TEACHING THE BIBLE

The Discourses and Politics of Biblical Pedagogy

Fernando F. Segovia
and
Mary Ann Tolbert,
Editors

ORBIS BOOKS
Maryknoll, New York 10545

The Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America (Maryknoll) recruits and trains people for overseas missionary service. Through Orbis Books, Maryknoll aims to foster the international dialogue that is essential to mission. The books published, however, reflect the opinions of their authors and are not meant to represent the official position of the society.

Published by Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY 10545-0308

Manufactured in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Teaching the Bible : the discourses and politics of biblical pedagogy
/ Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert, editors.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 1-57075-202-8 (pbk.)
1. Bible—Study and teaching. 2. Bible—Study and teaching—History.
I. Segovia, Fernando F. II. Tolbert, Mary Ann, 1947–

BS600.2.T44 1998
220'.071—dc21 98-25987
CIP

7

Reading from an Indigenous Place

Mark Lewis Taylor

> "Who will open Tibet, or claim the last acre of the Amazon, the hills of central India, the jungles of Borneo, the steppes of Siberia—the merchant or the missionary? When the war is over, let us take the Sword of the Spirit and march."
>
> —William Cameron Townsend, 1942. Founder, Wycliffe Bible Translators.

March, indeed, he did. In league with American corporate power, above all with associates of the powerful Rockefeller family, "Cam" Townsend worked alongside the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States and many a local dictator in order to plunge the "Sword of the Spirit" deep into the lands and cultures of indigenous peoples. All the while, like all too many missionaries before him, Townsend carried the Bible to "Bibleless tribes" and so gave crucial cultural support to the devastation of indigenous people being ground under by military and economic empire.

Before World War II, Guatemala, with a population of about 60 percent indigenous peoples, was one of those countries featuring many "Bibleless tribes," and it had already become one scene of Townsend's efforts. After the war, in the 1980s, his associates at the Summer Institute of Linguistics would even be serving there as translators of indigenous languages for local powers aiming to wipe out indigenous peoples who resisted the conditions of their impoverishment.[1] In that same Guatemala of the 1980s, a Mayan grandmother bequeathed to her son her own invented Spanish term for understanding how the powerful descendants of Europe and the United States continue to destroy her indigenous people. The term was *desencarnación*. It is not a standing Spanish word, and in English it would probably best be translated as "disincarnation." The ideas are a "de-fleshing," a disembodiment, an emptying out of life-force.

Her son still embraces the term as a way to understand the five hundred years of indigenous peoples' suffering at the hands of Euro-American powers. Moreover, from within the social location of the Mayans in contemporary Guatemala, the term takes on a particularly potent, even grisly, relevance. The

term there refers not only to a generalized life-draining system of economic austerity measures, which Guatemala's indigenous and poor have now suffered since the mid-1980s at the insistence of a U.S.-based International Monetary Fund in Washington, D.C. The term also refers to the many acts of torture and death—many by napalm, bayonet, and interrogation technique—that more than five hundred indigenous villages experienced at the hands of the Guatemalan army in the early 1980s, often with substantial amounts of aid from the U.S. military or allies.

The near-ritual dismemberment of the mother of Mayan Nobel Peace Prize winner, Rigoberta Menchú Tum, was quite literally an act of *desencarnación*, as her rape and torture bore witness. This was at once the pain of the Menchú family, of Guatemala's Mayan peoples, and of many indigenous in "the Americas."[2] The flesh and blood of indigenous peoples have often existed for Euro-American cultures as only a life-substance to be harnessed for their own uses or else to be routinely spilled, sliced up, and slowly drained off by Euro-American pressures.

Can there be an interpretive use of the Bible, this infamous "Sword of the Spirit," which can actually restore, instead of destroy, the flesh and blood of indigenous people? That is the question of this essay.

INDIGENOUS STRUGGLE: THE CONTINUING VIOLATION

As I write this essay, reminders of the life-destroying ways of imperialist power, especially as suffered by indigenous peoples, are close at hand. Thus, for example, the oft-conservative U.S. congressman from my state of New Jersey, Robert Torricelli, has angered his Republican colleagues by revealing the "dirty secret" of the CIA: the U.S. government's long support of the Guatemalan security forces in their onslaught against Mayan peoples. Guatemalan elites served on U.S. payrolls while doing their worst against thousands of indigenous and working peoples.[3]

Moreover, even as I write, the structural antipathy of U.S.-based transnational banks and corporations toward indigenous peoples has surfaced in a January 1995 memorandum of the Chase Manhattan Bank, prepared by Professor Riordan Roett of Johns Hopkins University. For the sake of investment security in Mexico, and especially for U.S. investors, Roett prescribed a "medicine" for restoring the health of investors that again threatened the flesh and blood of indigenous peoples. He ascribed Mexico's inability to secure the confidence of investors to the indigenous peasant rebels known as the Zapatistas (the EZLN) and active in the state of Chiapas:[4]

> While Chiapas, in our opinion, does not pose a fundamental threat to Mexican political stability, it is perceived to be so by many in the investment community. *The government will need to eliminate the Zapatistas* to demonstrate their effective control of the national territory and of security policy.[5]

Within two weeks of this memo, and extending throughout February of 1995, 60,000 Mexican troops, again U.S.-supplied, moved into indigenous territory in Chiapas, not only forcing EZLN rebels deep into the Lacondon jungle but also intentionally terrorizing more than 20,000 villagers, who were also forced to take refuge in the jungles, where they struggled with malnutrition and exposure and many died. Admittedly, one bank memo does not mobilize a whole Mexican army, but it is a signal of the way Euroamerican corporate investment culture has been, and still is, ready to sacrifice Indian peoples to its lust for money. Here again, indigenous flesh and blood is at risk—not by temporality, the passing of time that brings death and suffering to us all, but by abusive power that forces many poor to "die before their time."[6]

Desencarnación, then, is a complex force depending upon a web of power relations, involving our banks, armies, governments, and the ways we organize cultural practices within the reach of those powers. None of us, especially in U.S. cultures, are pure. We are all implicated in one way or another in the travail of indigenous peoples. Even descendants of indigenous groups can be part of an ethos of their own domination. This complexity means that we can write no simple "victimist" history with easily identifiable victims and oppressors. Nevertheless—and I emphasize the "nevertheless"—there are identifiable sufferers, identifiable callous bystanders, and equally identifiable perpetrating agents and forces. There is a difference, for example, between U.S. cavalries with heartless lieutenant-generals and village women and children disemboweled by them. One should remember in this regard the slaughter by the U.S. military at Sand Creek in Colorado.

