. Born and baptized at the Mission San Luis Rey, Tac spent the first ten years of his life in a space that was both Luiseño and Catholic. He spent his last seven years at the College in Rome, admittedly

a very different Native and Catholic space. Tac was far from home, but perhaps not so far from a Native Space that was familiar to him.

W F D :

I was puzzled by another point. In the spring of 1850, mounted U.S. Dragoons massacred members of a Pomo Indian settlement near Clear Lake, north of Napa County. The murders were ostensibly in retribution for the killing of two whites who had long brutalized and enslaved the Pomo people. An unknown number of Pomo were cut down. By any metric or standard, the massacre was horrific. Akins and Bauer, in reference to the work of historian Benjamin Madley, suggest that as many as eight hundred Indigenous Californians lay dead when all was over. That is possible, given Madley's estimation of somewhere between sixty and eight hundred victims. But the authors close this incomprehensibly grim narrative with the leap to a declarative claim: "Bloody Island stands as the site of the largest massacre in US history" (137). Such a provocative statement seems odd to me. The details (not to mention the victims) of Bloody Island speak tragically for themselves here. Why make such a claim about "massacre exceptionalism" absent empirical evidence? Why choose this horror as the point to make such an untidy assertion?

W J B :

Deverell suggests that we have overstated our discussion of the Bloody Island Massacre. In 1851, the U.S. Army attacked a Pomo town near Clear Lake; the number of dead, as Deverell notes, is disputed. However, Bloody Island is important for two reasons. For one, it is important to name and identify forms of colonialism that operated in California. Second, teachers and other readers can communicate the magnitude of what happened in California during the gold rush. Many people know about the Wounded Knee Massacre, Sand Creek Massacre, and countless others. What happened in California was not an aberration in the state or in the nation. Scholars who know California history are confounded by contemporary assertions that, for example, violence against Indigenous People, African Americans, or other groups is exceptional in U.S. history: we know that this was actually the norm.⁸ We also endeavored to balance the story of violence in gold rush-era California with stories of Indigenous resistance and survivance. For instance, we highlighted the successful efforts of Hupas to remain in their homeland.

W F D :

Two lacunae to note, in observation and light criticism. The authors clearly made a team decision to open their book with Indigenous Californians already arrived. I wonder about that choice. The human history of arrival in what eventually becomes California is perennially a topic and theme that thrills my students. Some of this fascination is tied simply to mystery: how did people get here, when, and from where? Competing theories demand that students make analytical choices in in course assignments. New scholarship, new theories, new evidence abound. Indigenous knowledge and histories roll together with other ideas. It is a constantly shifting interpretive landscape, one that always intrigues my

students, especially when balanced against the seriousness of origin histories. I wish that some of this had been here. Instead of starting the book with “arrivance,” Akins and Bauer opted for the persistence and “survivance” of Indigenous California in contemporary settings. That is defensible, but I can hear readers of this book asking, “When did people come here?”

W J B :

Deverell notes that, in chapter 1, California Indians have already “arrived” in California. Earlier drafts of the first chapter included discussions of the Bering land bridge theory and anthropologist Jon Erlandson’s more recent “kelp highway hypothesis,” which argues for a maritime, as well as an overland, route to California.⁹ Yet these earlier chapters read too much like the handbooks; they relied too much on anthropology and archaeology and not enough on Indigenous ways of knowing. We borrowed from the insight of Cherokee scholar Adrienne Keene: “Indigenous people have origin stories and creation stories, and settlers have colonization stories.”¹⁰ We foregrounded Indigenous stories and histories in the first chapter and then sustained that emphasis by highlighting Indigenous voices throughout the text.

W F D :

Another gap: fire. Fire is here, but not very often nor very much of it. Given the authors’ careful attention to that seam between past and present, and their regular references to contemporary Indigenous California, this lack of attention to fire is peculiar. Indigenous use of fire, Indigenous cultural and spiritual (and other) practices in and around fire, Indigenous fire knowledge: these are themes of surpassing importance in our climate-changed world of near-constant wildfire. I would have expected more of that here, especially given the long history of European and Anglo-American suppression of Indigenous fire practices.

D B A :

Should we have the opportunity to produce future editions of *We Are the Land*, I see several areas where more detail would enrich the text. This includes devoting more attention to the subject of fire, which, as Deverell points out, is a “peculiar” omission here.

