

The End of Anthropology (at Hopi)?

PETER WHITELEY

The pure products of America go crazy.

—William Carlos Williams
(via James Clifford)

SCENE I: THE RITUAL

It is August in the dusty pueblo plaza. Two lines of ritually attired men emerge from underground kivas and make their way to an arbor. The “Antelopes,” white-kilted and with white zigzags painted over a gray ground down their torsos, march past the arbor, stamping on a plank-drum, and line up in front of it. The “Snakes,” painted brown and kilted, march behind the Antelopes, stamping on the drum, then line up to face them. A short song and dance follows. Then each Snake man goes to the arbor and procures a live snake. He places the back of its neck between his teeth and dances the snake around the plaza. At the conclusion, the Snake men set all the snakes down into a cornmeal circle, where they are sprinkled with cornmeal by Snake women; the men then pick up the snakes again and race them out of the plaza.

YOU THOUGHT I WAS TALKING about the Hopi Snake ceremony, right? *Pay qa pam ‘i*, “That’s not it,” as a Hopi clown says when he introduces his *tawi*, or pun-story, whose words depend on newly coined, sometimes obscene or perverse meanings for existing verbal representations. No, I’m talking about the *Smoki* Snake Dance, an ersatz performance, which coins new meaning, probably obscene, certainly perverse,

PETER WHITELEY has conducted anthropological and historical research at Hopi over the last twelve years, resulting in two books, *Deliberate Acts: Changing Hopi Culture through the Oraibi Split* (University of Arizona Press, 1988) and *Bacavi: Journey to Reed Springs* (Northland, 1988). He has taught anthropology at Sarah Lawrence College since 1985. A version of this article will appear in *Anthropologists and Indians since Custer* (a twentieth-anniversary assessment of Vine Deloria, Jr.’s critique of anthropologists in *Custer Died for Your Sins*), Thomas Biolsi and Larry Zimmerman, eds.

for Hopi ritual representations. In the *Smoki* Snake Dance, the performers are white, the “pueblo” is plywood, the snakes are all bull (rattles are the key snakes for Hopis)—in short, the ritual is a racist parody.

Founded in 1921 by Prescott businessmen to burlesque Indian ceremonies, the Smokis soon became more earnest, initiating a fraternal order, founding a museum with Indian artifacts and ethnographic books, and claiming to preserve Native American culture; the (racist) joke turned serious. The group has typically included men of influence in white Arizona. (Barry Goldwater was a member who performed three times; *Arizona Republic* August 5, 1990:2.)¹

The dance itself is a mishmash. Elements are close to the Hopi original. The kilts, for example, were probably purchased from Hopis in the past, the body paint and arbor setup are roughly accurate, some of the dance movements mimic the real thing—and my description might indeed have been of the Hopi ceremony. But I was selective. I neglected to mention that the painted backdrop was illuminated by floodlights. (It was night; the Hopi ritual occurs in daylight.) The participants—divided into “warriors,” “braves,” and “squaws” under the leadership of “Chief Hairlip” (sic)—wore red bandannas over black long-haired wigs. There were drummers (there are none at Hopi) dressed like Hollywood Navajos, who pounded out a Western-movie-Indian, heavy-on-the-first-beat rhythm in four-four time; the rattles were painted coffee cans; and the “songs” (Oh! ah! oh! ah! oh! ah!) and dance movements seemed choreographed by the same characters who do “tribal” dances in Tarzan movies.

To begin, the public address system intoned a script while an elderly Smoki mimed to costumed children, and the story was enacted by other Smokis stage-left. The story, purporting to be the snake myth, was obvi-

1. The contexts of this interethnic play of identity and difference are multiple and complex, but one deserves emphasis. The Hopi Snake Dance had been since the 1880s a major feature of the Southwest tourist trade, annually drawing large parties of wealthy, socially connected tourists, particularly from “back East” and Europe (Teddy Roosevelt came in 1913, D. H. Lawrence [of course!] in 1924 [Lawrence 1924]). Frontier Anglos in Arizona were thus on one edge of an intercultural representational play: while the exoticism of local Indians was celebrated with a quasi-erotic mixture of disgust and fascination—a look-at-the-savages-with-snakes-in-their-mouths sort of zoo-gaze—their own identity and difference with these Eastern sophisticates was equivocal. No doubt their provinciality, their Westernness as opposed to Easternness—a significant dimension of white-American class-status games—was slighted. In short, Arizona white identity was partly refracted through images of frontier otherness epitomized by the Hopi Snake Dance and its annual deluge of high-society pilgrims.

ously taken from Hopi ethnography, though with a heavy dose of savagist ambience:

The old Snake priest gathers his grandchildren and the children of the tribe, and the story begins. Many moons ago, the chief's son, Tiyo, wondered about the universe. His father told him to go to the underworld to seek out Spiderwoman. . . .

After this, the paying audience applauded from their bleachers (payment, applause, and bleachers are absent from the original) amidst the drone of the highway (likewise) from outside the roadside arena. Then, on to the ceremony itself: "Ladies and gentlemen, the world-famous Smoki Snake Dance!" The voice boomed with a Western twang.²

SCENE II: THE LAND

Twelve miles south of Holbrook, Arizona, rises a volcanic cinder cone known as Woodruff Butte, after a Mormon who founded a nearby settlement in the 1870s. In Hopi it is *Tsimontukwi*, Jimson-Weed Butte, a rather important place which has carried this name since time immemorial. It houses one of nine major shrines (*tuutuskyam*) that mark the boundaries of *Hopitutskwa*, Hopi land (Page and Page 1982; Whiteley 1989). The butte also contains clan shrines for the Bearstrap and Water clans—both formerly lived in the vicinity—and shrines for the *Porswimimkyam* curing society. Some plant medicines are collected there. The two previously named clans also have property rights to eagles in the vicinity, which Hopis continue to gather every May. The area is particularly sacred to the Water clan because of an establishing myth in which a boy and a girl were sacrificed there to appease *Paalölöqangw*, the Water Snake spirit of *Paayu*, the Little Colorado River.³

2. I should add that my ethnographer's representations are also counterfeit. I was not a "participant-observer" but watched all this on a VCR; a tape—punctuated by guffaws and wisecracks, as well as pregnant silences, from Hopi observers—was made by a Hopi videographer (Kaye 1991) as part of a large Hopi protest at the 1990 performance. My somewhat half-hearted plans to attend in 1991 were mercifully scotched by cancellation, owing to years of increasingly publicized Hopi protests (see, e.g., *Arizona Republic* August 5, 1990:1–2). It now seems that the Smokis have finally been persuaded to cease their performances, but their recency is still prominent in Hopi consciousness of their relations with whites.

3. The area is also sacred to Zunis (Zuni's land responsibilities go south of the butte, Hopi's north), Navajos and White Mountain Apaches (*Navajo Times* December 27, 1990).

Tsimontukwi is not on a reservation; it has been “privately owned” by a local white family since 1935. The Bearstrap clan shrines, which used to be on top of the butte, were destroyed in the 1960s when a radio tower was erected. In September 1990, the owners leased the butte to a gravel-mining company. Hopi religious leaders and Tribal officials protested. The lead owner, Norman Turley, knew of the place’s significance, but apparently cared little (*New York Times* January 3, 1991), challenging the Hopis to buy him out for a million dollars. The Tribe sought a legal appraisal, which came in at \$45,000, and made a counteroffer.

Meanwhile mining went ahead. The priests, terribly concerned, continued to visit the butte. While Eldridge Koinva, chief of the Antelope society (and a leader of the Bearstrap clan) from Shongopavi, looked on helplessly, the boundary shrine itself was felled by a bulldozer.

The controversy has grown, and mining operations have ceased temporarily. In recent months, Tribal officials met with Arizona Governor Fife Symington, though as of September 1992 no resolution has emerged (*Gallup Independent* June 6, 1992; June 16, 1992). But the owner is not amused. Angered by the Hopi counteroffer in 1991, Turley at one point threatened to blow up the whole butte rather than return it to the Hopis (Hopi Office of Cultural Preservation, telephone conversation, July 1991). The mining area was fenced off, a large “No Trespassing” sign was put up, and to make sure the Indians got the message, a dead coyote was pinned to it.

