“Travels of an American Indian into the Hinterlands of Soviet Russia”: Rethinking Indigenous Modernity and the Popular Front in the Work of Archie Phinney and D’Arcy McNickle

Benjamin Balthaser

In a 1933 edition of the California Communist Party newspaper the *Western Worker*, a letter appeared from a Native American Communist Party member, Vincent Spotted Eagle, framed as a response to then gubernatorial candidate Upton Sinclair’s accusations that communism is “un-American” and “from Russia”:

Now Mr. Sinclair, in regard to Americanism. It so happens that I am an American Indian, which is more American than you ever thought of being. We American Indians can truthfully say we are 100% Americans, which you can not.

You are original products of Europe and so is your mode of production and distribution, and since Columbus discovered this Great Nation we have been exploited.

We American Indians are lovers of all humanity, especially the Negroes, who are the most exploited race in this country. As Chief White Calf of the Blackfoot Indian Reservation in Montana, whose face appears on the Buffalo Head nickel has often said to me, “The flags of the white men are emblems of intolerance.”

Before the white man came, our mode of production and distribution were on a cooperative basis, without any exploitation. This is Communism, which is true Americanism. And this is why I joined the Communist Party.¹

If this is a use of nationalism, it is one that dramatically alters the ideological terrain of belonging. The author of this letter claims a distinctly *American* national identity at the same time that he positions the most salient image of national identity, the flag, as an “emblem of intolerance.” It is both a claim to citizenship and a rejection of the ideological grounds on which modern citizenship is constructed. But perhaps more compellingly, the letter is a fusion of modern discourses about capitalism with claims of indigenous heritage and sovereign rights to the land. Two years after this letter was written, Archie Phinney, a Nez Perce student of Franz Boas, embarked on a five-year

course of study as an anthropologist in Leningrad, articulating many of the same concepts: by becoming “alert, modern communities,” the Nez Perce and other Indian tribes may retain their identity as well as a modicum of power in their relationships with local and federal authorities, all through the lens of a transnational socialist project.

While there is no way to verify Spotted Eagle’s claims to indigenous heritage, his letter is nonetheless a concise summary of many of the aspirations and contradictions of radical modernist notions of democratic pluralism and claims of sovereignty by communities of color during the “Popular Front era.” As Michael Denning articulates in *The Cultural Front*, the “cultural pluralism” of the Popular Front era contained elements of radical ethnic and racial nationalism as well as patriotic cultures of inclusion and belonging.² Spotted Eagle’s letter draws into sharp relief one singular absence in recent scholarship about the period—the role of Native Americans and Native American issues. The absence of Native Americans from accounts of the Popular Front period is all the more striking considering that the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 not only was a major component of the New Deal agenda but was considered one of the few successes of the New Deal’s left-wing.³ And while the IRA fell short of Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) secretary John Collier’s goals and remains controversial for reasons that I discuss below, its passage was accompanied by both federally and state-funded cultural productions focusing on Native American lives as well as a small explosion of Native and non-Native writers broadly sympathetic to Native claims of sovereignty.

Additionally, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), a pan-Indian political organization dedicated to representing Indian issues to the state and federal government, resembled other Popular Front civil rights organizations of the time, suggesting by its name as well as its purpose the National Negro Congress and Congress of Spanish-Speaking Peoples.⁴ The cofounders of the NCAI—D’Arcy McNickle (Cree Métis-Salish) and Phinney—were not only among the most prominent Native American intellectuals of the era, they were with a greater Popular Front “structure of feeling” as members of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s “New Deal” coalition, while also trying to create racial forms of expression that challenged and went beyond its reformist programs. Phinney and McNickle were among many Native Americans in the 1930s and 1940s in dialogue with broader social movements in the United States (and indeed, there appears to have been a small cadre of Native Americans in the Communist Party). Indeed, Phinney’s and McNickle’s centrality as Native American intellectuals and activists suggests that their experiences may be, if not as typical, at least as exemplary of one current within a wider field

of meaning. While Phinney was far more explicit about his engagement with a transnational socialist Left, both writers considered the Popular Front at least one way to reconcile modernity with the retention and promotion of Native American cultural and political identity. By placing Native American struggles for self-determination at the center of radical modern culture, we can ask to what extent the Popular Front helped formulate modern concepts of indigeneity, as well as the ways Native American activists and intellectuals may have helped shaped 1930s and 1940s progressive social movements. The very presence of Native American members of the Communist Party asks us to revise much of what we think we know about midcentury movements for social justice and for indigenous sovereignty.

Of the two figures, the least has been written about Phinney, despite or perhaps because of his formal training as an anthropologist in the Soviet Union and the wide-ranging nature of his critical writings, from studies of Nez Perce oral tradition to essays on Soviet indigenous policy. After returning from a five-year journey to the Soviet Union in the late 1930s, Phinney urged formally educated Indians to go “beyond old tribal horizons toward a racial identity” to link Native struggles for self-determination with racial struggles for justice in the United States and abroad.⁵ Pan-Indian, cosmopolitan, and self-reflexively modern, Phinney represented a crucial link between Native American intellectuals in the 1930s and 1940s and other intellectuals of color. Framing the Soviet experiment as “the first attempt of men to intelligently direct their own history,”⁶ Phinney’s appreciation for what I refer to as “radical modernity” allowed him to search along with other 1930s intellectuals to the east and to the global South for a new social order at once at home in the technological and cultural world of the twentieth century yet not founded on the racial and classed hierarchies of the West. While scholars have documented the way that many African American, Asian American, and Latino/a intellectuals saw in the global Left new possibilities for social transformation, figures such as Phinney suggest how indigenous intellectuals contributed to radical modern movements, as well as to allow current scholars to explore ways that radical modernity contributed to indigenous struggles for self-determination. If the internationalist Left has often been seen as indifferent or even hostile to indigenous claims for sovereignty, Phinney nonetheless articulated his claim to the modern world as a Nez Perce through the modality of a transnational racial and socialist project.⁷ Phinney’s desire to engage with the modern world—yet to do so on terms of equality, cultural integrity, and self-determination—prefigures Robert Warrior’s call to not live “the romantic old days” but to live out a form of “humanism in a new situation.”⁸

Rather than read Phinney in the shadow of McNickle's greater literary output, we can ask how Phinney's clear articulations of radical modernity situates McNickle's *Surrounded* (1936) as a Popular Front text, in critical dialogue with other radical writers of color who claimed themselves as part of transnational socialist movements. Considered the first "modern" Native American novel, *The Surrounded* offers a way to read the contradictions between Popular Front modalities of self-determination and democratic pluralism. In some ways, the novel is optimistic about the possibility of cultural and political redemption between the Salish and the white settlers on the reservation. Serving as a kind of metonym, the protagonist's Salish mother and Spanish father are at "warfare" with each other, a "warfare" that is resolved by his father's recognition of the wrongs done to the Salish people and his mother's renunciation of Christianity for the "old ways." This view of reciprocal redemption sits squarely within the progressive vision of the original Native American New Deal authored by Collier and several Indian rights organizations that formed out of the fight to save Pueblo lands in New Mexico in the early 1920s: in short, they believed that the way to "save" US democracy was to recognize past inequalities and respect the cultural rights of national minorities. Yet McNickle forecloses this possibility as Archilde Leon, the mixed-race son returning to the reservation, is caught further within the violence inherent to the US racial state. Structurally and thematically, the novel suggests that white racism and settler colonialism cannot be undone by symbolic acts of recognition. Formally, this tension is represented by an inverted bildungsroman structure, in which Archilde's coming-of-age narrative of reconciliation and self-discovery is paralleled by a growing carceral threat, until the two merge in his final surrender—and death—at the hands of the frontier sheriff.