Similarly, there is a difference, which complexity does not dissolve, between a Riordan Roett whose academic discourse is disseminated by Chase Manhattan and an academic activist like Jorge Santiago who sits in Mexican jails during the Mexican army's sweep in Chiapas because of his work for indigenous peoples' right to live with dignity. Only a self-indulgent "postmodernism," or an effete will-not-to-know, could use complexity and critique of "victimist" thinking as ways to gloss the essential difference between perpetrators of violence and those whose flesh and blood are sacrificed. Ethnocritic Arnold Krupat has put it eloquently:

> One may grant that not all Euroamericans were rapacious, genocidal monsters, and that not all Indians were, in the purest and most absolute sense, their hapless, innocent victims: nonetheless, it seems to me beyond question that—all things considered—the indigenous peoples of this continent, along with African Americans, women, and many other groups, have overwhelmingly been more sinned against than sinning. If this is so, to construct one's discourse on such a premise is not necessarily to engage in the revisionist allegory of victimism. Some people *have* been hurt by others and if that is not the only and the most interesting thing to say, it most certainly remains something that still, today, can probably not be said too often.[7]

The conferences at Vanderbilt, which situated biblical hermeneutics in the context of critique and counter-critique between old and new voices on the global scene, surfaces new awareness of the legacy of pain sown by centuries of Western expansionism and domination. This paper works in the purview of that awareness. I presuppose a group of scholars who move beyond immobilizing guilt. I eschew any pure righteous indignation and sense of duty on behalf of others. It is simply in all of our interests not to compromise with anything less than a hermeneutics that works to restore flesh and blood on an earth whose death may be foreshadowed by the *desencarnación* ruthlessly imposed on earth's indigenous peoples.[8]

THE BIBLE, FLESH-AND-BLOOD READERS, AND A THESIS

Those who see biblical interpretation as only a textual matter, using historical and literary methods of textual discipline, will be puzzled by the consideration of such political and cultural issues as those that arise across the pages of articles in these volumes of *Reading from This Place*.

One way of describing the present state of biblical hermeneutics is to say that Bible scholars today are finding it necessary, as perhaps never before, to consider biblical meaning and truth in relation to the vicissitudes of flesh-and-blood interpreters. In this section, I will summarize the major moves that have delivered us to this point and then offer a thesis that I will develop in the rest of this essay.

Biblical criticism, especially where developing in conversation with a wide array of university disciplines, has moved into and beyond (though never completely out of) three modes of focusing biblical interpretation. Each mode privileges a distinctive dimension of our process of interpreting the Bible. In order to describe these modes of focusing, I shall draw from some distinctions occurring in Paul Ricoeur's discussions of the location of meaning in texts. How might we envision the "meaning of a text" when we go looking for it as interpreters?

1. One option is to say the meaning is "*in* the text." The relevant dimension which is here explored by readers is predominantly intratextual, i.e., pertinent to the text's literary form. Within this option I would include the sophisticated literary critic who carefully studies the narrative texts, those who in untrained ways read it "literally" and "simply," and even those who just let the Bible leaves fall open to reveal some meaning for the moment. For all the real differences between these readers, what they have in common is a focus on the textual dimension. Here we give attention (whether disciplined, habitual, or haphazard) to the book. That is where the meaning is. Similarly, arguments for the truth of such meanings (if one wants to go after that ever elusive notion, "truth") will focus on getting precise and rigorous about what is "in the text." The reader may thus be advised to read the text more carefully; to check its setting in the book, in the canon, in that type of literature; to pay close attention to linguistic forms, structure, emplotment.

2. A second option entails a move "*behind* the text" in order to get at the biblical meaning. Signs, themes, and narrative in the texts are important, but more crucial here is a move beneath or "behind" the text to the historical milieu from which it came. To understand the meaning of the spatial designation of "behind," one may envision a present-day reader standing in front of the Bible with the text's historical, past environs lying on the other side of the text from the reader. The text is located in a historical period that has the past as its major horizon. The text might be viewed as a kind of product of that historical past, which can be explained by reference to actors, authors' experiences and intentions, and sometimes cultural movements in that world behind the text.

Much of what has been called "historical criticism" made the move behind the text to an author's intention ("What was Paul really trying to get at when writing his epistle with the city of Corinth in mind?"). It should be pointed out, however, that the move behind the text can also include cultural and sociological analyses of institutions and practices deemed to exist in a text's historical milieu. The basic point is that whether taking a personal-historical route to study a Paul or a Mark (authors with certain intentions) or a cultural-historical route to examine dynamics like Pharisaism, the Herodian elite, Christian anti-Jewish sentiments, or Roman imperialism, the meaning of the text as well as claims to truth are quickened around an analysis of the dynamic interplay in the milieu behind the texts.

Both of these first two options usually shared a commitment to a hegemony of objective method, a method that searched for, sifted, and debated evidence pertaining to textual and literary theses and structures ("*in* the texts") or historical and cultural events ("*behind* the texts").

3. Within each of these options—and under the pressure of diverse currents such as twentieth-century hermeneutics (in the mode of Friedrich Schleiermacher, Wilhelm Dilthey, and Hans-Georg Gadamer), linguistic philosophy (in the mode of Ludwig Wittgenstein), neo-pragmatist writings (Hilary Putnam and Richard Rorty), and ideology critique and studies of the politics of interpretation[9]—another dimension was brought to the fore. We may term it, following Ricoeur again, a dimension "*in front of* the texts."