SCENE III: THE SACRA, OR AHÖLA’S NOSE IS OUT OF JOINT

Sotheby’s auction house in New York City is in a posh setting on the Upper East Side. A sale in May 1991 featured “Fine American Indian Art” (Sotheby’s 1991), including three Southwest “masks,”⁴ one possibly Navajo, the other two Hopi, an *Ahöla*, and a *Kooyemsi*. Despite Hopi protests (*New York Newsday* May 18, 1991, May 22, 1991; *New York Times* May 21, 1991), Sotheby’s insisted the masks were “legitimately acquired,”

4. For Hopis, even the concept “mask,” implying representational falsity, in itself violates the items’ sanctity. In English Hopis usually refer to them as Kachina “friends” (translating from the Hopi reference *ikwaatsi*, “my friend”), actively avoiding “mask.”

although they refused to disclose the identity of the seller (Natalie Wolcott, personal communication May 18, 1991).

The auction room was buzzing and the press were on hand. The buyers were mostly wealthy “Indian-art” patrons, all white as far as I could see, both “old money” and *arrivistes*, in Madison Avenue *haute couture* or Santa Fe chic. Bids that outstrip most Hopi families’ annual incomes were casually mounted. Finally, Ahöla was swung round on a revolving platform, surrounded by a gray cloth ground, transformed into “fine art.” He went for \$24,200. As he came into view, I saw the nose had been dislocated, cocked slightly to one side.⁵ Of course no one would care, the object’s newfound commodity status, not its Hopi meaning, was the sole criterion of value. Nonetheless, the disjointed nose seemed somehow appropriate—an index of incongruities born of the clash of cultural meanings and standards.⁶

SCENE IV: THE TEXTS

The Hopi are a fascination in the public mind. More than any other group in North, Central, or South America, the Hopi have retained their aboriginal culture, with its religious expression in its purest form. And they embody a philosophy of life totally in balance with their physical and spiritual environment. . . . Within Hopi rituals and sacred ceremonies, the ancient knowledge of early humanity is deposited. It is brought to us without interruption or corruption. Most of us will go to Hopi driven by the force of the primeval need to be in communion with the source. (Boissière 1986:20–22)

North American Indians, because of their culture, hold a special place among aboriginal peoples of our world. The Hopi, in turn,

6. As a result of the prior publicity, the purchaser, Elizabeth Sackler, in fact bought it with the sole intention of returning it to the Hopi people (*New York Times* May 22, 1991; *New York Newsday* May 22, 1991; and for a video-documentary summary, see Wallach 1992). While a noble enough act in itself, it scarcely solved the ironies and political-economic implications, the intercultural class and power inequities, or the clash of cultural values. Subsequently, the Hopi Tribe has been approached by a number of collectors seeking to return Hopi sacra—as long, of course, as they can get a tax write-off for their generosity.

are esteemed among Native North Americans. Mythology is the central feature of Hopi culture. The Hopi prophecy plays a central role within Hopi mythology. At the center of that prophecy we find Pahana, the Elder White Brother, for whose return the Hopi wait. There is thus a connection between our hopes concerning the wisdom of tribal people and the Hopi expectation for the return of Elder White Brother. (Kaiser 1991:85–86)

We have . . . a specific link between New-Age thinking and the worldview of indigenous peoples and of nature religions. We sense that our dualistic distinctions between spirit and matter, God and the world, humans and nature, subject and object, do not apply in their view of things. Instead there is an understanding of the holistic connectedness of all that exists. For a people holding such a holistic view of the world, everything would be sacred, imbued with the Spirit, part of a greater Whole, inseparably interwoven. (ibid:116)

These excerpts from Robert Boissière's *Meditations with the Hopi* and Rudolf Kaiser's *The Voice of the Great Spirit: Prophecies of the Hopi Indians* illustrate a wide-ranging interest in Hopi spiritual beliefs by "New Age" groups from North America and Europe. The Hopi are held up as icons of spiritual wisdom, exemplars in a quest toward new meaning in the malaise of modern life (cf. A. Geertz 1987, 1992).

Popular literature on the Hopi, especially since Frank Waters' *Book of the Hopi* (1963), produced an influx of seekers and yearners in the 1960s, and while these eventually departed, the legacy has remained. During Hotevilla's *Powamuy* rituals in 1981, for example, a mysterious, black-garbed German woman interrupted *Angwusnasomtaga's* (Crow Mother's) distribution of bean sprouts, grabbing handfuls and offering them grandiosely to spectators, before being shooed away by a Hopi woman. Another mysterious character in a red robe camped for a while by Oraibi and went round at night claiming to be *Maasaw*, a prominent Hopi deity. And recently, Hopis visiting the *sipaapuni* emergence shrine in Little Colorado River Canyon have found, to their dismay, crystals and other pseudo-offerings.

Radically decontextualized reinterpretation of Hopi traditional and prophetic representations by New Agers and their fellow travelers has thus begotten another clash of representations between Hopi and the

dominant society. The clash reached an apogee at the “Harmonic Convergence”:⁷

Large numbers of people gathered at many sacred sites all over the world. . . . including Prophecy Rock on the Hopi reservation. A small group, between thirty and fifty people, made sacrificial offerings, drew astrological signs on the ground in front of Prophecy Rock and, at sunrise on 17 August, raised their hands toward the sky, turning east toward the rising sun, in the direction faced by Prophecy Rock for thousands of years. (Kaiser 1991:119)

None of the celebrants, so far as I am aware, was Hopi; Hopi religious leaders specifically repudiated the connection, denying any recognition of this alien convergence or its association with the so-called “Prophecy Rock.”⁸ The Hopi meaning of this petroglyph-marked site is contested but has been greatly reworked by Thomas Banyacya, a Hopi guru to many New Agers, and the subject of much controversy in Hopi discourse (cf. A. Geertz 1992).

In each of these four cases, cultural conceptions that are critical to Hopi identity—religious rituals, a sacred landscape, deity masks, and metaphysical beliefs—are fundamentally violated by various elements from the dominant society. Core Hopi representations and meanings are (1) directly parodied (the Smokis), (2) actively scorned and destroyed (Tsimontukwi), (3) commodified and transmuted into an alien register of value (Ahöla), and (4) self-servingly re-imagined into the canons of a new universalizing religious cult (the New Agers).

Broadly, each case involves different interest groups, though all are predominantly white. The respective interests intersect along a number of axes, including capital gain (both material and symbolic), regional identity (particularly for the Smokis), class, and ethnic-supermacist ideology (conscious or not). These cases and their attendant interests by

7. Kaiser (1991:118–19) explains the “Harmonic Convergence” as follows: “On the basis of an intensive study of Aztec and Mayan stone calendars, he [José Arguelles, an astrologer] projected the transition to the Age of Aquarius to occur during the night of the 16th to the 17th day of August 1987.”

8. Armin Geertz (1992:354, n. 14) claims Thomas Banyacya in fact met and led New Age acolytes in the construction of an altar at Prophecy Rock. If this is so, Banyacya must have been working both sides of the issue, since his signature appeared on circulars (posted in prominent places around the reservation prior to August 16th) condemning the celebration.

no means exhaust the manipulation of Hopi representations by outsiders. I choose them to illustrate recent, particularly acute violations of Hopi cultural and religious sovereignty. Moreover, all occur outside the direct application of U.S. sociopolitical and ideological domination (although this serves as ultimate guarantor), as is applied by federal laws and B.I.A. police, B.I.A. schools, missionary religions, and the metropolitan economy. They involve a subtler process of cultural hegemony, a politics of representation wherein a dominant group appropriates and refigures a subaltern's cultural symbols to its own purposes (cf. Vizenor 1987; Lavie 1990; Çelik 1992).

This distortion of symbols has reflexive effects back home⁹: it conditions interactions between Hopis and non-Indians, and partly undermines the symbols' established meanings and transformative power. Tourists arrive with arrogant assumptions about heathen rituals and their rights to sample them; illegal plunder of artifacts¹⁰ and sites proceeds apace; many items of traditional culture (notably including Kachina dolls¹¹) have been commodified for the "ethnic-art" market; and interference with shrines and rituals is ongoing.

A promiscuous traffic in Hopi representations thus occupies multiple nexuses of meaning. Hopi has for the last century been progressively inundated by a dominant society that has sought in myriad ways to impose its political, economic, religious, and sociocultural control. The Hopi are still technically wards of the U.S. Government, "domestic dependent nations" (e.g., Deloria and Lytle 1984), their land is held in trust, and they have very limited real political sovereignty. Perpetuation of traditions must battle imposed institutions like schools and missions, supermarkets, wage labor, television, and other forms of cultural imperialism. All of this has had profound effects: many Hopi children do

9. I am utilizing a (Clifford) Geertzian conception of cultural symbols here. Unlike many (e.g., Leach 1976; Bloch 1989), however, I disavow a separation between instrumental and expressive domains of culture. The Ahöla mask is, in Hopi conceptions, inseparable from the supernatural figure it represents; the mask is not just an expression but *embodies* the deity (cf. my remarks on the Snake Dance [1987:698]). My use of the term "symbols," then, should not be taken to imply a denial of their intrinsic instrumental power.