W F D :

One speculation or question: the innovation of the “Native Spaces” digressions is, in a way, counterbalanced by the conventional periodization across the book’s chapters. In putting the book together, did the authors contemplate or consider alternative ways in which to periodize many centuries of California history? We get some sense of this in deft references to Indigenous oral traditions across time, but once we enter, say, the era of European exploration, contact, and implantation of the mission system, the body of the book unspools in typical historical chunks of time. It makes me wonder: what other ways of conceiving change over time—what other divisions between eras—might have suggested themselves as the book came into being?

We Are the Land ends with a short, but noteworthy and entirely appropriate, discussion of land return. One could imagine a seminar or course discussion that started here and then worked backwards into the heart of the book. This discussion (and this is modeled throughout the book, as we've seen) ties past to present and contemplates an Indigenous California future where land and justice come together. We are in a period of acknowledgment: gesturing to the broken, stolen sovereignty of Indigenous land possession has become reflexive across many academic and public settings. This book offers a strong interpretive framework, backed by scholarly heft, that insists we move beyond acknowledgment platitudes. Acknowledgment is a step, but if we understand what these authors are saying in this important book, it is but a step, and a small one at that.

To close: it will be very good to keep this book close at hand and to insist that our students do the same. It is timely, it is a significant accomplishment, and it is welcome.

W J B:

We appreciate Deverell's thoughtful critique of the book. He raised many more points about the book but we only have space here to address these. We hope that people will read our book and Deverell's review and continue to participate in the conversation that we have generated.

NOTES

1. Robert Heizer (ed.), *The Handbook of North American Indians: California*, vol. 8 (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1978) (hereafter HNAI).
2. Alfred Kroeber, *Handbook of the Indians of California* (Mineola, NY: Dover, 2012 [1923]).
3. George Harwood Phillips, *The Enduring Struggle: Indians in California History* (San Francisco: Boyd and Fraser, 1981); Jack Forbes, *Native Americans of California and Nevada* (Happy Camp, CA: Naturegraph, 1982); Rupert Costo and Jeannette Henry Costo, *Natives of the Golden State: The California Indians* (San Francisco: Indian Historian Press, 1995).
4. Edward Castillo, "The Impact of Euro-American Exploration and Settlement," 99–127, and "Twentieth-Century Secular Movements," 713–718, both in HNAI.
5. Kroeber, *Handbook*, 464. For a discussion of the Verona Band, see Akins and Bauer, *We Are the Land*, 301–302.
6. Kari Marie Norgaard, *Salmon & Acorns Feed Our People: Colonialism, Nature & Social Action* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2019), 219–220; Brittani Orona, "This Is Our Home, This Is Our Land: Visualizing Decolonization on the Klamath River Basin," Virtual Talk for the Centre for Indigenous and Settler Colonial Studies, University of Kent, December 10, 2020, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PgFSgmBBjLw&list=PLQ-REK2g5nb3iM5-w6G1i1UC-LQLCP7L&index=1>; "Stories of the River, Stories of the People: Memory on the Klamath River Basin," online exhibit, <http://www.nativewomenscollective.org/storiesoftheriver.html>.
7. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1–40.
8. For an example of violence being characterized as out of character in U.S. history, see <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/mar/10/this-is-not-who-we-are-american-lindsay-graham>.
9. Jon Erlandson, Michael Graham, Bruce Bourque, Debra Corbett, James Estes, and Robert Stenbeck, "The Kelp Highway Hypothesis: Marine Ecology, the Coastal Migration Theory and the Peopling of the Americas," *Journal of Island and Coastal Archaeology* 2, no. 2 (2007): 161–174; René Vennowith and Jeffrey Altschul, "Antiquarians, Culture Historians, and Scientists: The Archaeology of the Bight," in Jeffrey Altschul and Donn Grenda (eds.), *Islanders & Mainlanders: Prehistoric Context for the Southern California Bight* (Tucson, AZ: SRI Press, 2002), 98. See also Standing Rock Sioux scholar Vine Deloria Jr.'s critique in *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact* (Golden, CO: Fulcrum, 1887), 67–91.
10. "Representation Matters," *Cultural Survival Quarterly Magazine*, July, 2019, <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/representation-matters>.