When one highlights this dimension of the interpretive process, then other complexities are brought to light. Each of these involve dynamics of interaction going on "between" the texts and their present-day readers. This area in-between is made up of several dynamics which I will only briefly highlight here:

a. First, several aspects of a text's language have enabled students of language to speak of texts "generating" or "producing" meanings. Because of the richness of certain textual forms of language (especially in their narrative, symbolic, or metaphorical forms), worlds of meaning seem to "move out from" texts toward readers, make a claim upon them, catch them up in a world of meaning. Language in texts "leans forward," if you will, toward readers' worlds. The oft-quoted sutra metaphor, "Poetry is a finger pointing to the moon," is, for example, a construction so provocative that it has a certain

vitality, enabling new meaning to surge out toward readers. This position can be maintained without a full-blown notion of inspiration. It is not so much that the text as "letter" is here indwelt by an external spirit, as that metaphorical language, as in this sutra, has this creative, insurgent power. Through such a linguistic vitality, meaning surges forth from texts onto a middle ground, in front of the text, between texts and readers.

b. A second dynamic, often discussed in the world between text and reader, is "tradition"—the stream of many interpretations of a text that "carries" the text into the world of present-day readers. Here, the text's language is not primarily emphasized as surging toward readers; rather, the text and its language flow into readers' worlds through the surging stream of tradition(s). Those who focus on tradition often insist that even highly critical readers of a text stand in tradition. To criticize the tradition presumes some engagement with the text, and this "engagement" suggests an influence of tradition upon the interpreter. The complexities and debates here are many, but my point is that the exploration of tradition is another way of focusing and discussing the world in front of the text, or between text and reader.

c. The hermeneutical world "in front of" the text reaches its creative complexity, however, when one turns attention to the contribution of present-day readers. Here is where the notion of "social location" is most dramatically relevant. Readers who interpret are not just discrete individuals, singular thinkers carefully following exegetical methods. They are, more profoundly, persons interacting with others in distinctive social environments. They dream, spin cultural patterns, hold political convictions, struggle, exploit, and are exploited.

The more detailed we become in analyzing readers in front of the text, the more it is clear that these socially located readers carry many different kinds of interest into interaction with meanings from the text. Indeed, now, with an awareness of how active readers can be when interpreting texts, the stress falls on the many ways that interest-laden readers "construct" meanings of texts.[10] In fact, those meanings often thought to be generated by the text's linguistic or narrative content may be—if not entirely, at least in part—living creations brought into being by present-day readers. In order to connote maximum concreteness and complexity to these kinds of readers, Ricoeur referred to them as "flesh-and-blood readers."[11]

When this point is reached, hermeneutics (perhaps even biblical hermeneutics) becomes something more akin to what Fernando Segovia calls "cultural studies." The social location of readers of texts has become so important a dimension of interpretation that the cultures and social locations of the readers themselves become subject matter for hermeneutics. Segovia summarizes this kind of "cultural studies" as the application of cultural criticism not just to texts but to readers' worlds. This is an application that Segovia sees as emergent since the 1970s and which now constitutes an acute challenge for biblical criticism:

> This new development posits . . . a very different construct, the flesh-and-blood reader: always positioned and interested; socially and historically conditioned and unable to transcend such conditions—to attain a sort of asocial and ahistorical nirvana—not only with respect to socioeconomic class but also with regard to the many other factors that make up human identity.[12]

It is precisely through readers exposed and understood in these ways that the issues of power and position inevitably flow into hermeneutics. With such readers on hand, what they *do* and *how* they read become crucial to the meanings brought forth from the texts. Because interpretations are constructs of socially located flesh-and-blood readers, culture and politics belong at the centers of inquiry into the meanings of texts. Moreover, if these readers know anything of the colonizers' uses of the Bible, the ways that merchants and missionaries wielded the "Sword of the Spirit" against the very lives of indigenous peoples, then readers' interpretations will entail judgments about the value and use of that book. Whether the Bible is seen as defensible from charges that it is damaging to indigenous health or confirmed as indictable and thus expendable—all this assessment goes on in the strife between flesh-and-blood readers in front of the text.

As one reader who is aware of the Bible's role in colonizing power, I now offer a thesis. It is a thesis that proposes a distinctive reading strategy—a cultural-political criticism for biblical reading, which, when further developed, I also term an "indigenist criticism." The thesis is as follows: (a) The worth of reading the Bible and the desirability of embracing or enacting its perspectives, depends upon (b) its being situated among readers who pursue a multivocal/global criticism, (c) in a way that privileges the voices and needs of indigenous peoples and their lands. It must remain beyond the scope of this essay to offer new readings of the Bible. My main concern is to identify the kind of community of criticism within which such new readings might be possible in the future.

TOWARD AN INDIGENIST CRITICISM

Let us look, in turn, at each of the key phrases of the proposed thesis. The commentary that follows sketches what I take as the main lines of an "indigenist criticism."[13]

The Worth of Reading and Embracing the Bible

The thesis presupposes that the Bible is not necessarily and in itself worth reading, or its perspectives in themselves worth embracing. The Bible will seem to many of the faithful unquestionable, important to read, and worth embracing and enacting. I am here presuming, however, readers who know the Bible's complicity in culturally reinforcing the decimation of indigenous peoples.

Within that frame of reference, biblical worth can at best be a hard-won conviction, especially if biblical worth means that the book might make some contribution to a practice of life and freedom for indigenous peoples.

Most claims that the Bible is valuable, then, presume that, unless certain conditions are present, pertaining to the way the Bible is used, it easily functions abusively. So, is "the good book" good? Well, it depends. It depends on certain conditions being met. Most readers and devotees intuitively affirm the fact of this dependence, if only by their insistence that the Bible be "rightly interpreted," i.e., read and used in a context wherein certain conditions are held to apply. Conditions for right interpretation may include a "faithful attitude," the reverent heeding of some Spirit, perhaps the presence of a company of other committed Christian readers, or maybe the employment of disciplined standards of professional exegesis. Whatever the case, certain presumed conditions are intrinsic to any claim that the Bible is worth reading and affirming.

The first phrase of the thesis, then, constitutes a declaration born of suspicion and past historical and cultural abuse. The "only" suggests the radical conditionedness of our using this book in our times. The first phrase, we might say, is a "dependent clause"—dependent, that is, on certain conditions being met. The remaining two phrases of my thesis specify what I consider to be two necessary conditions if any post-imperialist readings of the Bible are to become possible.

A Multi-vocal/global Criticism

This first condition specifies a certain kind of hermeneutical site which takes seriously the presence of socially located readers. This site is one that is multi-vocal/global. Why it is that I append the designation "global" will become clearer below. Let me stay for now with the notion of multi-vocality.

In the present era of academic "culture wars," such notions as multi-vocal, like "multi-ethnic" or "multi-cultural," can connote either a crude practice of balkanizing identity politics (trying to have one or a few representatives of many groups) or a haphazard celebration of a thousand blooming flowers. In contrast to both, I envision an embrace of multi-vocality that features a certain *discipline* that we can even identify as a mode of criticism. Multi-vocality, as a key trait of the world of socially located readers, involves attending to two critical tasks.