10. Thefts of religious society altars, central to ritual practice, have been a particularly strong source of concern recently (see, e.g., *Tucson Weekly* July 1, 1992; my thanks to Laurel Cooper for this reference).

11. Here, too, there is a proliferation of counterfeits, including a recent (summer 1991) container-load of dolls from Hong Kong impounded by U.S. Customs in San Francisco (Leigh Jenkins, personal communication, 1991).

not understand the language, prefer heavy metal over Hopi songs, choose Coke and Big Macs over *yoyvwala* (rainwater) and *piki* (wafer bread), and expect jobs off-reservation rather than engagement in the subsistence economy.¹²

COLLECTING HOPI CULTURE

The relations of power whereby one portion of humanity can select, value, and collect the pure products of others need to be criticized and transformed. (Clifford 1988:213)

At the same time as it exerts overt domination the national society, or elements of it, has continuously fetishized aspects of Hopi culture—especially rituals and artifacts—into its own canons of value. Appropriation and sale of religious objects has occurred for more than a century. At Hopi, private collectors and formal museum expeditions, especially at the turn of the century (notably including the Smithsonian, Chicago Field Museum, Harvard Peabody, Southwest Museum, and the Museum of the American Indian), have made off with great quantities of artifacts, some of irreplaceable sacred worth (e.g., Wade 1985). Recently, the “primitive art” market has caused a renewed proliferation of pothunting and thefts. The Hopi Reservation is difficult to patrol: some pothunters (many apparently northern Arizona whites) fly in by helicopter at night, ransack sites, and are out again in no time: this is big business.

The anthropological world has been quick to condemn pothunting, but in their effects the “professional” excavation of “sites” and removal of artifacts to university museums seem hard to distinguish from the pothunters’ practice. In both cases, important materials are alienated from Hopi, or from the collective spiritual patrimony of Hopi ancestry. Generally speaking, Hopi belief mandates that remnants of the past be left alone, to serve as sources of power and meaning in the landscape; eagle gatherers, for example, revisit ancient habitation sites, because

12. Even more complex, many young adults—often those without access to traditional ritual status and knowledge (because of their village or clan, or family ideology)—favor an embryonic Third World/indigenist identity. This is socially underpinned also by their experience of subalternity in the national society. It is culturally constructed especially through the politics and music of Caribbean reggae (Hopi is a major stop on Jamaican musicians’ tours) along with a rather abstract acknowledgment of the wisdom of Hopi elders.

eagles who dwell there reincarnate clan ancestors. The reality that formal archaeology may protect such sites from vandalism and theft does not alleviate this basic contradiction to Hopi sacred values.

For the collector, prehistoric items gain a special cachet of symbolic capital because of their antiquity and finitude. Items in current ritual use are also prized, partly for motives of aesthetic primitivism (Torgovnick 1990), but also as spoils of a vicarious raid into a resistant exotic-Other's inner sanctum. Some Hopis whose loyalties are subverted by the need for cash (cf. Price 1989:69) have dealt with the culture vultures, but in most cases they have no authority over, and have effectively stolen, sacra that they sell. Art-dealer arguments about "legitimate acquisition" thus gain credence: "this was bought from a Hopi." Yet here again a politics of ethnic domination appears: vulgar stereotypes of communitarian "tribal societies"—which lack order, laws, or coherent decision-making processes—are subtextually invoked. A willful failure to recognize legitimate Hopi authorities, or whether particular individuals are adhering to Hopi religious precepts, somehow justifies expropriation.¹³

Collection of Hopi representations follows a patterned division in the commodification of "tribal art" and "artifacts" into, briefly, fine art, folk art/craft, and tourist art (Clifford 1988:223–26; see also Price 1989). Though the categories overlap, this division reflects a hierarchy of interest groups in many instances coincident with class divisions in the dominant society. The panoply of cultural and social registers of interest is especially noticeable among tourists, and national class is not the only configuration of difference: ethnicity—indigenous, national, and international—is also prominent. A typical Hopi ritual, for example, sees a multiplicity of outsiders, including (1) *kyavakviti*, Hopis from other villages; (2) other Native Americans, especially Navajos and Pueblos, often

13. This issue has complex forms when muddled by internal factionalism. Despite a long-term, societywide ban on ritual photography, one "Traditionalist" spokesman recently submitted color footage of Hotevilla rituals he had shot clandestinely since the 1960s for inclusion in a documentary film (*Techqua Ikachi* 1991). The film evoked an outcry when it was shown in Hotevilla in March 1992. Hotevilla, which does not send representatives to the Tribal Council and in other respects opposes it, in this instance petitioned the council's assistance to prevent the film's distribution (as yet, national distributors have shied away because of the controversy; in Europe, German and French editions of the film have been publicly available since 1989). The Swiss and German producers, when approached by the Tribe's Office of Cultural Preservation, passed off responsibility for commercializing footage well known as highly taboo throughout Hopi society (not just from one factional standpoint) by claiming a factional allegiance to the Traditionalist group, and reasserting a challenge to the council's legitimacy.

from Zuni, Laguna, Cochiti, and Santo Domingo; (3) many non-Native Americans—the great majority white, but also Hispanic, African-American, and Asian-American—of different classes, age-groups, regions, and sub-ethnicities; (4) Europeans, especially Germans, French, Italians, occasional Britons, Spaniards, and others; (5) Japanese and other Asians, including occasional Pakistanis, Tibetans, and Indian Sikhs;¹⁴ (6) and perhaps the odd African, Latin-American, Indonesian, white Australian, or even a Jamaican reggae entourage (see note 12). In addition to their intrinsic attraction as performers of exotic rituals and producers of acquirable tribal art, Hopis are on a major American tourist circuit because of their proximity to the Grand Canyon and Monument Valley. In short, outside interests in and valuations of Hopi people and their representations are anything but monolithic.

The invention of “tribal art” in the dominant society into a marketable commodity (which objectifies and reflects the identity and often the prestige of its owners) confounds the artifacts’ indigenous meanings. Whatever it is that collectors see in Hopi artifacts, it is not their Hopi saliences. Rather, an alien code of value supervenes: that of symbolic capital and its acquisitive worth in the construction of Western selves (cf. Clifford 1988:220). Inasmuch as Hopi objects evoke some notion of Hopiness for their collectors and observers, the cultural recognition is typically no more than “ethnocentric sentimentalism in the absence of a knowledge of what those arts are about or an understanding of the culture out of which they come” (C. Geertz 1983:119).

As with museum objects, the artifacts of an exotic culture, or even photographs of its members, allow the metropolitan aesthetic gaze to empathize on its own terms. In earlier times, cultural exhibitions often included individual “natives” as well, shipped in for display (Rydell 1984; Çelik 1992). Contemporary American Indian arts and crafts fairs perpetuate this in modified form. Some Hopi friends regularly demonstrate plaque-weaving and pottery in St. Louis and Washington, D.C., where they have occasionally been asked to wear buckskins and sit in front of tepees.

Modern transportation and a developed tourist industry (whether in Papua New Guinea, the Amazon, Borneo, or the American Southwest)

14. Sometimes white-bourgeois Sikhs from Española, New Mexico (known in local parlance, for their mostly white turbans, as “diaper-heads”) are present too: at a Hopi dance transgressive postmodern identities are refracted across multiple intersecting planes.

recapitulate the self-absorbed fetishizing gaze, but *in situ*. At home, Hopis often don stereotypic personae for tourists, both to ensure real privacy and because it eases cash transactions for crafts (cf. Lavie 1990, on constructions of Bedouin identity).

So graven images (in museums, private collections, or coffee-table texts¹⁵), briefly visited ritual performances, and staged cultural identities and practices enable outsiders, in the seclusion of their imaginations, to envisage Hopi (among Others') experience insulated from its material realities. Psychological realization of an aesthetic impulse (involving a sort of primitivist cathexis)—through voyeuristic attributions of “beauty,” “dignity,” or “ingenious handiwork”—effectively discharges human obligation and diverts any real social concern. In general, aestheticization defuses social responsibility: “An aestheticizing reference to painting, sculpture or literature . . . resorts to the neutralization and distancing which bourgeois discourse about the social world requires and performs” (Bourdieu 1984:45).¹⁶

In some instances, fetishizers of Hopi culture have been centrally involved in overt political domination (Snake Dance visitors at the turn of the century, a period of coercively “directed culture change,” often included political dignitaries; cf. note 1).¹⁷ The New Agers, by contrast, ideologically (and in the Marxist sense, with false consciousness) deny or oppose establishment values present in governmental domination: for them, fetishized Hopis become metonymic emblems of a millenarian struggle against old meanings. And *haut-bourgeois* art patrons, if they care, deny complicity in domination by setting their fetishism in a sublime category apart (“neutralizing” and “distancing” it in Bourdieu’s terms) from the grime of a material politics, i.e., as “Art” or “Aesthetics,”

15. On Hopi coffee-table images, cf. Whiteley (1990).

16. In an incisive recent critique of the same process at work in Sebastião Salgado’s photography of dying children in the Sahel—widely acclaimed in Western bourgeois circles for its supposed social consciousness—Ingrid Sischy (1991:92) points out: “This beautification of tragedy results in pictures that ultimately reinforce our passivity toward the experience they reveal. To aestheticize tragedy is the fastest way to anesthetize the feelings of those who are witnessing it. Beauty is a call to admiration, not to action.”