The contradiction between *The Surrounded's* adherence to the bildungsroman form and its violent end thus functions as a metonym for the contradiction between self-determination and pluralistic democracy that informs this and other 1930s and 1940s texts by writers of color. If one considers the basic political and formal structures of Richard Wright's *Native Son*, Carlos Bulosan's *America Is in the Heart*, and Américo Paredes's *George Washington Gómez*, the radical bildungsroman of personal and political development is often predicated on the protagonist's further fatal entanglement with a racial state, either through racial violence or, in the case of *Gómez*, through co-optation. Rather than understand these novels as wholesale rejections of Popular Front pluralism, I would suggest that they dialectically embrace the radical novel form to expose the racial limitations of its universalist contours, as well as to claim a space within the narrative of modernity—one that, as Paul Gilroy argues, writers of color

could mold on their own terms.⁹ As Philip Deloria writes, “According to most narratives, Indian people, corralled on isolated and impoverished reservations, missed out on modernity”; they are seen as “largely insignificant cultural and political actors in the reform efforts of the 1920s and 1930s.”¹⁰ While Deloria focuses on cinematic representation and technological mobility, Phinney and McNickle add yet another dimension to the ways in which Native peoples engaged with the radical modernity of the Popular Front era. If Phinney’s own description of the Soviet Union focused on the modern quest of humanity “to intelligently direct their own history,” we might think of McNickle’s and Phinney’s employment in the BIA, the formation of the NCAI, and cultural modes such as critical essays on racial identity and modern social realist novels as staking a claim on the alterior modernist modes championed by other radical writers of color, such as Wright, C. L. R. James, Bulosan, Emma Tenayuca, W. E. B. Du Bois, H. T. Tsiang, and Langston Hughes. As there is a growing body of literature linking texts by African Americans to radical modern movements of the 1930s and 1940s, examining how other marginalized communities in the United States shared a common point of departure and even a common cultural and political framework seems long overdue.

Native American New Deal or Native American Popular Front?

As Michael Omi and Howard Winant articulate in their groundbreaking *Racial Formation in the United States*, the racial paradigm in the United States changed dramatically in the 1930s from a “biologist” view of essential racial difference to an “ethnicity” paradigm of assimilation and cultural pluralism.¹¹ While “cultural pluralism” arose as an explicit challenge to earlier views of white racial superiority, the recognition of “cultural difference” tended to flatten or erase historical inequalities among different ethnic groups, as well as to deny “group rights” based on these histories of inequality, exclusion, enslavement, and extermination.¹² Yet this new consensus around ethnicity was not only the result of changes within the discipline of sociology and shifts at the level of the Supreme Court and federal government; such changes were the result of extensive grassroots organizing by political movements whose politics often went far beyond the limited victories granted by state, academic, and business elites. Robin D. G. Kelly and Bill Mullen both point to how African American participation in the social movements of the 1930s often weaved the politics of Garveyism, black nationalism, and militant antiracism with the more integrationist model of Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) organizing drives and democratic politics.¹³ Even within radical movements

such as the Communist Party, vacillation between integration and the politics of anti-imperialist nationalism owed, as Kelley suggests, as much to differing opinions of black members themselves as to pressure from party leadership.¹⁴ Likewise, social movements are never solely questions of discourse or a sum total of their political achievements—often claims for freedom and equality exist within but are not contained by dominant cultural expression. As Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe argue, politics is an “articulatory process” in which meaning is always mediated, unable to be fixed, and situated within various dimensions that lack the ideological closure of dominant institutions.¹⁵ Thus reading the politics of sovereignty in the Popular Front era must go beyond simply reading for outcomes or even policy, as important as these may be, to thinking about the often contradictory and partial ways claims for freedom are constructed and acted on.

I would like to suggest that the participation of Phinney and McNickle with the reforms of the 1930s must be seen not only in the light of their own developing politics of sovereignty but also within a larger context of subaltern participation in the Popular Front itself, as marginalized groups participated in, supported, and resisted interpellation depending on the possibilities available to them and the extent to which new discourses of “ethnicity” allowed for political openings previously unavailable. Tensions within the New Deal Indian reforms were a concise expression of many of the contradictions around questions of race and nationalism within the new social movements of the 1930s and 1940s. In one sense, the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) and the Federal Writers’ Project represented a break with government assimilationist policy and promoted a “pluralistic” or multicultural view of US history. As Kevin Bruyneel suggests, the IRA “promoted indigenous community” by acknowledging collective and individual citizenship as coincident forms of political belonging.¹⁶ In other words, it granted “group rights” to Native American nations while fostering participation in the wider national political life. Yet as Jodi Byrd argues, the IRA can also be seen as merely a new form of “administrative colonialism” in which the limited “self-government” of federally recognized tribes was merely the modern terms under which assimilation into the logic of settler-colonialist multiculturalism would be based.¹⁷ I would argue that both viewpoints accurately describe Collier’s policies and suggest unresolved contradictions with the Popular Front and the New Deal era of reform. However, such contradictions of public policy and cultural production also opened spaces for more radical voices to be expressed and created valuable precursors for later liberation movements. While my point is not to reopen debate on the political legacy of the Native American New Deal,

I would rather hope to consider how the IRA fit within broader patterns of Popular Front politics. Not only was the IRA accompanied by both federally and state-funded cultural productions focusing on Native American lives as well as a small explosion of Indian and non-Indian writers broadly sympathetic to Native claims of sovereignty, radical social movements such as the Communist Party, in the US West at least, apparently took an interest in Native issues as part of a broader focus on race and anti-imperialism.

Indeed, one missing model from the historical record of Collier's IRA is the Soviet Union's policy on "national minorities." As Anthony Dawahare writes, Joseph Stalin's popular book *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question* became highly influential among black intellectuals in the 1930s who were looking for answers to the intractability of racial progress in United States as well as a way to square separatism with integration in a global revolutionary analysis. Particularly attractive was Stalin's proclamation that colonized peoples have the right to "national self-determination," legitimating both national liberation struggles and the cultural independence of colonized peoples.¹⁸ These policies were also popularly understood to be underway in the former colonies of imperial Russia. For instance, Langston Hughes wrote numerous articles for the *Daily Worker* and the *New Masses* about life in the former Russian Empire during his trip to the Central Asiatic republics in the mid-1930s, which he later published in memoir form in *I Wonder as I Wander* (1956). Rather than see the Soviet model as measured in terms of formal democracy or universal human rights, Hughes assessed the Soviet Union in relation to how it addressed the issues faced by people of color when in contact with the Western world. Explaining the significance of the opening of film schools, arts programs, and economic development, he distinguishes himself from his European companion's distaste for the "primitive" conditions of Soviet Asia by remarking that "Turkmenistan" was less "a primitive land moving into the twentieth century" than a "colored land moving into the orbits hitherto reserved for whites."¹⁹