1. The first task is the foregrounding of one's own complex voice and position. A socially located reader, however, is not simply a singular ego who reads. There is always a play of voices in a reading individual. Developmentally, there may be the voice of the mother, other-parents, care-givers. As a socialized being, a reader is already multi-vocal within himself or herself. This is true, I think, for all readers, but even more for culturally liminal readers, bi-cultural readers, who have, through displacement or travel, experienced the voices of different cultures within themselves. Moreover, when any reader (already multi-vocal) speaks and interacts through language and action with other readers in his or her present, as socially located beings do, then new voices become part of the repertoire of any given reader's voice. The reader is part of a reading community, wherein many voices are heard. Multi-vocality as a key trait of a socially located reader, then, involves attending to this complexity.

Segovia signals the critical process here when he writes of interpreters "fully foregrounding themselves as flesh-and-blood readers variously situated and engaged in their respective social locations."[14] This process of full foregrounding of oneself is no quick and easy task, especially if one really explores the interaction between a complex personal journey and the cultural dynamics of conditioning. No easy label-making can produce such foregrounding.

This first task of multi-vocality, then, is a discipline that is always exploring the voice of oneself that is foregrounded. Antonio Gramsci termed this "critical self-inventory."[15] It is "hermeneutical self-implicature" as Calvin Schrag still more verbosely puts it.[16] Whatever the term, the task demands nothing less than a process of continuing experiment and studied awareness. Ask an artist or writer how easy it is to find one's "voice" (or one's voices?). Not to do this is to risk having one's voice taken over (usurped and co-opted) by others. Not to have found one's voice is often to lack one's place in conversation. Not knowing our own particular voice-in-place is also to risk usurping and speaking "for" others. Both dangers (depending on who the speakers are)—of being usurped and being usurper—rise to meet us, if we are not about the disciplines of foregrounding our voices, from our places—speaking "in our own tongues," as Segovia put it.[17]

2. A second critical task of multi-vocality is that of dialogically engaging the voices of others who are encounterable within communal interchange. This, too, is a difficult set of tasks, involving the disciplines and risks of listening, the courage to speak and to engage others in return. It involves learning languages, cultural styles, navigating and resisting the power-plays, the power-politics, and the complex wars of opposition that usually attend the social locations of readers. Hearing others—in the many and varied contexts of the United States, for example—will involve crossing diverse cultural and subcultural boundaries and hearing diverse subordinated peoples: the voices of beaten and silenced women, of impoverished sufferers of economic exploitation, of the silent disabled people, and of the targets of white supremacism. Multi-vocality, as disseminated along these and other modes of power and difference, calls forth a maddening array of disciplines for critical engagement.

Both tasks of multi-vocality are crucial to creating a criticism and a post-colonial kind of normativity. This would be a criticism that nurtures manifold voices, in contrast to the imperialist pretension to not only project one cultural voice, but to do so as carrier of the one "civilized" or "universal" perspective. The disciplined tasks of multi-vocality—finding and foregrounding one's own voice *and* critically engaging others' voices—are a way to build *breadth* into reflection and into interpretation.

It is by now a truism, in the perspective of recent hermeneutics, that "foundations," "bases," and "archimedean points" are not free from social-cultural

construction. Whether reflection and interpretation are persuasive, capable of marshalling a sense of "truth," depends less on the solidity or singularity of a base and more on the breadth of the differences in the conversation through which foundations or bases are worked out. What Charles Peirce said about persuasive reasoning might be identified as the hallmark of multi-vocality as a disciplined criticism. This criticism does "not form a chain which is no stronger than its weakest link, but a cable whose fibers may be ever so slender, provided they are sufficiently numerous and intimately connected."[18]

Readers who work on sites of multi-vocal criticism, then, pursuing the disciplines sketched above, forge the "strength" of their positions (i.e. their "normativity" or "persuasiveness") in such a way as this. Numerous voices, seeking intimate and precise connection—this kind of breadth is the fruit of multi-vocal criticism. As such, it offers what is most crucial to persuasive, "strong" interpretations: breadth and diversity. It is this seeking of strength in interpretation by cultivating breadth that continuously drives multi-vocal criticism toward "global" horizons. Hence, now I can attend to the "global" as implicit in the multi-vocal.

This movement of multi-vocality toward the global is neither a grasp for the homogeneous One, nor a drive to command a panoptic vision that surveys totality. By the "global" intending within multi-vocal criticism, I mean the continual, unceasing penchant to widen the horizons of one's dialogue. In Segovia's language, the inquirer "looks for a truly global interaction."[19] This penchant keeps one asking ever broadening questions. Is the dialogue, in fact, broad? In what sense? Is the dialogue remaining broad? Are the horizons of its breadth changing? Are accepted views of difference in need of challenge? Which subordinated voices are still silent, not included? A criticism that is "multi-vocal/global" seeks dialogue with difference in a milieu that continually includes/seeks/asks for the most distant, widely arrayed, and challenging "others." Moreover, these horizons—ideally always honored and always sought—are themselves changing. These are not set horizons. The horizons of "broad" multi-vocal criticism are always receding and re-emerging. Multi-vocality is thus kept dynamic and insurgent.

How different Euroamerican hermeneutics would have appeared if it had sought multi-vocal/global discipline as its mode of testing interpretations! Instead, this hermeneutics sought to pose as the one expanding voice. When did merchant and missionary let Taino or Cakchiquel voices be heard? When and where did European speakers and planners allow Aztec or Inca to speak forth their agendas? How different things might have been if Euroamerican leaders had not only known their own voice as diverse, particular, and finite, but also then honored the voices of Renape, Powhattan, and Osage!

The "spirit" of multi-vocal/global criticism does not allow the biblical text to appear as a singular, sharp, penetrating "sword," as Cam Townsend would have it. Amid multi-vocality, text may still have shape, but what kind? Maybe text, now, awaits transformation to something more like wind or water. Something fluid, always, as for the Sioux medicine man, Horse, to which missing things need to be added.[20] It is to such a multi-vocal criticism that the biblical text as Euroamerican "sword" must now submit. What text becomes then, this must be a later subject. But to multi-vocal/global criticism I will entrust the Bible. Its criticism constitutes the first condition on which depends any worth of biblical reading and practice.