17. Foucault’s analyses of power (e.g., 1978) render implausible absolute distinctions between overt political oppression and aesthetic valuation. Gramsci’s concept of hegemony (e.g., 1970) also keenly demonstrates the infiltration of power structures into cognitive, including aesthetic, processes. Eagleton (1990) has recently taken up and extended these and other arguments on the social roles and effects of aesthetics.

entrenched categories of bourgeois taste and self-identification (e.g., Williams 1977:150; Price 1989).

WRITING HOPI CULTURE

Contemporary Hopi life is inseparably positioned within the political-economic and aesthetic-cultural interests of a national polity and its local forms under the control of Anglo Americans. Hopi perspectives on the dominant society and its interests in them are inextricably tied to contexts of interaction instanced in the previously described abuses of their representations.

Anthropology is deeply implicated here, both as a principal source of outside knowledge about Hopi and as another mode of collecting, analyzing, and re-ordering Hopi practices to its own registers of significance. Ethnographic knowledge about the Hopi has been accumulating for more than a century (e.g., Laird 1977). The first real monograph, J. G. Bourke's *The Snake Dance of the Moquis of Arizona*, appeared in 1884. Since then, ethnographic research and writing have proliferated: every conceivable area of Hopi life—from sexuality to astronomy, herpetology to child psychology—has come under scrutiny at one point or another. Moreover, anthropologists are often indistinguishable for Hopis from other “ethnographic” inquirers, academic and otherwise:

No ethnic group of comparable size has had as much attention trained on it as the Hopi Indians of Arizona. Ethnologists and religious specialists, linguists, art historians and collectors, hippies and “Indian-freaks,” ecologists, spiritualists and pursuers of esoterica—interest in this people oscillates among extremes. (Kunze 1988:jacket, my translation)

Many Hopis are deeply suspicious of *any* graphic representations of their culture, particularly of ritual knowledge and practice. For years now, all villages have featured signs prohibiting photography, note taking, painting, and sketching (in Hopi, the same term, *peena*, “to represent graphically,” covers all these inscriptional modes). The signs may as well say “No Ethnography.” While much anger is focused on Frank Waters' *Book of the Hopi*, a great deal is directed at more serious ethnographic publications, both the older studies of esoteric ritual detail, like

those of Voth, Stephen, and Fewkes, and also recent works focused on religious ritual and belief.

Traditionally, academic scholars have privileged their practice and mystified its politics.¹⁸ They do this via institutionally supported prestige techniques and discourses, including the blanket invocation of old shibboleths—"academic freedom" (to inquire) and "freedom of speech" (to publish). Further, they distance their work from all "amateur" interests not sanctioned by the academy. So (we) self-righteous anthropologists can be appalled by Smokis, art collectors, or New Agers, but conveniently blind ourselves to a family resemblance with our own representations of Hopi culture. In claiming an exalted ground of "pure research," scholars disavow the political situation underpinning their work, i.e., the state of dominance and subordination between their society of origin and those of their subjects (cf. Asad 1973).

It is little wonder that subject societies are often unconvinced of the virtues of academic research, especially if they know any published representations will be open to abuses affecting their cultural and political sovereignty.¹⁹ Again, fine distinctions among serious and less serious inquiries are often irrelevant to Hopi interests. Both the scholar, whether blithely bent on "pure research"²⁰ or genuinely interested in a sensitive portrayal of Hopi perspectives, and the dabbler ask similar kinds of ques-

18. This has been pointed out by a rising tide of critics (e.g., Maquet 1964; Gough 1967; Deloria 1969; Asad 1973, 1992; Hymes 1972; Dwyer 1982; Clifford 1983; Fabian 1983; Marcus and Fischer 1986; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Said 1989; Minh-ha 1989). As Said (1989:213) puts it: "The by now massed discourses, codes, and practical traditions of anthropology, with its authorities, disciplinary rigors, genealogical maps, systems of patronage and accreditation have all been accumulated into various modes of *being anthropological*. . . . The customary way of doing things both narcotizes and insulates the guild member. . . . To practice anthropology in the United States is therefore not just to be doing scholarly work investigating 'otherness' and 'difference' in a large country; it is to be discussing them in an enormously influential and powerful state whose global role is that of a superpower."

19. It is certain, for example, that the Smokis used ethnographic works on the Snake Dance, by Voth and Fewkes, in particular.

20. Vine Deloria's witty polemic (1969:83–104) against "pure research" by anthropologists in Native American communities is still unequalled as an indictment of socially insouciant academic practice. For example: "The anthro is usually devoted to PURE RESEARCH. Pure research is a body of knowledge absolutely devoid of useful application and incapable of meaningful digestion. Pure research is an abstraction of scholarly suspicions concerning some obscure theory originally expounded in pre-Revolutionary days and systematically checked each summer since then. A 1969 thesis restating a proposition of 1773 complete with footnotes to all material published between 1773 and 1969 is pure research" (1969:85).

tions and often produce written representations with analogously disruptive effects.

Moreover, fear or dislike of misrepresentation is not the only issue. Voth's and Stephen's work (for bibliography see Laird 1977) and some recent publications on religious ritual, for example, are targeted specifically for their *accuracy*. One Hopi friend ironized after reading Voth's *The Oraibi Summer Snake Ceremony* (1903), "Thank you [to Voth, as if he were a ritual sponsor]; now I am an initiate." And others have indicated a preference for spurious, plainly inaccurate accounts, because at least these keep the reality private by misleading their audience: truth, in this context, is held more dangerous than fiction (cf. Scott 1985).

The desire for privacy and autonomy is a function both of the inundation of inquisitors and of the internal sociology of Hopi knowledge. Knowledge conferred by initiation simultaneously endows instrumental power over actions and events in the world. Much ritual power and knowledge is held secret within specific sectors of Hopi society: secrecy and the attendant social care and respect accorded to esoteric knowledge guarantees both authority conferred by initiation and instrumental efficacy when the power and knowledge is activated. Prescriptions for individual conduct in ritual, namely a purity of thought, emotion, and intention, and proscriptions against the misuse of ritual knowledge, which specify supernatural retribution, are utterly central in Hopi discourse (Whiteley 1987). Dissemination of ritual knowledge, either orally to unentitled parties or *ipso facto* in published accounts, violates ritual sanctity and effectiveness and may damage the spiritual health of the community.²¹

In light of this and of the abuses adumbrated above, it is not surprising that the Snake Dance has recently been closed to non-Indians or that in 1992, for the first time ever, most villages closed down Kachina dances, following an issue of Marvel Comics' (March 1992) *NFL Superpro*, which featured the steroid-inflated, white superhero in a "gut-stomping" contest with named Hopi Kachinas, impersonated by a white

21. Secrecy, particularly regarding instrumentally powerful knowledge, is, of course, a universal social practice (see, e.g., Bok 1983). While in the U.S., for example, academics and the press often trumpet an unproblematized version of "free speech," the same society has produced multiple secret praxes in military and other matters deemed to affect "national security." With regard to the ethnographic politics of ritual knowledge elsewhere, Australian aboriginal societies have (finally) had some particular success in persuading anthropologists to preserve secrecy (see Myers 1986).

mafioso gambling cartel.²² Nor then should it be surprising that Hopis have actively sought to prevent publication of an academic work on religious pilgrimage that identifies shrine locations (Raymond 1990) and have resisted efforts to re-publish older Hopi ethnographic reports dealing with ritual. Tribal officials continue to debate specific restrictions on research; not a few argue for a total moratorium, as Tribal Chairman Vernon Masayesva (January 23, 1991) pointed out in a speech at Northern Arizona University: "As people we have been studied as 'social artifacts' or quaint vestiges of a primitive existence. Our legends, handicrafts, and even the bones of our ancestors have been collected and studied outside of the subjective view of our own ways of life."