Hughes also remarked on the speed with which the Soviet Union dismantled Jim Crow policies of the Russian Empire, noting that restrictions on Turkmen and Jews had been lifted since the Soviets came to power and that "I could not help but remember Atlanta, Birmingham and Houston. . . . I had to sit in the COLORED section"; in Turkmenistan "Russians . . . Europeans, and natives . . . all went to the same schools, sat on the same benches, ate in the same co-operatives, worked in the same shops and factories, . . . gains and defeats were shared alike."²⁰ This mix of economic development, federal control, and cultural independence—the promotion of Turkic languages and cultures—was attractive for anthropologists who wanted to see what effect the policies would

have on indigenous peoples living in Siberia. One can see obvious parallels between the IRA's emphasis on cultural freedom with the economic benefits of tribal incorporation. Boas and Collier openly praised the Soviet policy, and Phinney was hired by Collier at least partly on the basis of his study of Soviet policy while in Leningrad.²¹ To the extent that Collier supported federal intervention and transnational—even Soviet—answers to Native policy, he and the IRA should be considered a part of Popular Front culture and policy, and not just an element of the New Deal; indeed, Collier often referred to his opponents as “fascists” and “Nazis,” suggesting that he understood his struggle within the frame of contemporary international politics.²²

Yet far beyond and undoubtedly affecting Collier and the IRA, the 1930s witnessed a cultural resurgence of Native American themes within literature and popular culture. The sheer amount and variety of literature by—and more often about—Native Americans suggests that (re)imagining Native Americans and their relationship to the United States was central to the formation of left-wing culture in the 1930s and to conceptions of modernity in general. From the Federal Writers' Project (FWP) travel guides to oral histories, to journalism by figures like Carey McWilliams and Edmund Wilson, to novels by well-known left writers like Howard Fast and emergent Native American voices like McNickle, “rediscovering” Native culture resonated powerfully with Popular Front attempts to redefine national belonging along democratic and multiethnic lines. Most prominent among these authors, Fast's novel, and 1941 Readers' Club selection, *The Last Frontier* narrates the story of one Sioux band's attempt to escape their reservation and make it back to the Black Hills.²³ Wilson's travel memoir of crossing the United States ends by noting the “robber barons” of the nineteenth century could consolidate their power only by putting down the last attempt of Native Americans “to assert their independence.”²⁴ And perhaps more optimistically, the newsletter published by the BIA under Collier, *Indians at Work*, seemed like perhaps the most salient and obvious attempt to fuse the politics of Indian representation with the prolabor politics of the Popular Front.

More than other writer of the 1930s and 1940s, the California Left's organic intellectual McWilliams historicized the relationship among fascism, imperialism, and Native genocide in the far West of the United States. Coining the term *farm fascism* to capture the precise nexus of racial violence and concentrated political power on the West Coast, McWilliams links fascism to a much longer history of mass murder and land theft. In *Southern California Country*, McWilliams gives a uniquely US version of fascism, connecting the Western colonization of California to fascist genocide and slave-labor in the

San Joaquin fields. “The Franciscan padres eliminated the Indians with the effectiveness of Nazis operating concentration camps,” and notes that the only Native Americans to survive the US invasion in large numbers were those who also resisted the mission system.²⁵ McWilliams’s concept of the “concentration camp” is much like Antonio Benítez-Rojo’s “traveling plantation,” in the sense that it combines a racial logic with a mode of production that expands through place and time. The US policy, while more violent and genocidal than the Spanish or Mexicans, “to extirpate Indian culture . . . to be liquidated as rapidly as possible,” merely modernized the hacienda system started under the Spanish.²⁶ That is, for whatever the differences among US, Spanish, and Mexican policy toward California Native peoples, McWilliams sees the beginning of California’s oppressive system of agriculture in the enslavement of the California indigenous population.

One could frame McWilliams’s intervention a “radical Turnerism,” as McWilliams locates a unique US identity in westward—and genocidal—expansion. While the FWP travel guides cautioned its writers to avoid “sentimental” and “dishonest” stereotypes of Native Americans, the “inclusion” of Native Americans in the travel guides does not present contemporary material about Native communities, nor do the guides present any of the massive changes enacted by the IRA. This alone generated the perception that Native communities were “non-historical facts,” little different from the vast descriptions of geological formations or other flora and fauna.²⁷ For McWilliams, however, as well as some writers for *Daily Worker*, the logic of Native genocide continues to inform reactionary political movements, labor suppression, racism, and violence in US culture. Of perhaps greater importance for the antifascist Left was to argue that the United States has its own fascist history, equal in its authoritarian and racist content, but separate in cultural appearance and origin. If, as Du Bois argued, fascism owes its conception to colonial regimes in Africa, so McWilliams argues that American fascism begins in settler conquest.²⁸ While with Fast’s novel and the FWP guides, Native Americans remain symbols of, rather than subjects of, an emergent pluralistic nation, for McWilliams the fate of the United States hinges on the redemption of its relationship with its indigenous peoples.

For writers such as Fast and for journalists in socialist publications like the *People’s Daily World*, the image of the Native was reproduced often in romantic ways, yet at the same these images were often accompanied by critiques of Manifest Destiny. In the *People’s Daily World*, the West Coast publication of the Communist Party, articles ran in its weekend magazine pointing out that Mount Rushmore was on land claimed by Sioux treaty and that “Sitting Bull

should be held in just as much reverence” as the presidents carved into the side of the mountain.²⁹ Indeed, just to clarify on whose side Sitting Bull would be, the author noted that Sitting Bull pursued a “united front policy” against the Native Americans common enemy, the US military, linking the fight against fascism with the Sioux struggle to defend their land.³⁰ A month earlier, an account of the Battle of Little Bighorn appeared, written by “the only living Indian who knew and fought with Sitting Bull at the Battle of Little Bighorn,” openly praising the victory over the US cavalry.³¹ On the next page, an article titled “This Land Is Ours” told the story of Mexican American farmers who face the threat of “colonization” by “Anglo-Americans and the Chamber of Commerce” who “conspire to take their land.”³² While stock images of Natives on horseback in the first piece speak to the racial romanticism of the editor who chose the accompanying image, it is clear that the editor also wishes to point out how Manifest Destiny continues to the present, with the enclosure and theft of land held by nonwhites at the center. And it should be noted, there was nothing romantic in the presentation of the Mexican American family losing their farm.

Perhaps because of this greater attention to antiracism and Indian issues on the left, there seem to have been a small number of Native American members of the Communist Party (CP) who had, at least in regional chapters, a relatively high profile. On the West Coast, in the early 1930s, an activist by the name of Joe Manzanares, self-identified as an American Indian, was featured in several headline stories; he also placed an advertisement asking for those “interested in Indian issues” to call a number at the San Francisco CPUSA office.³³ There were also calls by Native Americans to join the Communist Party in the editorial section, framed much like the letter by Spotted Eagle, as a combination of calls for self-determination, communist class rhetoric, and anticolonial questionings of the savage–civilized binary. One letter, for instance, argues that “white bosses stole all the land from us Indians” and “they call us ‘natives,’ or ‘Indians,’ or ‘wild,’ . . . the Indians are not wild. . . . Indians are always friendly to workers who must slave for a living.”³⁴ This letter writer suggests that entering modernity—being “not wild”—is not the same as assimilation. Socialism, described as “solidarity with the proletariat,” is reimagined as coincident with the writer’s claims to the land and his history of dispossession. Much like Spotted Eagle’s letter, communism and indigenous claims for self-determination are articulated as being part of the same project. Or to put it another way, self-determination is reinvented through the language of the transnational Left.