Reading from an Indigenous Place

The thesis asserts, however, an embrace of not only multi-vocal/global criticism and its play of differences. It also insists upon a privileging of certain voices—those of indigenous peoples and their lands. This particular privilege is a second condition I propose as a necessary feature among the flesh-and-blood readers who would interpret the Bible.

Again, the possibility of the Bible's retrieval within a legacy of imperialist destruction of indigenous peoples has become radically questionable. Above all, the notion of a people chosen by God to possess the land and its peoples has been used repeatedly to sanction forced removal and genocide of indigenous peoples. One thinks not only of the religious justification of Afrikaner "State Theology" in South Africa but also of the sacral "manifest destiny" applied by Euroamericans against the original inhabitants of America, the new "promised land." Biblical story-lines and abusive biblical interpretations have not led to the flourishing of indigenous peoples.[21]

If we here speak now of "privileging" indigenous voices, this is not simply some reactive oppositionalism, a mere giving glory to what before was denigrated. Corrections, reversal of past abusive history, even reparations—all these must be considered. But "the place" of indigenous voices is one worth privileging, I argue, because of its importance for orienting the criticism that *any* of us undertake and because, also, that privilege is crucial to creating the practices we must exhibit if our *entire* planet is to remain inhabitable. Redressing the needs of Indian peoples, then, is not simply to acknowledge and offer the justice long denied them. It is that, and perhaps that first of all. But it is also to assure for criticism an inclusive hermeneutical vision and to begin a practice crucial for all peoples and creatures of the planet.

The fundamental question I seek to answer in this final section is this: what is it about the indigenous place that, when privileged, does not just create a new tyranny by a new ethnic group but instead nurtures radical and fruitful inclusion? An answer lies in noting three traits intrinsic to indigenous place. A crucial reminder is in order, however. None of the discussion of "privilege" which I offer below should conceal the fact that, as voices in the context of multi-vocal/global criticism, indigenous peoples speak "in their own tongues" and are different and particular in their forms and interests. All the interpretive strategies that cultivate a valuation of difference are, therefore, necessary in order to hear and assess critically the claims and visions of indigenous peoples—as Osage, Renape, Apache, Mescalero Apache, Cherokee, variously acculturated Cherokee, and so on. In the multi-vocal setting, any indigenous speakers are at once speakers of their own tongues, of several tongues among the many indigenous tongues, and of several tongues among the many tongues

and voices of the world's indigenous and non-indigenous peoples. The indigenous voice is far from homogeneous.

I explore here, however, what may seem a curious phenomenon: exploring the unique differences of and within indigenous peoples' voices exposes the greater comprehensiveness of those voices for reading and criticism. Reading from an indigenous place facilitates a more global, radically inclusive vision for criticism and practice. And so I take up now the three ways in which indigenous voices can be seen as "privileged":

1. The indigenous place is, first of all, *a subaltern place*. It is not only a place where speakers from the multi-vocal scene of conversation experience otherness (the "altern"), it is also a place where the shock and interruption of subordinated others (the subaltern) are encountered. Indigenous peoples and their speech have not been annihilated, but their tongues and their lives continue to be marked by oppression.

I need not here recount the legacy of that violation, that *desencarnación*, as I discussed it above. Whether looking at the impact of Spanish cultures on Mesoamerican and South American peoples, whether confronting European and U.S. cultures' decimation of North American indigenous peoples, whether meditating again on U.S. domination of all "the Americas" and its continuing destruction of indigenous place(s)—all these exercises only dramatize the pain of individual Amerindians and that of whole communities.

Here I point out the interpretive valence of that subaltern or oppressed legacy. What is the meaning of privileging indigenous place, the indigenous social location? We may begin to derive a response from previous discussions of "the hermeneutical privilege of the oppressed."[22] We can acknowledge this privilege not in the ludicrous sense that interpretation from the spaces of oppressed peoples should be immune from criticism and suspicion. No, the "privilege" lies rather in the special kind of hermeneutical vantage point of oppressed peoples, the unique contributions they make to the scene of multi-vocal/global dialogue.

The key is to recall that the oppressed are often the voices excluded from criticism and conversation. This is still a challenge, in fact, in university settings where "multicultural" values are sought. The oppressed are the ones often "put out of hearing," the ones put at a distance from established scenes of conversation, where decisions are made, power is centralized, cultural values are ratified and celebrated. In criticism and hermeneutics, therefore, to read from an oppressed place is to read from "a distant place"—far from the center, at the horizons of discourse, at the edge.

The tendency of oppressed voices to be at the distant horizon of discourse and criticism, for all its injustice, is a productive, hermeneutical feature. Recall my earlier argument to the effect that, in a world marked by multi-vocality, "strong interpretations" depend upon cultivating "breadth," a penchant for seeking out positions and voices on the distant horizons, the most silenced ones (sometimes these silenced ones are physically near, as feminist and womanist writers have emphasized about the silenced ones who inhabit professionals' families). The seeking of these set at a distance from established centers is precisely what is needed for breadth and hence strong interpretations. The oppressed voice, thus, is not only one among many voices. It is also a voice that has a special power in nurturing the need of multi-vocal criticism for going global by orienting criticism to the ever-changing horizons of discourse where dwell the voices made distant. To the extent that the indigenous place participates in such oppressed space, the space of the subaltern (the subordinated others), then it shares also in the kind of hermeneutical privilege that characterizes that space.

We can note other ways to describe the standpoint of oppressed peoples as "privileged." The acute suffering born by oppressed peoples steeps oppressed interpreters in what Hans-Georg Gadamer has termed "experiences of negativity."[23] Extreme experiences of negativity grant to the social locations of oppressed peoples a quality of not simply being "other" but of rupturing established orders that organize groups in relation to centers and peripheries, the "same" and the "other." Emmanuel Levinas also writes of the particular power of the poor, the "destitute other," to rupture the received order of things.[24] Because of the negativity of indigenous peoples' experiences, their alternity is a subalternity that ruptures the received order and has often therefore a greater capacity for fresh and new insight on the whole. Again, if multi-vocal criticism, as *multi-* vocal, means playing out fully and radically the differences at work in criticism, then it is crucial to expose ourselves to the otherness of oppressed peoples' experiences of negativity. Or, if we the interpreters ourselves are indigenous, which I am not, then it is crucial to foreground one's indigenous standpoint with its rupturing and insightful potential.