He goes on to note two cases of research (by scholars from Arizona universities) Hopis found offensive, one suggesting Hopis were cannibals until the 1700s (contrary to Hopi historical knowledge), the other concerning the Salt Trail pilgrimage:

I learned that [the] University could not take any action on my complaint since the research was protected by a sacred university tradition called "academic freedom." It is this type of research that is causing many Hopis to pressure the Hopi Tribal Council to enact an ordinance prohibiting *all* future research activities on the Hopi Reservation. . . . Although the [Salt Trail] research wears the cloak of scholarly enterprise, its publication denotes to us a lack of sensitivity to our religious values and the way we organize and conceptualize our sacred traditions. Research needs to be based on the reality of our existence *as we experience it*, not just from the narrow and limited view American universities carried over from the German research tradition.

THE END OF ANTHROPOLOGY? OR DÉJÀ VU?

To anthropologists I say, put your own house in order because what you may regard today as just a skirmish with Indians may tomorrow become a worldwide problem. (Ortiz 1973:91)

22. One of the most acutely upsetting elements of this comic was that the Kachinas' masks were knocked off, revealing their human vehicles. The issue appeared on reservation newsstands right at the time of Powamuy initiation, when Hopi children are supposed to be learning some of the secrets of the Kachina society in a more orthodox way. The Tribal Council's protests to Marvel Comics produced a somewhat belated and ambiguous apology and the withdrawal (well after their peak sales period) of the remaining copies.

In 1987, Palestinian-American critic Edward Said (1989) suggested before the American Anthropological Association that the anthropological project itself be abandoned, for its collusion with the colonial domination of its subjects. In some respects anthropology has been experiencing an ontological crisis recently, and critiques, both academic and popular, are mounting (e.g., Dwyer 1982; *Anthropology on Trial* 1984; Marcus and Fischer 1986; Sass 1986; Clifford 1988; McGrane 1989; Minh-ha 1989; Malcomson 1989; Said 1989; Torgovnick 1990). But, as with much 1980s and 1990s social analysis, there is a sense of déjà vu here.²³

In 1969, Native American critic Vine Deloria, Jr., challenged anthropologists in similar ways as Said did. For a while, there was a more genuine dialogue, at least between Native scholars and academic anthropologists (e.g., American Anthropological Association 1973) and this was associated with revisionary contemplations of the discipline's ethical foundations (e.g., *Current Anthropology* 1968, 1971; Hymes 1972). The 1960s, as we nostalgically rhapsodize, were a watershed for cultural and political critique. Deloria's challenge came at a time of serious questioning within and beyond the discipline. Revisionary theoretical challenge (e.g., Leach 1961) coincided with critiques of anthropology's colonial associations²⁴, producing a serious examination of both the intellectual and moral condition of the discipline and its relations with its constituted subjects. Critique of theory was explicitly associated with critique of practical political effects on subject communities.

In the 1960s the critique of anthropology had clearer theoretical and political targets in functionalism, on the one hand, and obvious colonial structures, on the other. At present, while the political (e.g., Third Worldist) critique is still associated with resistance to old and neo-colonial structures, it is hard even to identify a central body of theory. And perhaps indeed it is a question more of absence than presence. If we choose, say, postmodernism as a recent ethnographic episteme, it is less easily assailable than functionalism as an intellectual collusion with

23. After I had already titled my paper I discovered, tellingly, the identical title (minus the "(at Hopi)") in a 1966 paper by Peter Worsley. The recent debates on "endism" from right and left (e.g., Fukuyama 1989; McKibben 1989; Malcomson 1989) reproduce a precedent that is rather more full-bodied. Indeed, compared to earlier critiques of anthropology, the later ones often seem lame, more a disengaged postmodern navel contemplation than a call to social action.

24. For example, see Hooker (1963); Maquet (1964); Lévi-Strauss (1966); Gough (1967); Anderson (1968); *Current Anthropology* (1968); Goddard (1969); Banaji (1970); Leclerc (1972); and most especially Asad (1973), from which I take much of this history.

formal power because of its philosophical diffuseness, its emphasis on continuous deconstructing and decentering, and its own avowed critical stance on colonial structures. While the de Man affair has contributed to the re-awakening of a more contextualized historicism (e.g., Lehman 1991), much postmodernist critique disenables a politics of action because of its emphasis on the radical contingency of events, meanings, and perspectives. Postmodern cultural analysis depends on the same bourgeois social distance and aestheticizing valorization—but here of academic-intellectual discourse itself—present in culture collecting. If signification is only self-referential, social recommendations seem irrelevant and postmodernists may sit comfortably on their ivory fences.

If anthropology is really in crisis at present, and this is not some anthropologists cultivating a fashionable, careerist neurosis, it might be hard to notice. Almost twenty years ago, Asad (1973:10) noted a similar paradox:

The Association of Social Anthropologists flourishes as never before; it holds academic conferences whose proceedings are regularly published in handsome hardcover and paperback editions. Monographs, articles and text-books by writers calling themselves anthropologists appear in increasing number. . . . The subject is now being taught in more university and college departments than ever. . . . Seen in terms of its public activity there is no crisis in social anthropology.

If we change the references to a North American context in the early 1990s, all of these characterizations hold true, as the American Anthropological Association annual meetings repeatedly attest.²⁵

What has changed in the last twenty years or so is the role of Native Americanists and their subjects within anthropology. Both have become marginal in critical debates and prestiged discourses of the discipline (cf. Lurie 1988), a factor reflected in both teaching and research. In graduate level teaching of anthropological theory, contemporary texts on Native North Americans figure sparingly. Most teaching of Native American ethnography probably occurs at an undergraduate level. Moreover, undergraduate textbooks typically reproduce stereotypical vignettes of Native cultures, selected for their topical imaginative appeal,

25. Indeed, they hold less true in Britain, owing to the educational ravages of Thatcherism.

as different from or models for a critique of the students' own cultures. Of the Hopi, for example, undergraduates are most likely to learn that they have no concepts of time and little gender inequality.²⁶ Images of Native Americans constructed through canonical ethnographic texts, textbooks, and other representational modes "invent" Native Americans for their audience (cf. Deloria 1969; Vizenor 1987). Some presumptions I attributed above to New Agers derive in part from classroom inventions of Native Americans: timeless, historyless spiritualists at harmony with one another and in tune with nature—and this is the story many students continue to want to hear.

Moreover, ethnographic monographs are proving insufficient teaching tools for the interpretation of cultures. Student criticism (some of which I share) of ethnographic texts—that they are "dry," jargon-filled, and distant from the lived experience and interpretations of their subjects—causes me to assign a mix of (auto)biography and Native American literature and criticism, along with formal ethnography. A related fact is that few ethnographic texts by Native Americans are being produced, because there are very few Native ethnographers (as academics anyway). Native American academics for the most part have pursued other disciplines, indicating, *inter alia*, a signal failure of anthropology in its stated goal of serving as a vehicle for genuine, usable intercultural understanding. The most interesting "ethnography" by, and to some extent of, Native Americans today is literary (Leslie Marmon Silko, Louise Erdrich), or cultural critique-based (Gerald Vizenor), or visual (Victor Masayesva, Jr.) rather than being in a strictly anthropological frame.

With respect to research, graduate students are urged to work in Papua New Guinea, Amazonia, Indonesia, or some other suitably exotic overseas elsewhere. Native Americans have "lost their culture," become "proletarianized," or at any rate have been "overworked" (in the manic careerist bazaar of "original" research projects); they have been "done" already. Central concerns in contemporary theory—such as power, the self, gender, the body, discourse, agency, hierarchy, and textual representation—are best worked out in those distant locales where these things are somehow more authentically constitutive of lived experience (cf. Ap-

26. Whorf's depictions of the Hopi language as timeless remain popular despite Malotki's (1983) careful corrective. The theme of gender equality originates with Schlegel's work (e.g., 1977).

padurai 1986). Reciprocally, Native Americanists no longer lead in key debates and, with a few exceptions (largely in archaeology and narrative translation), inhabit the intellectual peripheries of key arguments.

This alleged marginalization may come as a shock to Hopis (and other Native peoples) who each summer, with the appropriate seasonality their “biological” worldviews are held to prescribe,²⁷ experience the arrival of neophyte anthropologists, often from less prestigious graduate programs and, in the West especially, from local universities. Like beaching driftwood on the flood tide of tourists, in “field schools” or just off their own bats, they appear on the reservation to investigate some “problem,” usually devised without the benefit of any local input.²⁸ Native communities remain proving-grounds—boot camps—for apprentice researchers. That this is possible bespeaks the same political domination that underwrites the abuses of Hopi representations I began with.