In addition, the *Western Worker/People's Daily World* printed five stories about Communist Party members organizing relief drives and unemployed councils on reservations in California, which suggests that on the West Coast at the very least, party activists and Native Americans organized together on reservations.³⁵ While the extent and shape of these organizing drives remain unclear, that the Communist Party had a presence on Western reservations and organized for such things as unemployment relief and land claims suggests a very different picture of not only the Communist Party in the West but also the political engagement of at least some Native groups. And in the *Western Worker/People's Daily World*, numerous articles ran on the subjects, including illegal land claims by whites on Indian land, broken treaties, deportations of Native Americans to Mexico, and the "genocidal" policy of Indian Removal in California, suggesting that the party did not merely see Native Americans through the lens of class but understood the specificity of Native claims to injustice.³⁶ While lacking in the formal party infrastructure that helped vocalize issues of importance to African Americans, such articles and editorials suggest far greater participation and involvement between Native communities and the far Left than is usually granted. In Montana the CP ran a Native senatorial candidate by the name of Raymond Gray in 1934, and the well-known civil rights activist Hunter Bear (John R. Salter), wrote for the CP publication *Masses and Mainstream* in the 1950s, and owed his political education to the Industrial Workers of the World and to the CP-led union Mine-Mill.³⁷

As critics like Michael Staub, Deloria, and Mindy Morgan have pointed out, 1930s documentary and literary culture did more than just include Native Americans in more "accurate" ways, as suggested by the FWP travel guides. There was a great emphasis on documenting the lives of Native Americans—collecting oral histories and writing down Native storytelling. As Staub writes, ethnographies such *Black Elk Speaks*, *The Autobiography of a Papago Woman*, and the "Stone and Kelsey 'Massacre'" were surprisingly self-reflexive texts that gave voice to marginalized perspectives and often silenced histories in ways that neither sentimentalized their subjects nor privileged the recorders. In addition, other FWP projects such as *Land of Nakoda: The Story of the Assiniboiné Indians* and "*I Will Be Meat for My Salish*": *The Montana Writers Project and the Buffalo of the Flathead Indian Reservation* were projects undertaken by educated members of their respective tribal communities to correct the "failings" of previous ethnographic works as well as to preserve oral traditions within the contemporary context of changing reservation life.³⁸ Unlike the FWP guides, Native communities had total control over the representation of

oral history and contemporary life in these projects. And equally, other FWP projects, such as “Henry Mitchell, Indian Canoe Maker,” created an oral history account of a Penobscot who claims Native identity while both criticizing the commodification of that identity and living a “modern” life as a factory worker and urban city dweller.³⁹

These “narrative acts of self-determination,” as one critic framed them, were also part of a renaissance of Native literature.⁴⁰ Nonfiction tracts such as Luther Standing Bear’s memoir *Land of the Spotted Eagle* and the avant-garde *America Needs Indians!* by Iktomi Hicala suggested a further boldness in both style and claim during the Depression. Yet memoirs and political tracts remain related more to genres of nineteenth- or early twentieth-century Native writing, like Zitkala-Sa’s *Impressions of an Indian Childhood* or William Apress’s *Eulogy on King Philip*. In a major break with earlier forms of Native writing, John Joseph Mathew’s *Sundown* and McNickle’s *Surrounded* have been called the first modern Native novels.⁴¹ And while critics have credited *The Surrounded* as being the progenitor of modern Native fiction, it is also useful to consider how the novel engages with major currents of 1930s literature, especially Popular Front literature by writers of color. As I discuss below, *The Surrounded* is a social modernist novel that signifies many generic and cultural currents of the 1930s while exposing the limits of democratic narratives’ address to subjectivity and needs of the Salish people. In this sense, not only is indigenous modernity expressed through literature, but literature is the expression and product of it.

Phinney and the “New Indian Intelligentsia”

More than any other figure, Phinney both theorized and lived the nexus between an emergent Native American politics of self-determination and the cultures of the Popular Front. Born in 1904 in Culdesac, Idaho, Phinney studied at Columbia University with Boas, completing *Nez Perce Texts*, a collection of oral tales narrated by Phinney’s mother, along with the first published transcription of the Nez Perce alphabet.⁴² After four years at Columbia, Phinney found a teaching and research post at the Leningrad Academy of Sciences from 1932 to 1937 to conduct a comparative study of Soviet and US federal Indian policy. While there, Phinney not only learned Russian and took numerous graduate seminars on Marxist theory and anthropology but also made several trips to Siberia to research how postrevolutionary policy on “national minorities” changed life for the Native peoples, hoping to find in the Soviet system a model that the United States could emulate. While Phinney never published a book-length text on his experiences in the Soviet Union, it is clear from his

published and unpublished manuscripts that the Soviet policy as well as his experiences in the Soviet Union deeply influenced his sense of politics, and cultural and racial identity, both as an eventual agent of the BIA under Collier and as cofounder of the NCAI.

In the few brief scholarly sketches written of Phinney, questions of his intellectual analysis as well as his political allegiances remain controversial. Phinney earned an extensive FBI file during his tenure at the BIA, and it is clear that the FBI suspected Phinney may have been a Communist Party member, or at least a sympathizer, citing through informants that Phinney “wanted an economy like Russia” and that Phinney promoted “Communitistic doctrines.”⁴³ As several commentators note, had Phinney not abruptly died at a relatively young age in 1949, he would have undoubtedly been called before the House Un-American Activities Committee and more than likely have lost his position with the agency. In what is to date the most thorough assessment of Phinney’s contributions as an activist and scholar, both William Willard and David Price suggest that despite his extensive file, Phinney was alienated in the Soviet Union, found little value in Soviet policy, and rarely mentioned the Soviet Union on his return to the United States.⁴⁴ From the published as well as the unpublished record, the truth about Phinney’s politics and ideology lay somewhere in between, and indeed, it appears that the scholars who collaborated in the retrospective either did not read the entire record or were more concerned with clearing Phinney’s name than with exploring his investment in Soviet policy and socialist culture. While defetishing membership in the Communist Party is crucial to understanding the broad cultural and political alignments of the Popular Front period, suggesting that Phinney went “beyond” communism to promote a pure vision of tribal sovereignty or that his alignment with the Soviet Union or CPUSA was “not relevant” suggests an unfortunate binary between radical modernist politics and questions of Native self-determination.⁴⁵ For Phinney, as with African American intellectuals such as Hughes and James, the Soviet Union suggested an alternative path of development in which questions of radical modernity and self-determination were in theory, at least, necessarily entwined.