We can also discuss the ways multi-vocality is itself uniquely built into the oppressed voice. Here, too, is another kind of testimony to the privilege of oppressed peoples' standpoints. The interpretive voices of oppressed peoples tend to be intensely multi-vocal within themselves. Many empirical, cultural studies have confirmed that subordinated peoples often develop a bicultural or bilingual (sometimes tricultural and trilingual) capacity in speech and vision.[25] This is born out of the demands of struggle under conditions of long-term subordination. Subordinated peoples, for survival, usually have to learn not only their own subordinated culture's life-ways but also those of the subordinating culture. Speakers and interpreters from dominator cultures tend to know less about the cultures they dominate and control than the controlled ones know about the dominator cultures.

The position of greatest power in a given context, therefore, is not necessarily the position from which the most comprehensive and complex knowledge of the whole is available about that context. Quite to the contrary, the richer and more diverse layers of vision are more usually resident in the bi- and tri-vocality and vision internalized in oppressed peoples' lives. "Indigenous place," especially, is privileged with this multi-layered and complex space. This multi-layered complexity has only intensified in recent years. Indigenous peoples have neither been assimilated nor have they died out. Stefano Varese argues that a new sociology is needed to grapple with the complex space and

standpoints they inhabit. No longer simply the rural villagers that anthropologists traditionally studied, they are now also "transnationalized, urban, proletarian, border-crossing, bilingual and trilingual, professional."[26]

2. The indigenous place which we have just now described as one of subalternity, or oppression, is also a privileged one as *a place where the voices of the dead proliferate*.

In the United States, Uncle Sam was, as Chickasaw novelist and poet, Linda Hogan, writes, "a cold uncle with a mean soul and a cruel spirit."[27] According to some of the more cautious estimates of Native American population at the time of the emergence of the U.S. "Founding Fathers" in 1796, somewhere between 1.5 and 1.8 million Indians still lived within the continental United States.[28] During the first century of the country's existence, the probability is thus that "the U.S. destroyed 80 to 85 percent of 'its' Indians." Even if many deaths of Indians, both before and after the rise of the U.S. government, were due to disease, this was not simply a matter of "natural disaster" or a mere inevitable spin-off from cultural "encounter" and "discovery." The entire contact and encounter between Europeans and Indigenous took place within a colonialist intention and paradigm. In addition, disease was more than once intentionally spread among the Indians or stimulated by policies of forced relocation and destruction of village infrastructure. Even today, the Mexican military has pulled up latrine works and destroyed Indian villages in Chiapas, leaving almost every lake, river, and stream infected with deadly cholera.

The U.S. government never acted to halt such disease among the Indians; in fact, its actions by military and para-military militia groups only took disaster to more horrific depths.

> A bare sampling of some of the worst must include the 1854 massacre of perhaps 150 Lakotas at Blue River (Nebraska), the 1863 Bear River (Idaho) Massacre of some 500 Western Shoshones, the 1864 Sand Creek (Colorado) Massacre of as many as 250 Cheyennes and Arapahoes, the 1868 massacre of another 300 Cheyennes at the Washita River (Oklahoma), the 1875 massacre of about 75 Cheyennes along the Sappa Creek (Kansas), the 1878 massacre of still another 100 Cheyennes at Camp Robinson (Nebraska) and the 1890 massacre of more than 300 Lakotas at Wounded Knee (South Dakota).[29]

These are all impersonal numbers. A Colorado rancher, who was forced out of bed to ride with U.S. Colonel Chivington's soldiers against 600 Cheyennes and Arapahoes camped at Sand Creek with over 400 of their women and children, gives a more personal account:

> The warriors put the squaws and children together, and surrounded them to protect them. I saw five squaws under a bank for shelter. When the troops came up to them they ran out and showed their persons to let the soldiers know they were squaws and begged for mercy, but the soldiers shot them all. . . . There seemed to be indiscriminate slaughter of men, women, and children. There were some thirty or forty squaws collected in a hole for protection; they sent out a little girl about six years old with a white flag on a stick; she had not proceeded but a few steps when she was shot and killed. All the squaws in that hole were afterwards killed, and four or five bucks outside.

Lieutenant James Connor surveyed the same scene on the following day:

> In going over the battleground the next day I did not see a body of man, woman, or child but was scalped, and in many instances their bodies were mutilated in the most horrible manner—men, women and children's privates cut out, etc. I heard one man say that he had cut out a woman's private parts and had them for exhibition on a stick; . . . I also heard of numerous instances in which men had cut out the private parts of females and stretched them over the saddle-bows and wore them over their hats while riding in the ranks.[30]

I wish one could say these were rare and exceptionable atrocities. Unfortunately, not. They were widespread and crucial for the enactment of what the powerful thought was essential for American "manifest destiny," and part of what makes America what it is. In spite of the living vitality of the Indians today, as a non-annihilated people, to read from their place is to read from a place of the dead.

What can this mean hermeneutically, "to read from a place of the dead"? Does one even want to derive "hermeneutical insight" about reading, of *any* kind, from such horror? If reading goes on in communities of flesh-and-blood readers, rooted in the histories of ancestors, what does the decimation of many Indian bodies mean now? Can we ever read a text—the Bible or any other text—without hearing the voices of the dead? I am not pressing for some hermeneutical "guilt-consciousness." The histories of indigenous travail do not merely seek to create guilty consciences. Guilt should be there for white Americans, should be heeded, grieved, and borne. I am more interested, however, in a reading and a practice that face the horror and do not run from the voices of the indigenous dead.

If we academics traffic in discourse called "hermeneutics," chances are that notions like "voices of the dead" seem superstitious, alien intrusions into sophisticated inquiry. But one should think again. Have we not said that, in significant ways, interpreters always belong to their pasts and to their traditions?[31] Then, one should recall that our pasts are not simply abstract historical forces but very concrete and embodied ways of belonging culturally. Our ancestors' cultural ways of living *and* their ways of dying shape the present worlds we inhabit. Does this not mean that how they lived and died—perhaps who killed them and who they killed, and the relations of power entailed in the killing and being killed—sets the tone and timbre of our contemporary living-space? Given the extent of a cultural way of life that was based on what

M. Annette Jaimes has called a "killing process"[32] waged against North American indigenous peoples (in addition to the killing process intrinsic to the uprooting and the enslavement of Africa's indigenous people brought to the United States), would we not today have to be completely numb or extraordinarily tone deaf not to hear some voices crying, some voices of the dead, of the unjustly slaughtered?