The research picture is further complicated by the “blurring of genres” (C. Geertz 1983). Anthropologists are increasingly not the only academics interested in Hopi. Occasional linguists, psychologists, and philosophers have studied there at least since the 1930s, but recently a gaggle of linguists and narratologists, students of comparative religion, and art historians have entered the fray, very often examining the same questions as anthropologists but blithely unaware of the ethical standards and cultural understandings anthropology has genuinely accumulated (partly as a result of its history of interaction with Native Americans).²⁹ For Hopis, the many faces of research get ever muddier.

POSSIBILITIES

It would be wise for anthropologists to get down from their thrones of authority and PURE research and begin helping Indian tribes instead of preying on them. (Deloria 1969:104)

[Anthropology] can be abused, but it can also be used humanely and ethically, as well as scientifically. (Ortiz 1973:87)

27. My jibe is intended particularly for Calvin Martin (1987).

28. Deloria's (1969:83) acid comments on this practice still hold true more than twenty years later.

29. See, for example, American Anthropological Association (1971, 1990); Fluehr-Lobban 1991.

I had a call from a graduate student at a department quite close to Hopi that will remain nameless. He said he was writing a paper on Hopi “tipony” and did I have any advice. After I determined that he meant not a small Franglais horse, but *tiiponi*, an important ritual emblem, I suggested he go and talk to some Hopis. No, he said, he was not going to do that; he just wanted to read up on it and come to his own conclusions. He would then present his paper on a religiously sensitive matter to the world (actually to the AAA meetings).

I had another call from a novelist in New Jersey. He said he had read my book that focuses on the deliberacy of Hopi political decision making (1988). He had also heard about the theft of the *Taalawtumsit*, very important ritual figures used in manhood initiation, from Shongopavi. Their theft in the late 1970s has been ritually and socially very disruptive and deeply hurtful to Hopi sensibilities (perhaps the way Catholics would feel if the Sistine Chapel were blown up by atheist terrorists). The novelist had an idea; he wanted to write a Tony-Hillermanesque tale set at Hopi, the plot of which would focus on how the Shongopavi priests deliberately got rid of these religious figures for some dark purpose. I advised him against this. The already damaged community would be gravely offended by this adding of insult to injury, and such a publication would be like pouring acid onto an open social wound.

How naive can outsiders get about the social effects of their representations? The West’s liberal conscience was shocked when Ayatollah Khomeini issued a death sentence on Salman Rushdie for *The Satanic Verses*. “Freedom of speech” again was the rallying cry. But as Asad has pointed out (1990), the protests ignored the social context of embattled subaltern Muslim communities, particularly in Britain; the book’s implicit critique of Islam, as well as the Muslim world’s reaction to it, has already been transmuted into another tool of cultural oppression by the dominant white, non-Muslim majority.

While the management of Hopi representations must be partly regulated internally, it is clear that the U.S. government will put down forcible resistances, such as death sentences against ethnographers or novelists, as it has repeatedly shown with numerous subaltern activist groups from A.I.M. to the Black Panthers. So for their part anthropologists must take an initiative and decide whether they are willing to be complicit in processes of oppression or whether they will work in various ways, both in terms of their representations and their social action, for Hopi interests against misrepresentation. The moral situation is, of

course, more complex than this framing of choice but not thereby grounds for its avoidance (see MacLean, Montefiore, and Winch 1990). It may already be too late: the crisis of bad faith has been compounded in so many ways that Hopis may well elect simply to exclude ethnographers (as Masayesva's speech indicates).

In the atmosphere of cultural subversion that my four initial examples point to, the question remains whether anthropology or various sister disciplines have any practical or intellectual utility within Hopi society or can genuinely enhance intercultural respect, appreciation, and understanding in a way that overrides potential abuses. Anthropologists (and others) can no longer sustain the illusion that their work occurs in a political or representational vacuum. They *must* now address the likely effects on Hopis of disseminating ethnography in the dominant society.

As for my own work, I want mostly to leave that to the judgment of others: emphasis on the self-scrutinizing author's voice in recent ethnographic writing seems to me mostly simple narcissism designed to obviate dialectical critique and mask unconsidered subtexts. I am concerned, however, that my representations were read by this novelist and put together into his dark little plot. And given what I have said, I think it unwise at present to publish on an area of great personal interest and substantial research over the last decade, Hopi place names; I would have to subtitle it, "A Site Guide for New-Age Tourists and Pothunters." Here again the politics of representations are complex: if Tsimontukwi had been widely known about among those sympathetic to Hopi interests in the dominant society, it just might not have been desecrated.

Third-World critic Trinh Minh-ha (1989:68) has characterized anthropology as fundamentally gossip. As anthropologists know, gossip can be a powerful technique for social control in any community. In the contemporary global community, if their representations are going to have any use to their subjects, anthropologists must make their gossip *more controlling on behalf of their subjects* and *less* for their subjects' oppressors. The "speaking for others" at the heart of the anthropological enterprise must come to terms with the moral responsibilities latent in all such practice (see Alcoff 1991). This will involve, not just an account of resistance, but a full-blown focus on the multiple processes whereby the West has exerted its hegemony on colonized societies, forcing them to reconfigure numerous social and cultural practices and concepts (Asad 1992). If anthropologists are to survive and pursue any of their stated

goals of furthering intercultural understanding, they must move their cultural inquiries into a different register. With regard to Hopi, first, what is badly needed in ethnographic description are Hopi perspectives—social, cultural, critical, historical, ecological, etc. It is the height of absurdity (in any event, but especially after more than a century of ethnography), for example, to read in a recent account myself cited as the authority for an observation that Hopis know they need water to grow crops (Loftin 1991:10).

Second, the literature already has more than enough accounts of Hopi ritual detail: we do not need to encourage “tipony-ism.” Regarding ritual, anthropologists should move to explaining to their audience in a socially constructive way how Hopis situate, evaluate, and feel about their actions in contemporary circumstances, why privacy needs to be respected, why many accounts of ritual are subversive, and that Hopis want members of the dominant society to appreciate and learn from Hopi practice but without desecrating it. In short, the intersocietal environment conditioning both Hopi and non-Hopi interpretations of ritual needs foregrounding as the critically salient site of present cultural explanation. In many instances Hopis are glad to share their perspectives on what they perceive to be the uniquely beneficial aspects and effects of their culture’s worldview. As one friend put it when discussing accounts of Hopi for the outside world, an account is beneficial “so long as it positively enhances their lives, their understanding.” In this implicit critique, Hopis see their culture not as some abstract expression, but as instrumental: ritual dramas, for example, are performed *for* the material benefit of the whole world. It is only with great reluctance and significant opposition, therefore, that even after decades of Smoki and other kinds of abuse, the priests felt they had no alternative but to close down Snake and Kachina dances. In other words, it runs counter to Hopi first principles to restrict all outside representations of them: they are simply tired of the abuses.

Third, anthropologists must attend and conform to the interests of local communities in constructing research projects. The graduate school rationale of constructing “problems” *in vacuo* to pursue “in the field”—and here, I think, lies the epistemological key to anthropology’s contemporary intellectual reproduction of colonial oppression—just has got to go. If this means giving up cherished theoretical procedures and being skeptical of knee-jerk invocations of “academic freedom,” then so be it:

we stand to gain far more for theory itself in a discipline devoted to the study of culture if we genuinely engage different cultural perspectives.³⁰

And fourth, a corollary of the preceding, this seems the only way anthropology is going to become truly multicultural. I like to tell my undergraduate students in the current debates that anthropology is the most sophisticated potential tool for understanding cultural realities, dialogically bridging difference and, therefore, engaging a truly multicultural perspective. But this remains potential. Why after so much research for so long on Native American cultures are there still so few Native anthropologists? It is particularly ironic, given the discipline's stated interests, to see year after year the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association utterly dominated numerically by whites. If anthropology is to become a genuine vehicle of intercultural understanding rather than a bourgeois language game about the oppressed it must reform its thought and its institutional structures, both to be of interest to members of subaltern ethnicities and to provide them formal access to its practices and discourses. In the present global society, anthropology, more than any other subject, drastically needs "affirmative action" to include practitioners from all communities.³¹ For this to happen (and it sounds utopian) anthropology must not only "rethink" and "re-invent"—to allude to previous efforts at revision—or "recapture"—to refer to a more recent one—but radically restructure both its thought and its institutional underpinnings.³² If it does not make such efforts quickly, it will probably die a slow, lingering death from disinterest, increasingly irrelevant to cultural interpretation in the emergent cosmopolitan order.