In what is perhaps Phinney’s best-known essay, “Numipu among the White Settlers,” Phinney poses a fundamental challenge after narrating the eighty-year decline of the Numipu (Nez Perce) since the US government’s first treaty violation in 1855: “The present task . . . must be to make Indians participate in American life as alert, modern communities struggling for their own interests.”⁴⁶ Written in 1937 as part of his application for position of agent in Collier’s BIA, it is clear that Phinney wishes to imply his support for the IRA by sug-

gesting “modern” modes of self-determination for the Nez Perce; nonetheless, Phinney’s embrace of modernity as a mode of empowerment has implications beyond US federal Indian policy.⁴⁷ In an essay titled “Racial Minorities in the Soviet Union,” published in *Pacific Affairs* in 1935, Phinney promotes the Soviet Union’s policies on “national minorities” as an answer to the centuries of Russian colonialism, as well as “of the deepest importance to every person interested in problems of cultural contact and ‘race’ relations throughout the world.”⁴⁸ Czarist colonialism of the east was not only a “system of oppression” in search of “raw materials”; it also installed a native comprador class of “chiefs, traders, landlords, and government representatives” who “arrested and vitiated growth of native culture.”⁴⁹

Colonialism for Phinney was thus not merely the destruction of Native cultures but their ossification as well. As Frantz Fanon points out in dialectical fashion, colonialism constructs its opposite, the native—and thus produces the very primitivism it defines as its other. As Warrior suggests, to escape this dialectic one must not revive a romantic image of the past but attempt to imagine cultural and political liberation in a “new situation.”⁵⁰ And while one could argue whether the Soviet Union achieved this for Siberian tribes, Phinney seems to believe that the Soviet policy may have been an answer for the question he poses in “Numipu”—how to live as “alert modern communities” in a settler-colony. As Phinney describes Soviet policy, indigenous Soviet citizens would be able to reverse the “Russification” policy of the empire and promote Native cultures, as well as reverse the core–periphery model that developed the “core” metropole and underdeveloped the “periphery” colonial sphere. Phinney continually repeats his central thesis, that it is through the modernization of the Native areas that the “Northern peoples” are gaining both cultural and economic agency. In “planning their lives” with “a medical station, cooperative stores and other facilities” and “achieving a new life . . . as technicians, teachers, health workers, social and political organizers, and creators of native art and literature,” the tribal areas are also “reanimating the traditional elements and forms of culture” by “bringing them into a new synthesis, consistent with the development of future world cultures.”⁵¹ Culture for Phinney is a dynamic process, engaged with the dialectics of modernity and sovereign power. The preservation of Native cultures relies on their transformation for Phinney—their entrance into modernity on their own terms.

This “new synthesis” was largely rooted in a materialist conception of language. For Phinney, language was that part of national culture most affected by historical condition. In a handwritten essay “On Minority Languages in the Soviet Union,” written symbolically perhaps on the reverse side of his transla-

tion from Sahaptin into English of *Nez Perce Texts* (Phinney often complained to Boas of a lack of quality paper in Russia), Phinney suggests that language is the cultural medium through which “daily life” and the mode of historical development is most fully expressed.⁵² By way of example, Phinney translates Marx’s definition of “historical materialism” from English into Sahaptin, noting that in Sahaptin, it takes 151 words, whereas in English it takes only 50.⁵³ The question for Phinney is not that Marx’s concept is untranslatable but that there exists in English a ready-made infrastructure of abstract concepts by benefit of the English-speaking world’s level of historical development. From this, Phinney then follows that it was through language that tribal cultures in czarist Russia were dominated, as language is that mode through which an entire social and historical way of life is expressed:

One of the most effective instruments of bending national minority life to the devastating economic interests of an outside ruling bourgeoisie was that of language, and that the Russianizing process was an outright system of making minor nationalities good subjects for exploitation—a system sustained by ideals commonly proclaimed in other countries, of civilizing a backwards people. They see that Russian Czarist policy, utilizing language as a most effective instrument for Russianizing, was bent towards the substitution of the Russian language for all native languages—a policy which was carried into effect first by constituting Russian as an official language in the conduct of political and business affairs among nationalities and secondly by establishing schools which not only were conducted in Russian language, but followed principles of education, though specially drafted curriculae, that were consistent with the maintenance of exploitation.⁵⁴

Despite “Russianizing” Native life in Siberia, Phinney refuses to accept the binary opposite, that tribes should learn only their native languages and that Russian should be removed from educational and civic life. Phinney is aware that it is just the cosmopolitanism of the imperialist that makes the local appear as a site of resistance:

For imperialist expansion . . . it is necessary to break down the barriers of isolation and independence among . . . colonial peoples. Just as economic isolation and independence . . . react against the exploiting interests of oppressor nations so will cultural isolation and independence react not only against the flowering of a high world culture but against the fullest local cultural development.⁵⁵

For Phinney, the problem is not merely to accept a cosmopolitanism and modernity that rejects the provincialism of the local but to find a radical modernity that can aid in the resistance to imperialism without freezing native culture in an isolated past.

Given the centrality of language in expressing fundamental cultural and historical modes of existence for Phinney, he endorses what he sees as the Soviet model, a radical bilingualism in which “national minority languages may not only survive but will develop if . . . native conversation, tradition, mythology, folk tales and songs are glorified” and in which Russian is also taught as a way for Native peoples to enter “the new living world of science, technology, philosophy, political science, art and literature.”⁵⁶ In this double track, Phinney embraces his materialist concept of language as a possible way out for Siberian tribes. If each language expresses a “whole way of life,” then for those tasks necessary for modern development, Phinney encourages the acquisition of a language that has had centuries of exposure to modernity while retaining a native language for social and cultural life, anticipating that at some point, the native language will eventually overtake Russian or English in wider and wider aspects of Native life. For Phinney, socialism becomes a mode by which the power, but not the cultural, national, or even spiritual specificity, is taken out of language. As Phinney writes, it is “only socialism” in such a polynational form that “will clean the linguistic air” of the internalized “inferiority” felt by Native cultures in the use of their language and erase the “glamour” of the colonizer’s tongue.⁵⁷

While one might think that Collier’s vision of the Indian New Deal would seem like a plausible version of what Phinney admired in the Soviet policy for national minorities, with its emphasis on economic development and cultural pluralism, it is clear that Phinney had his own vision of Native self-empowerment. As much as Phinney eagerly sought out work in the BIA, Phinney felt that he had a greater role in shaping Native identity through the foundation of the NCAI.⁵⁸ Sending a long, critical letter to Collier over what he felt were the IRA’s failures to break out of the “rigid guardianship of the government” and objecting to the dominance of white anthropologists and missionaries at the American Indian Conference in 1939, Phinney formed a new caucus of “limited bona fide Indian leaders” out of which the NCAI grew.⁵⁹ Phinney felt that the NCAI would represent a new, “Indian” identity, one far more “aggressive and militant” than earlier pan-Indian organizations.⁶⁰ In an essay titled “The New Indian Intelligentsia,” Phinney sketches out his vision of the NCAI as a way to respond to the meaning of being Indian in the modern world:

Apart from any considerations of racism or nationalism, there must be ascribed to American Indians not only a tribal status but a racial status. The concept of an Indian “race” derives largely from our modern propensity for classifying groups of people rather than individualizing them. Anciently, Indians identified themselves by local groups or bands, later by tribes

and ethno-linguistic stocks, until now they have gained a distinct consciousness of that all-embracing classification—"Indians." . . . This trend is already apparent among Indian tribes as it is among mother minorities throughout the world.⁶¹

Inhabiting a racial identity would be, paradoxically, the mode in which Native peoples could also inhabit a modern political identity. Ever the dialectician, Phinney sees the imposed identity of race as a way to form collective strength and, as importantly, to not allow resistance to "modern" definitions to prevent Indians from organizing. Anticipating that tribal identity would—and often did—prevent Native peoples from developing a pan-Indian alliance, Phinney stresses that "Indian racial heritage is not a thing that depends for its survival upon a reservation atmosphere . . . , such non-reservation Indians are probably the most capable and aggressive element of the Indian population in the United States."⁶² Phinney's last point seems telling—rather than imagine as Mathews or McNickle did in their fiction that modernity would bring tragedy to those Native Americans brave or foolish enough to face it, just such a deracinated identity will allow them to govern their own affairs.