We contemporary critics often know what it means to lose parents, loved ones, and friends to death, and thus know well what it means to still hear their voices, to think and live from their points of view. I am not really, here, suggesting something so new. Is it really too much to ask—too "superstitious" to expect—flesh-and-blood critical readers to listen to the voices of the indigenous dead? Or will we go on and not listen, thereby keeping the grand "family secret" of these dead who sully our nation's claims to greatness.

Such a listening to these dead, I suggest, is not only possible, but it is also a way to experience the privileged standpoint of the indigenous place. Hearing and "including" those voices intensify the "breadth" of the reading community—a breadth that I argued above is central to strong interpretation. Multivocal criticism that really "tends to the global" must tend to the dead, those slain before their time, those whose exclusion took the form of being ripped from their communities and lands—from life itself. Receding and re-emerging, the voices of the dead might constitute the horizons of a reading community as very few others can. Linda Hogan reminds us that the North American Indians tend to be "the shadow people living almost invisible on the fringes. . . ."[33]

Reading from an indigenous place means listening to, learning from, speaking with, these ones from the shadows—and this will often also entail a working for their exodus from the debilitation that comes from being consigned to those shadows. A practical struggle for indigenous liberation is thus intrinsic to, and necessary for, multi-vocal criticism. When conversing with "shadows," we may begin to see, as Hogan also suggests, that the white worlds are but "wisps of smoke stealing by and around their [the Indians'] own more solid world."[34] To refuse to "hear the voices of the dead" or of the lives of the shadow peoples is to stand outside of life's full historical and present complexity. It is to stand outside of life, and this "standing-above" is the really problematic "superstition" (the standing, *-stare*, which is *super-*, above and disengaged).

The indigenous place is a privileged place of reading, then, because in U.S. cultural criticism especially it is a space with a site of criticism broadened even toward that horizon from which the dead might speak.

3. In conclusion, there is a final sense in which reading critically from "the indigenous place" is a privileged way of reading. Not only does it give the breadth and strength accruing to the site of the oppressed, or the added intensification of breadth that globally intends even the dead's voices. The "indigenous place," especially, if within it we hear and learn from the voices of the indigenous dead, is privileged also because it is *a place where land is intended*—where landedness of interpreters becomes an issue and where also the impact of interpretations upon land are assessed.

The focus here on land is not simply implied by a stereotypical embrace of the "nearness to nature" of Native American traditions, so central to notions of the "Noble Savage" that extend from eighteenth-century travelogues to late twentieth-century Disney movies like "Pocahontas." The evidence does warrant our observing, however, that cosmologies throughout *Abya Yala* do highlight, take as essential, the earth and land in ways that the arriving European cultural members did not.[35] The *continents* that are home, *Abya Yala*, are fruitful, fructifying *earth*. This is signaled by the very construction of indigenous voices of the dead and of their peoples' experiences of forced removal. In fact, terms like "experiencing death" and "forced removal" are too abstract, i.e., they are descriptions of suffering that fail to note that the pain involved is more complex by reason of the separation from earth and the nature systems. The Chickasaw novelist, Linda Hogan, again well describes the whole circuit of pain, when she deftly portrays forced removal for education in white men's schools as negative because it "lifted them up, screaming, *from the ground*. . . ."[36] To hear the indigenous voice, dead or dying, is to hear not just a lament of a human person or a culture but also the travail of being separated from the earth. In this way, land and earth are implicated in critical reading strategies that take seriously the voice of the dead.

There is an even more direct manner, however, in which land makes its way into the hearing, speaking, and interpreting that are central to critical communities of reading. The voices heard in the indigenous place are not just voices of those separated from earth, torn away from it. The earth *itself* is treated as having desires, voice, and also rage. Hogan writes of a voice inside people that is a voice of rage—"the rage of mother earth." This rage, like earth's desires generally, is not avoidable by humanity. Earth and its peoples can be violated, but the terrain and nature, earth, will remain greater. As Hogan writes, "the earth had a mind of its own . . . the wills and whims of men were empty desires, were nothing pitted up against the desires of earth."[37]

Listening to the land's voice of rage and desire interjects another powerful, often unconsidered, voice and standpoint into the critical community of readers. To talk about the crucial concept of "flesh-and-blood readers" without addressing the issues of land and earth which nurture flesh and blood would be to continue the problematic anthropocentrism of European cosmologies. A full reading from an indigenous place means hearing also the voice(s) that reside in and resound from the material matrix from which flesh-and-blood readers emerge and to which they return. Mayans, and many other native traditions as well, remind us of this by their beliefs to the effect that corn grown from earth's soils is also the flesh of the human. As a result, corn, in various ways, takes on sacral meaning.[38]

This insight—which might be explored further as an ethnographic, cosmological, or religious topic—is here important because of its pertinence to critical reading and hermeneutics. To pursue criticism in dialogue (multi-vocal/global) with flesh-and-blood readers who are engaged *as landed*, i.e., with a sense of relatedness to land and of what that means for our relation to each other, is a "privileged" kind of criticism, because both the particularity of

voices and the articulation of the global sense are intensified. Reading from an indigenous place, aware of the dimension of the landedness of readers, is to cultivate a stronger sense of local place, *and*, through that locatedness, it is also to find one's place on a larger field of vision, ultimately to be on the way, through dialogue, "from place to place" in a larger cosmic whole. "Better" criticism and interpretation, we might say, is achieved by privileging the indigenous place upon which land and earth's voices come to expression and are heard. Multi-vocal/global criticism is not simply a matter of dialogue with many flesh-and-blood readers, representing many diverse social locations. It is that, but most important it is doing this with a sense of the land-and-earth matrix within which interpretive practice occurs.

With this insight the emphasis on "social location" crystalizes around the notion of locale, of location. We are reminded that place cannot be reduced, in indigenist criticism, to voice. Locale orients and embraces flesh-and-blood.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In conclusion, I should like to entertain a final query. If multi-vocal/global criticism and then also reading from the rich and privileged indigenous place are the conditions for affirming the value and worth of the Bible, what does all that suggest about specific biblical texts and the message(s) of the Bible for indigenous peoples? I believe it premature to answer such questions. The Christian liberationist in me would like to come forth with messages that are liberating to counteract the imperialist biblical hermeneutics that have reinforced so much *desencarnación*. We will not be able to derive such readings, or know that they are possible, until there exist sustained reading communities that are multi-vocal/global and that exhibit reading strategies that assure the presence of indigenous interpreters and their radically inclusive voices.