30. Archaeologists, for example, in both their theory and praxis, have more often than not systematically excluded the knowledges and interpretations of living Pueblo descendants—as they have with non-Western indigenous peoples worldwide (Ucko 1987; Bruguier and Zimmerman 1991). The intellectual grounds for exclusion, particularly in the now-old "new archaeology," exalt cold "scientific analysis" of mute material remains over indigenous oral histories: Natives need not apply. To me, at least, this seems an appalling interpretive error (as well as a morally indefensible act in a genuinely plural society), cultural varieties of historicity notwithstanding. It is as if classical archaeologists were simply to throw out all Greek and Roman texts and deny a need to know the languages, an inconceivable circumstance. Yet I cannot think of a single Southwestern archaeologist who has taken the trouble to learn a Pueblo language, for example.

31. The AAA's Committee on Anthropology in Predominantly Minority Institutions, founded in 1989, is a step in the right direction.

32. Neither is this recommendation new. Two decades ago (again), Delmos Jones (1970:258) put it this way: "The emergence of a native anthropology is part of an essential decolonization of anthropological knowledge and requires drastic changes in the recruitment and training of anthropologists."

In terms of social action, it is easy to pontificate and issue conscience-salving hard-line calls to the barricades. But earlier attempts to do this (e.g., Moore 1971) have largely failed. At the same time, it seems clear that “action-oriented,” activist, or applied anthropology must become a component of *all* anthropological practice, rather than being ghettoized into a sub-discipline. I do not mean to trivialize the problematics of activism and advocacy (see, e.g., Wright 1988; Hastrup and Ellass 1990) but, at a basic level, if anthropologists are not interested in the fates of their subjects, then what use can their knowledge have either to the community itself or to any genuine “science of man”? Hopis identify plenty of existing social and cultural problems deriving from decades of U.S. cultural hegemony—land loss, language loss, cultural loss, intellectual property violations, alcoholism, and diabetes—that the particular skills of anthropologists could help with, *if* anthropologists have the political will to do so and if they are perceived as beneficent by Hopis. Some of this is taking place at present, and by no means all anthropologists at Hopi are exclusively self-interested. But researchers have a long way to go, in the atmosphere I have described, to overturn Hopi impressions that cultural exploitation is the sole motive for their presence.

Let me close with some more of Vernon Masayesva’s remarks (January 23, 1991), which resonate with several of these arguments:

I hope you [i.e., the academic community] can help us find common ground. Together we need to examine the issue of research and the manner in which scholars will conduct research so that Indian views will be respected. I propose an inclusive agenda . . . involving Indian people in formulating research questions. In the process you can help us become effective researchers. The inclusive agenda would involve mutual study, not just one person or group objectively studying the other. The key to our survival as Indian people is not just preserving our cultural ways, but in devising ways to effectively interact with the dominant society and other cultures with which we coexist. I believe the university has a major responsibility in sharing its academic tools with us. . . . However, let me caution you again that any university-sponsored project, regardless of how noble its aim might be, will surely fail if consultation with Indian tribes is not part of the planning process from the project’s inception.

EPILOGUE: THE PURE PRODUCTS GO CRAZY:
RITUAL AS ETHNOGRAPHIC ALLEGORY³³

Finally, lest I risk overemphasizing anthropologists' self-importance as cultural representers, they are not the only ones to practice or utilize ethnography as a medium of intercultural impression management (cf. Basso 1979). Hopis, while oppressed materially and representationally by the dominant society, are not just passive receptors of the traffic in their representations. Although I have argued that anthropologists can be of assistance in some cultural spheres and that we need more Hopi anthropologists in a cosmopolitan program of intercultural and inter-societal studies, Hopis are working out many of their own intercultural experiences in their own traditional ethnographic modes.

IT IS AUGUST in the dusty pueblo plaza. . . . Well, actually it's June, but you get the picture: I am talking about a Snake Dance. But this time it *is* a Hopi plaza (Kykotsmovi, ca 1985) with a mixed Hopi and non-Hopi audience. The performers are Hopi clowns,³⁴ the snakes are of the store-bought bamboo-segment variety, the songs are histrionic Hollywood-tribal, and the dance steps are, as my friend put it, "you know, white-man style" (which I took to mean, in the first place, rhythmically inept, over-gestural, and uncoordinated). They are burlesquing the Smoki Snake Dance, ridiculing its racism and incongruities, reasserting sovereignty over Hopi representations, parodically turning the parody back on itself, emptying it for the time being at least of its oppressive meaning and power. The Hopi part of the audience—with a trace of nervousness because, as with much clown ethnographic allegory, this gets rather close to the bone—dissolves in laughter. ❖

SPECIAL POSTSCRIPT

Since this article was completed and just before it went to press, Victor Masayeva's marvelous film *Imagining Indians* (1992) has come

33. Lavié's (1990) portrayal of Mzeina allegorical identity plays is particularly resonant here.

34. This account is taken from a Hopi friend who participated. I did not witness the performance, though I have seen many others over the years.

to my attention. Masayesva broaches some of the same issues (including some of the same examples) of appropriation, fetishization, and misrepresentation of Native American cultures—brilliantly, penetratingly—as appear here.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Versions of this paper were presented at a session of the 1991 American Anthropological Association annual meeting in Chicago on “Native Americans, Anthropology, and Ethics”; at the Royal Anthropological Institute’s third International Festival of Ethnographic Film held at Manchester University in September 1992, symposium on “Discovering Native America: Images, Texts, Politics”; and to the doctoral program in anthropology, Graduate Center, City University of New York in October 1992. I am most grateful for comments and encouragement in Chicago to Leigh Jenkins, Kurt Dongoske, Roger Echohawk, and Larry Zimmerman; in Manchester to Marilyn Strathern, Paul Henley, Stephen Hugh-Jones, and Barbara Babcock; in New York to Louise Lennihan, May Ebihara, Delmos Jones, and Gerald Sider. Many thanks for comments also to Tom Biolsi and Larry Zimmerman, to Arnold Krupat and Nicole Polier at Sarah Lawrence College, and to Hans-Ulrich Sanner at the University of Frankfurt. I am most grateful, too, to Vernon Masayesva for permission to quote from his speech at Northern Arizona University.

REFERENCES

- Alcoff, Linda. 1991. “The Problem of Speaking for Others.” *Cultural Critique* Winter:5–32.
- American Anthropological Association. 1971. “Statement on Ethics, Principles of Professional Responsibility.” Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Assn.
- . 1973. *Symposium on Anthropology and the American Indian*. San Francisco: Indian Historian Press.
- . 1990. “Amendment to AAA 1971.” Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Assn.
- Anderson, Perry. 1968. “Components of the National Culture.” *New Left Review* 50:3–57.

- “Anthropology on Trial.” 1984. Nova videograph (WGBH) New York: Time-Life Video.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. “Theory in Anthropology: Center and Periphery.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 28(2):356–61.
- Arizona Republic*, 8-5-1990, “Anglo ‘Tribe’ Dances Controversial Steps,” by Paul Brinkley-Rogers, A1–A2.
- Asad, Talal, ed. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.
- . 1990. “Ethnography, Literature, and Politics: Some Readings and Uses of Salman Rushdie’s *The Satanic Verses*.” *Cultural Anthropology* 5(3):239–69.
- . 1992. “Afterword: From the History of Colonial Anthropology to the Anthropology of Western Hegemony.” In *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*, G. Stocking, ed., 314–24. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Banaji, Jairus. 1970. “The Crisis of British Anthropology.” *New Left Review* 64:71–85.
- Basso, Keith. 1979. *Portraits of “The Whiteman”: Linguistic Play and Cultural Symbols among the Western Apache*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloch, Maurice. 1989. *Ritual, History, Power: Selected Papers in Anthropology*. London: Athlone.
- Boissière, Robert. 1986. *Meditations with the Hopi*. Santa Fe, New Mex.: Bear and Co.
- Bok, Sissela. 1983. *Secrets: On the Ethics of Concealment and Revelation*. New York: Pantheon.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984 [1979]. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, Richard Nice, trans. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bourke, John G. 1884. *The Snake Dance of the Moquis of Arizona*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons.
- Bruguier, Leonard R., and Larry J. Zimmerman. 1991. “Native Americans and the World Archaeological Congress Code of Ethics.” Paper presented at the 1991 Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association.
- Çelik, Zeynep. 1992. *Displaying the Orient: Architecture of Islam at Nineteenth-Century World’s Fairs*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Clifford, James. 1983. "On Ethnographic Authority." *Representations* 1:118–46.
- . 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, James, and George Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Current Anthropology*. 1968. "Social Responsibilities" (symposium). 9(5):391–435.
- . 1971. "Toward an Ethics for Anthropologists" (symposium). 12(3):321–56.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. 1969. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr., and C. M. Lytle. 1984. *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Self-Government*. New York: Pantheon.
- Dwyer, Kevin. 1982. *Moroccan Dialogues: Anthropology in Question*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Eagleton, Terry. 1990. *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn, ed. 1991. *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for a New Era*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The History of Sexuality*, vol. I, Robert Hurley, trans. New York: Pantheon.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1989. "The End of History?" *The National Interest* 16:3–35.
- Gallup Independent*, 6-6-1992, "Hopis Seek Help to Halt Woodruff Butte Mining," p. 1.
- . 6-16-1992, "Governor Shows Concern about Woodruff Butte," p. 1.
- Geertz, Armin. 1987. "Prophets and Fools: The Rhetoric of Hopi Indian Eschatology." *European Review of Native American Studies* 1(1): 33–45.
- . 1992. *The Invention of Prophecy: Continuity and Meaning in Hopi Indian Religion*. Knebel, Denmark: Brunbakke Publications.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1983. *Local Knowledge*. New York: Basic Books.