One could argue that Phinney embraces the "ethnicity paradigm" of the 1930s, yet it is clear that he also rejects the assumption that ethnicity is merely a modern form of assimilation. In Phinney's definition of ethnicity, racial markers should be used to address issues of collective concern to Native Americans, not as a way to erase Indigenous identity within what Byrd refers to as the "multi-cultural settler state." In such fashion, the NCAI limited its involvement with white-led organizations, and membership was restricted solely to Native Americans. While not technically a form of "separatism," the foundation of the NCAI considered self-determination and sovereignty primarily political concerns, about advancing Indian interests at the national level, and having means to articulate an Indian point of view, separate from tribal or land-based identities yet not independent from these concerns. As the NCAI founders understood, their interests coincided with those of other people of color, yet they also understood the uniqueness of Native American identity, one with special tribal needs, treaty claims, and legal relationships with the federal government.⁶³ In other words, the NCAI through Phinney's visionary construction uses the ethnicity paradigm to function politically in the modern world, yet retained a sovereign Native American identity and purpose. The successful fight against termination waged largely by the NCAI a decade later suggests that the foundation of such an organization was not a moment too soon.

As Deloria reminds us, the fixing of Native Americans within discourses of primitivism also entailed freezing them in place, both literally in terms of the carceral reservation and figuratively through antimodern portraits of Indians as romantic savages.⁶⁴ Thus for Phinney there is a larger question at stake: how are native peoples to join a cosmopolitan and transnational world culture? Phinney's transnational identity is a question that echoes through nearly everything he wrote, from his several articles on the Soviet Union to comparisons of Charlemagne and Napoleon to Sitting Bull and Tecumseh. Phinney's perspective is underscored by the title of an unpublished retrospective Phinney wrote for the *Baltimore Sun*: "Travels of an American Indian into the Hinterlands of Soviet Russia."⁶⁵ The "American Indian," as Deloria reminds us, is supposed to be the most provincial of creatures—and here, Phinney is both ironizing the "unexpectedness" of his own presence in the Soviet Union and calling attention to his modernity and his internationalism. Yet Phinney is also clear to maintain that such a transnational identity is not new: Native Americans visited Russia in the sixteenth century, and now, he noted with some pride, "an Indian had come to study and understand the Russians."⁶⁶ The reservation system is therefore not necessarily inherent to preserving culture; rather, as Phinney writes in "The New Indian Intelligentsia," by retaining a reservation identity, "we are making the Indian inordinately a reservation denizen rather than a world citizen and the Indian who adjusts himself outside of a reservation ceases to figure in the Indian picture simply because he is no longer an *Indian problem*."⁶⁷ In other words, redefining the reservation as a carceral space that both defines and confines Indianness to its status as a "problem," Phinney suggests that a transnational identity as a global citizen is the road to empowerment and self-affirmation.

As a cautious and often critical supporter of the "Indian" New Deal, Phinney hoped to see reservations reemerge as sites of cultural and economic development. Yet, as Phinney wrote, many of the tribes in the United States are "moribund," living on small, unsustainable reservations.⁶⁸ This is not to say that Phinney supported assimilation or termination. Assimilation, Phinney argued, is often based on false binary, assuming that one whole culture and way of life will be replaced by another, equally fulfilling. As Phinney writes in "Numipu among the White Settlers," even as the younger generation of Native Americans has already become "indifferent to . . . tribal activities" and "bereft" of their traditional way of life, their "ultimate assimilation by the whites" often means "assimilation on the lowest level of white proletarian existence."⁶⁹ Because of their position within the racial formation of the United States, Native Americans would be assimilated at the lowest rungs of US society. Functioning

in the world as modern members of a strong community was not assimilation but a refashioned vision of sovereignty that moved beyond a frozen definition of tradition as against a false ideal of Western identity.⁷⁰ As Warrior and Bruyneel articulate, moving beyond an essentialized vision of Native identity and a spatially fixed terrain of struggle can be defined as “intellectual sovereignty,” a move that Phinney imagined for the NCAI, leading to solidarity and participation with other various struggles for justice.⁷¹

Rather than understand Phinney as simply a devoted Nez Perce activist who was uninterested in socialism or as a “white man’s Indian” plagued by “personal and cultural dilemmas” stemming from “having been educated in institutions dominated by whites,” as Dolores Janiewski referred to him, Phinney was much more like other intellectuals of color of his day—concerned with colonialism, racial identity, and self-determination for his people in a global context.⁷² Phinney clearly saw indigenous rights as tied to the fate of other people of color and understood equally that imperialism and racism were themselves inseparable constructs. Thus adopting a racial identity was not only a way to create a pan-Indian identity but also a way to, as he put it, be counted “among other minorities throughout the world.” For Phinney, as for many writers of color in the first half of the twentieth century, international socialism became a critical lens through which formations of race and ethnic nationalism were refashioned. While the recent upsurge of scholarship on black internationalism between the 1920s and 1950s has done much to shift black political consciousness away from Harlem and Paris to the colonial world, it seems appropriate to consider how at least some Native American activists and intellectuals addressed their concerns not only across divergent dislocations and diasporas but through the lens of the international socialist Left. This makes Phinney no less Native, but suggests that “Native” is a concept, like modernity, that must be changed to address how it shapes and blinds us to lives through whom it lives and is lived.

Returning to the Present: Unmaking the Native American Bildungsroman

Like Phinney, McNickle was born on a reservation in the Mountain West and lived many of his formative years as a writer in New York City. Yet despite or perhaps because of this, in addition to writing what is perhaps the most important modern Native American novel of the Popular Front era, *The Surrounded*, McNickle also helped found the NCAI along with Phinney and several other BIA officials in the Collier administration. And while it would be difficult

to say that McNickle was engaged in the transnational socialist Left in the same way as Phinney, many of McNickle's attitudes and approaches to both capitalism and American Indian policy speak to the cultural common sense of the Popular Front era. As his biographer Dorothy Parker writes, McNickle became increasingly anticapitalist during the 1930s, and his personal politics of anticapitalism coincided with his own rediscovery of his Indian identity, echoing the ways in which other intellectuals of color expressed an opposition to capitalism within a racialized framework.⁷³ Equally, McNickle's role within the BIA resembled the attitude of many other Popular Front intellectuals working inside and outside the New Deal administration. As Parker writes, McNickle viewed the BIA reforms with a "pragmatic mind," opposing Collier's "mystical" and essentialist view of Indian identity.⁷⁴ At the same time, however, McNickle also felt that Collier's policies in the BIA "moved in the right direction" and, perhaps more importantly, opened up spaces for independent Indian voices and political organizing.⁷⁵ Thus it is important not only to read McNickle's novel within the *longue durée* of Native American written literature but also necessary to think of how the novel responds to themes of multicultural belonging and racial nationalism within the Popular Front and radical modernism. Through the experiences of the novel's protagonist, McNickle seems to suggest new forms of hybrid identity as well as the profound extent to which such modern solutions are continually foreclosed by the deep lineages of the racial state.