I am not holding out for a perfect community of strategic readers, a pure practice of multi-vocality and privileging of indigenous place. I am suggesting, however, that communities are needed which embrace as disciplinary ideals the dialogical practices of multi-vocal/global criticism and privileged indigenous standpoints. Until such critical communities of landed, flesh-and-blood readers begin to come forth, any rehabilitation of biblical meaning for indigenous peoples is premature. First, it is necessary to have the new reading communities. In those communities, the Bible, once "the sword" of imperial spirit, will have to find its new possibilites amid many other spirits that its Christian bearers often spurned. Maybe one finds a foretaste of conversation in new communities of criticism in the Sioux medicine man's talk with his people about the Bible:

> "First, I have to tell you about the book they call the Bible. It is a holy book for the European people, like those who live in the towns. It carries visions, commandments, and songs. I've added what I think is missing from its pages."
>
> One of the younger women interrupted him. "Why can't you just speak it?"

> "They don't believe anything is true unless they see it in writing."
>
> Then he explained to the many listeners, "You know all this. It's very simple. That's why it took me so long to write it."
>
> He began reading, "Honor father sky and mother earth. Look after everything. Life resides in all things, even the motionless stones. Take care of the insects for they have their place, and the plants and trees for they feed the people. Everything on earth, every creature and plant wants to live without pain, so do them no harm. Treat all people in creation with respect; all is sacred, especially the bats.
>
> "Live gently with the land. We are one with the land. We are part of everything in our world, part of the roundness and cycles of life. The world does not belong to us. We belong to the world. And all life is sacred."[39]

NOTES

1. G. Colby and C. Detton, *Thy Will Be Done—The Conquest of the Amazon: Nelson Rockefeller and Evangelism in the Age of Oil* (New York: Harper Collins, 1995) 809-810.

2. See P. Richard's constructive use of *Abya Yala* for the worlds of the Americas, in "The Hermeneutics of Liberation: A Hermeneutics of the Spirit," in *Reading from This Place.* Volume 2: *Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the Global Scene,* ed. Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995) 263–80.

3. A. Nairn, "CIA Death Squad," *The Nation* 17 April, 1995: 511-13.

4. Chiapas is the southernmost Mexican state, in which indigenous turbulence has been most pronounced and focused since the Zapatistas announced their opposition to NAFTA by attacking the town halls of major municipalities in the state. For a close analysis of these developments, see J. Ross, *Rebellion from the Roots: A Peasant Uprising in Chiapas* (Boston: Common Courage Press, 1995).

5. R. Roett, "Mexico-Political Update," Chase Manhattan's Emerging Markets Group Memo, 13 Jan. 1995. The full memo is available on PeaceNet, and full discussion and background about the memorandum is available in *The Nation* 6 March 1995: 306-11.

6. G. Gutiérrez, *Las Casas: In Search of the Poor of Jesus Christ* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1993) 4.

7. A. Krupat, *Ethnocriticism: Ethnography, History, Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992) 21.

8. On indigenous peoples' visions of the fate of the earth and one group's teachings about this, see A. Ereira, *The Elder Brothers* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990).

9. W. J. T. McNeill, *The Politics of Interpretation* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982).

10. On meaning as "constructed," see P. Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981) 174-175.

11. P. Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative,* trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1988) 3:171.

12. F. F. Segovia, "'And They Began to Speak in Other Tongues': Competing Modes of Discourse in Contemporary Modes of Biblical Criticism," in *Reading from This Place.* Volume 1: *Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States,* ed. F. F. Segovia and M. A. Tolbert (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995) 29.

13. On the notion of "indigenism" and "indigenist," see W. Churchill, *Struggle for the*

Land: Indigenous Resistance to Genocide, Ecocide and Expropriation in Contemporary North America (Monroe, MN: Common Courage Press, 1993) 403-451.

14. Segovia, "'And They Began to Speak in Other Tongues,'" 31.

15. See C. West, *The Ethical Dimensions of Marxist Thought* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1991) xv-xvi.

16. C. O. Schrag, *Communicative Praxis and the Space of Subjectivity* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1986).

17. Segovia, "'And They Began to Speak in Other Tongues.'"

18. C. S. Peirce, *The Collected Papers,* ed. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931-1935) 5:264.

19. Segovia, "'And They Began to Speak in Other Tongues,'" 31.

20. L. Hogan, *Mean Spirit* (New York. Ivy Books, 1990) 341.

21. G. E Tinker, *Missionary Conquest: The Gospel and Native American Cultural Genocide* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

22. In this section I summarize points made in a number of essays and books about this "hermeneutical privilege" as well as arguments in several of my previous works. For sources and arguments, see M. K. Taylor, *Remembering Esperanza: A Cultural-Political Theology for North American Praxis* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1990) 60-66; and "Celebrating Difference, Resisting Domination: The Need for Synchronic Strategies in Theological Education," in *Shifting Boundaries: Contextual Approaches to the Structure of Theological Education,* ed. E. Farley and B Wheeler (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991) 259-93.

23. H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method,* 2nd ed. (New York: Continuum, 1984) 353-54

24. E. Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority,* trans. A. Lingis (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969) 24-25.

25. J. E. Perlman, *The Myth of Marginality: Urban Poverty and Politics in Rio de Janeiro* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976); S. Ardener, ed., *Perceiving Woman* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1975) 1-17; and bell hooks, *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (Boston: South End Press, 1984).

26. S. Varese, "Think Locally, Act Globally," in *Report on the Americas: The First Nations, 1492-1992* (North American Council on Latin America) 25:3 (December 1991): 16.

27. Hogan, *Mean Spirit*, 221.

28. M. A. Jaimes, ed., *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance* (Boston: South End Press, 1992) 37.

29. Ibid., 34.

30. D. Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1970) 89 and 90.

31. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 262-63.

32. Jaimes, *The State of Native America*, 7.

33. Hogan, *Mean Spirit*, 81.

34. Ibid., 340.

35. K. Sale, *The Conquest of Paradise: Christopher Columbus and the Columbian Legacy* (New York: A Plume Book, 1990) 74-90.

36. Hogan, *Mean Spirit*, 36 (emphasis added).

37. Ibid., 186.

38. A. R. Sandstrom, *Corn Is Our Blood: Culture and Ethnic Identity in a Contemporary Aztec Indian Village* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991).

39. Hogan, *Mean Spirit*, 361-62.