- Goddard, David. 1969. "Limits of British Anthropology." *New Left Review* 58:79–89.
- Gough, Kathleen. 1967. "Anthropology: Child of Imperialism." *Monthly Review* 19(11):12–27.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1970. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith, eds. New York: International Publishers.
- Green, Rayna. 1988. "The Indian in Popular American Culture." In *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 4, *Indian-White Relations*, W. Washburn, ed., 587–606. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Hastrup, Kirsten, and Peter Ellass. 1990. "Anthropological Advocacy: A Contradiction in Terms?" *Current Anthropology* 31(3):301–11.
- Hooker, J. R. 1963. "The Anthropologist's Frontier: The Last Phase of African Exploitation." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 1:455–59.
- Hymes, Dell, ed. 1972. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon.
- Jones, Delmos. 1970. "Towards a Native Anthropology." *Human Organization* 29(4):251–59.
- Kaiser, Rudolf. 1991. *The Voice of the Great Spirit: Prophecies of the Hopi Indians*. Boston: Shambhala Press.
- Kaye, Merwin. 1991. Videotape of the 1990 Smoki Ceremonials. Hopi Office of Cultural Preservation, Kykotsmovi, Ariz.
- Kunze, Albert, ed. 1988. *Hopi und Kachina: Indianische Kultur im Wandel*. Munich: Trickster Verlag.
- Laird, W. David. 1977. *Hopi Bibliography: Comprehensive and Annotated*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Lavie, Smadar. 1990. *The Poetics of Military Occupation: Mzeina Allegories of Bedouin Identity Under Israeli and Egyptian Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1924. "The Hopi Snake Dance." *Theatre Arts Monthly* 8(12):836–60.
- Leach, Edmund. 1961. *Rethinking Anthropology*. London: Athlone.
- . 1976. *Culture and Communication: The Logic by which Symbols Are Connected*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leclerc, G. 1972. *Anthropologie et Colonialisme*. Paris: Fayard.
- Lehman, David. 1991. *Signs of the Times: Deconstruction and the Fall of Paul de Man*. New York: Poseidon.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1966. "Anthropology: Its Achievements and Future." *Current Anthropology* 7(2):124–27.

- Loftin, John D. 1991. *Religion and Hopi Life in the Twentieth Century*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Lurie, Nancy O. 1988. "Relations between Indians and Anthropologists." In *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 4, *Indian-White Relations*, W. Washburn, ed., 548–56. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- McGrane, Bernard. 1989. *Beyond Anthropology: Society and the Other*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McKibben, William. 1989. *The End of Nature*. New York: Random House.
- MacLean, Ian, Alan Montefiore, and Peter Winch, eds. 1990. *The Political Responsibility of Intellectuals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malcolmson, Scott. 1989. "How the West Was Lost: Writing at the End of the World." *Village Voice*, vol. 34., *Literary Supplement* 73 (April 1989):9–13.
- Malotki, Ekkehart. 1983. *Hopi Time: A Linguistic Analysis of the Temporal Concepts in the Hopi Language*. New York: Mouton.
- Maquet, J. J. 1964. "Objectivity in Anthropology." *Current Anthropology* 5(1):47–57.
- Marcus, George, and Michael Fischer. 1986. *Anthropology As Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Martin, Calvin, ed. 1987. *The American Indian and the Problem of History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Masayeva, Vernon. 1991. "Native Peoples and the University Community" (Research on Hopi: Concerns of the Tribe). Speech delivered at Northern Arizona University Union, January 23, 1991.
- Minh-ha, Trinh T. 1989. *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Moore, J. 1971. "Perspective for a Partisan Anthropology." *Liberation* 16:34–43.
- Myers, Fred. 1986. "The Politics of Representation: Anthropological Discourse and Australian Aborigines." *American Ethnologist* 13(1): 138–53.
- Navajo Times*, 12-27-1990, "Apaches, Zunis join Navajos, Hopis in Opposing Development of Sacred, Historical Landmark," by George Hardeen.

- New York Newsday*, 5-18-1991, "Indian Leaders Battle Auction of Sacred Items," by Amei Wallach, 2.
- . 5-22-91, "Top Bidder to Return Sacred Indian Masks," by Amei Wallach, 21.
- New York Times*, 1-3-1991, "Woodruff Journal: After Mining, a Furor over a Shrine," A12.
- . 5-21-1991, "Three Masks to Stay in Auction," by Rita Reif, C18.
- . 5-22-1991, "Buyer Vows to Return Three Masks to Indians," by Rita Reif, C11.
- Ortiz, Alfonso. 1973. "An Indian Anthropologist's Perspective on Anthropology." In *Symposium on Anthropology and the American Indian*, 85–92. San Francisco: Indian Historian Press.
- Page, Jake, and Susanne Page. 1982. "Inside the Sacred Hopi Homeland." *National Geographic* 162(5):606–29.
- Price, Sally. 1989. *Primitive Art in Civilized Places*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Raymond, Chris. 1990. "Dispute between Scholar, Tribe Leaders over Book on Hopi Ritual Raises Concerns about Censorship of Studies of American Indians." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 37(7):A6, 8–9.
- Rydell, Robert. 1984. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Said, Edward. 1989. "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors." *Critical Inquiry* 15:205–25.
- Sass, Louis. 1986. "Anthropology's Native Problems: Revisionism in the Field." *Harper's Magazine* May:49–57.
- Schlegel, Alice. 1977. *Sexual Stratification: A Cross-Cultural View*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sischy, Ingrid. 1991. "Photography: Good Intentions." *The New Yorker* Sept. 9:89–95.
- Sotheby's. 1991. "Fine American Indian Art" (auction catalogue). May 21. New York: Sotheby's.
- Techqua Ikachi* ("Land—My Life"). 1991. Film produced by Anka Schmid, Agnes Barmettler, and James Danaqyumtewa. Mano Productions.

- Torgovnick, Marianna. 1990. *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tucson Weekly*, 7-1-1992, "Mystery at Second Mesa," 10–24.
- Ucko, Peter. 1987. *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological Congress*. London: Duckworth.
- Vizenor, Gerald. 1987. "Socioacupuncture: Mythic Reversals and the Striptease in Four Scenes." In *The American Indian and the Problem of History*, Calvin Martin, ed., 180–91. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Voth, H. R. 1903. *The Oraibi Summer Snake Ceremony*. Field Columbian Museum Publication, no. 83. Chicago: Field Columbian Museum.
- Wade, Edwin. 1985. "The Ethnic Art Market in the American Southwest, 1880–1980." In *Objects and Others; Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, G. Stocking, ed., 167–91. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Wallach, Amei. 1992. "Essay on the Issue of the Hopi Sacred Masks." MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour (video). Public Broadcasting System.
- Waters, Frank. 1963. *Book of the Hopi*. New York: Viking.
- Whiteley, Peter. 1987. "The Interpretation of Politics: A Hopi Conundrum." *Man* 22(4):696–714.
- . 1988. *Deliberate Acts: Changing Hopi Culture through the Oraibi Split*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- . 1989. "Hopitutskwa: An Historical and Cultural Interpretation of the Hopi Traditional Land Claim." Expert witness report presented to the court in Masayesva vs. Zah vs. James [1934 reservation case].
- . 1990. Review of *Dwellers at the Source: Southwestern Photographs of A. C. Vroman, 1895–1904*, and *The Hopi Photographs, Kate Cory: 1905–1912*. *American Indian Quarterly* 14(3):325–26.
- Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Worsley, Peter. 1966. "The End of Anthropology?" Paper for Sociology and Social Anthropology Working Group, sixth World Congress of Sociology.
- Wright, Robin M. 1988. "Anthropological Presuppositions of Indigenous Advocacy." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 17:365–90.