The Surrounded tells the story of Archilde Leon, the son of a Salish mother and a Spanish father, who returns to the Flathead reservation after spending a year in Portland playing fiddle and working in restaurants as a dishwasher.⁷⁶ The novel follows a narrative arc of reconciliation and growth, as his mother returns to her forgotten "pagan" roots and Archilde reconciles with his well-intentioned but culturally limited father, who eventually agrees to send Archilde to Europe to play violin. Yet this arc is undercut by a second narrative in which the reservation—and its violence—eventually entrap Archilde, as he faces arrest and possible execution for the death of a sheriff and a game warden. Like realist novels such as Wright's *Native Son* or Bulosan's *America Is in the Heart*, *The Surrounded* ironically signifies on the Popular Front's "cultures of unity," or Denning's formation of the "national-popular." Rather than a culture of belonging based on an inclusive democratic nation, McNickle suggests that the land itself is a carceral trap, in which bonds of national belonging and solidarity racially mark the subject as "other" at the same time that "assimilation" is regarded as a kind of cultural suicide. As *Native Son* ironically invokes the folk nationalism of the Popular Front to undercut it—the "native son" of

the United States is put to death for an accidental murder (and the murder he did intentionally commit is largely ignored)—so too *The Surrounded* invokes Collier's romantic description of reservations as "islands removed from time" and "red Atlantis" to undermine it. Indeed, the book's title suggests more the "psychological island" of race that Wright describes in *12 Million Black Voices* than the "islands removed from time" of Collier's essays.⁷⁷ Such tropes of belonging are further belied by the narrative structure. *The Surrounded*, like *America* and *Native Son*, employs the bildungsroman form only to suggest how the protagonist's reintegration with his family and with Salish culture exposes him as vulnerable to the law. As with *Native Son*'s Bigger Thomas, Archilde's progressive vision of community comes only as he is about to be executed by the state.

So, too, claims that *The Surrounded* be read as a "high modernist" text suggest that we consider the sources not only of the novel's experimentation but also of the narrator's alienation.⁷⁸ The protagonist of *The Surrounded* is "culturally adrift" at the outset, yet his alienation is more a product of his exclusion from his white father's "big house" than any form of radical individualism. Modernism and modernity in *The Surrounded* are racialized—the protagonist is less nostalgic for a lost pastoral as in *The Wasteland* than trapped between a modernity he is excluded from and a way of life that has been violently exterminated. And like Wright's *Native Son*, *The Surrounded* deploys modernist forms of textuality—the incorporation of mass culture texts, the dime western and detective story. Yet while these devices suggest the Popular Front's embrace of mass culture, their function in the narrative also suggests a greater skepticism about the liberatory potential of "popular" forms like the western and the detective story.

Phinney's engagement with radical modernity and Popular Front forms of political engagement also invite us to reread the question of genre in McNickle's *Surrounded*. The novel's fusion of personal development and social critique suggests an affinity with what Barbara Foley refers to as "the radical bildungsroman," perhaps the most popular form for the radical novel of the 1930s.⁷⁹ The "radical" bildungsroman rejected many of the individualistic assumptions usually associated with the genre and often promoted oppositional forms of culture, often featuring a hero who embraced the class struggle and an affirmative vision of the world. While *The Surrounded* does not feature stories of collective action or class conflict, it does present an affirmative vision of reconciliation as the three central figures of the Leon family, Max, Catherine, and Archilde, are reunited. Indeed, Archilde is described by Father Grepilloux, the missionary priest, as the "sign of a new day," a hybrid figure, someone who can

cross cultural and racial boundaries, and may lead the tribe to a better future. And as at least one critic has suggested, we can read Archilde's hybridity as an embrace of a postcolonial critique of binary modes of thought.⁸⁰ Neither fully "native" or "colonist" in perspective, Archilde seems positioned to transcend the carceral trap of the reservation, as well as the worldview established in the novel's opening frame. Archilde suggests early in the novel that Louis, a horse thief and a brawler who lives as an outlaw in the mountains, has embraced a countermythology as dangerous as Sheriff Quigley's, and taunts Louis for his bluff to "wait for [Quigley] in the mountains with my gun."⁸¹ Unlike his white father and Salish mother, who live in "separate houses," Archilde is welcome in both and seems poised to overcome the final binary: to "stay" on the reservation or to "leave" it. By accepting an offer to study music on recommendation of the church, he remains tied to the history of Sniél-emen while also pursuing opportunities abroad.

The Surrounded opens with a stark binary: a "Western" and Christian worldview versus a "Native" and pagan worldview. When Max, Archilde's Spanish father, asks why he cannot get along with any of his half-Salish sons, Father Grepilloux does not answer directly—rather, he responds by telling the story of the Salish conversion to Christianity, their confession that they "had been worshipping false gods."⁸² Whatever problems the Salish may have retaining pagan customs, he suggests they had the "hearts of children" and cites their enthusiasm for confession and conversion as proof of their deep faith.⁸³ As Grepilloux speaks, Max reflects that he had never heard the story of the Salish's willing conversion and realizes—as part of his answer—that, despite living in Sniél-emen for forty years and marrying a Salish woman, "he was ignorant of these people."⁸⁴ While the story establishes Max's failing—his inability to see the Salish from their own perspective—it also establishes Grepilloux as a "man who knows Indians," in Richard Slotkin's turn of phrase, and as someone whose authority to speak for and about them goes unquestioned.

On the same day, however, Archilde's uncle Modeste offers another narrative of the Salish conversion. Modeste explains that after their tribe had been decimated with the introduction of modern weaponry among their ancient rivals, the Crows and Blackfeet, the "wise men" began looking desperately for answers as to "why the people had lost their power."⁸⁵ On the advice of Iroquois who came to Sniél-emen, the Salish sent men looking for "black robed priests" who had a "Somesh, a power" that "if they brought it to us we would be strong again." While Modeste acknowledges that their strategy failed, "we thought they would bring back the power we lost—but today we have less," the story reveals a far different motivation for conversion than what Grepilloux

maintains.⁸⁶ Rather than a tale of “False Gods” and “true faith,” this story suggests a political calculation based on a people desperate for answers that would save their tribe. Rather than a tribe with “the hearts of children,” Modeste’s story suggests agency as well as sophistication in the way they approached the priests so that the latter would not suspect Salish motivations. At the heart of Grepilloux’s misunderstanding is the colonial conceit that he was, in his own words, “teaching” the Salish the meaning of God, and that the relationship was based on a subject–object relationship of unequal power.⁸⁷

This division between conversion narratives is further framed by the two houses Archilde faces on his return, his father’s house and his mother’s cabin. In many ways, they can be read as ontological spaces, “the big house, where his [white] father would most likely be sitting,” and “the dirt-roofed log cabin,” where his Salish mother lived and “which occupied the lower ground.”⁸⁸ The separation of the two spaces speaks to the “warfare” in his own house and, of course, stands in as a metonym for the continuing and unresolved “warfare” that exists between the two peoples.⁸⁹ As a figure, Archilde, the son of a Salish mother and a white father, would seem to stand, as Grepilloux himself articulates, at the “place where the road divides”: he is someone who has the chance to make a new path and act as a mediator between the two cultures.⁹⁰

Archilde’s centrality in the text and inheritor of the *bildungsroman* form is reinforced by the fact that the narrative is told through his perspective. In contrast to Grepilloux, whose story of the Salish is compromised, and to Max, who anguishes at his inability to understand his Salish family, Archilde listens to Modeste and his mother tell stories of the Salish past. In addition, compared with Modeste and Catherine, who both have poor eyesight, Archilde is associated with birds and flight, often scrutinizing, ironizing, and weighing the value and wisdom of those with whom he comes into contact.⁹¹ His older brother is a “bag of wind” for boasting; his nephews he corrects when they repeat anti-Native stereotypes; his father talks of useless matters of business that reveal his own emotional poverty; the priests he indulges but knows they can’t teach him anything, and so on.⁹² Even many of the omniscient evaluations are delivered through Archilde’s eyes, including discrepancies between dress and action among the priests or how much his mother had aged since he last saw her.⁹³ Archilde’s aloof gaze throughout the novel not only affords the reader the assurance that he has mastery over his own life but also privileges his hybrid and frequently sophisticated view of the world. That the narrative centers on Archilde gives his voice priority and suggests that we should view Catherine, Modeste, Sniél-emen, Max, and Louis through his eyes. Such a narrative construction, of course, also reinforces the *bildungsroman* expectations, as Archilde seems to be the character most capable of growth and development.

The novel's affirmative arc is unraveled, however, by a second sequence of events: the murder of Archilde's brother by a game warden; the (counter) murder moments later of the warden by Archilde's mother; the eventual flight of Archilde and Elise, Archilde's companion and romantic interest; the capture of Archilde by Sheriff Quigley and the murder of the sheriff by Elise; and the capture of Archilde and Elise by the Indian agent and agency police. In the same way that the radical bildungsroman informs the text's initial structure, the murder of Louis, the warden, and the introduction of Sheriff Quigley articulates a second narrative strand. As *The Surrounded* employs and modifies the popular genre of the "radical bildungsroman" to mark Archilde as both within and without dominant cultural norms, so too the introduction of the "western" is not simply a question of another character but the introduction of a separate discursive device. Quigley appears only four brief times in the text, yet his presence and what he represents shape the entire contour and outcome of the narrative.

In this sense, I suggest that we refer to the narrative of Archilde's eventual flight and capture as the imposition of one *genre* over another genre. Sheriff Quigley belongs wholly to the Wild West dime novel, and the narrator suggests that Quigley is self-referentially aware of this fact: Quigley was "a sheriff out of the Old West . . . he had read of those hard-riding, quick-shooting dispensers of peace . . . he had made the part his own."⁹⁴ In this sense, *The Surrounded* exemplifies what the critic Christopher Vials calls the "mass-mediation" of 1930s texts, the mutual incorporation of popular and "pulp" genres within radical protest fiction and vice versa.⁹⁵ Yet McNickle significantly alters this format by arranging the genres hierarchically. The arrival of Quigley in the narrative both foreshadows and forecloses any possibility of Archilde's transformation and further growth. The "sudden" appearance of "horse and rider on the trail" and Quigley's "scrutiny" of Archilde for a "whole list of crimes" halt the bildungsroman as forcefully in its tracks as Archilde is frozen in terror by his chance meeting with Quigley in the mountains.

This secondary narrative also serves a colonial "ordering" function. When Archilde confronts the warden, his instincts are to speak English and do everything the warden asks, yet this instinct merely makes the warden more suspicious, as Louis will not speak English. More significantly, however, that Archilde responds to Louis's murder with confusion suggests the limits of his ontological hybridity.⁹⁶ Archilde is not only confused and shocked by Louis's murder, but Catherine kills the warden so quickly that Archilde does not even see it happen. The final phrase, that Archilde could not see what "led up to" his mother's counter-murder of the game warden, is highly suggestive of a broader

history than merely his mother's silent approach. Catherine has no trouble understanding what took place and acts immediately. The scene ends with Archilde continuing to ponder how "inexplicable" his mother's movements and acts were to him, suggesting that he is still quite removed from the Salish history of conquest.⁹⁷ In this way, Quigley becomes a figure who "racially orders" the text, aligning all Salish characters within the category, as Denise Ferreira da Silva writes, of bodies to whom violence can be done. Catherine, unlike Archilde, recognizes the fact and can act; Archilde is frozen in paralysis and confusion.

In the same way that the presence of *The Law* serves to "order" complex characters into racial types, the function of violence in the narrative also serves an ordering function, as it puts an end to the radical uncertainty to the novel. Max's long series of unanswered, and perhaps unanswerable, questions after Father Grepilloux's death—"what good came of . . . building a new world here?"—are not so much answered as foreclosed. Equally, the constant shifting among characters and viewpoints comes to a sudden end as the relations between whites and Salish are for once firmly established: the Indian agent stands above Archilde, who "extended his hands to be shackled" in a final act of submission.⁹⁸ As Lowe notes, the bildungsroman form contains within it a binary between youth and maturity that critically reproduces the binary between savage and civilized, colony and metropole.⁹⁹ That the novel undermines the bildungsroman, even in its radical form, suggests that we refuse the distinction between a "sighted" Archilde and "blind" elder or "crazy" Salish brother, and rather realize the strengths and limitations of an indeterminate and particular (nonuniversal) point of view. Yet the ending reminds us that the power to fix meaning does not belong to all narrators equally. While Modeste may remind the reader of Grepilloux's inaccuracy, Grepilloux's story is in writing. While the novel celebrates the primacy of the oral text and storyteller, it also is not mistaken about the power differentials between them within Western civilization. And for Archilde's hybrid perspective, violence marks him on one side of the binary without the agency to refuse.

When the Indian agent finally captures Archilde, the agent's line "it's too damn bad you people never learn you can't run away" is an echo of what Archilde has been saying about the reservation since the beginning of the novel: that one can no longer live in the mountains in the "old way."¹⁰⁰ The irony is less that Archilde was right all along than that Archilde must realize the extent to which he has embraced the colonizer's logic. In the end, Archilde is transformed from the great hope of the reservation to just another Indian; yet as a question of narrative there is nothing deterministic about it. McNickle's

narrative structure, in effect, allows Archilde's potential to become fully affirmed while both suggesting his limitations and imposing a secondary narrative structure on it. One could say that the "Wild West" narrative of the game warden performs the role of an occupation; its coercion is in one sense as totally incapacitating as it is external to the lives of the characters. This is not to suggest that all the Salish need to do is overthrow the local sheriff; rather, it affirms that the Salish "know their own affairs," as Modeste says, even if they have submitted to a greater military and colonial power.

From the viewpoint of social movements of the 1930s, one could say that the novel performs many of the contradictions of the Popular Front. The novel is in some ways redemptive—that Max and Catherine reconcile and Catherine moves back into the "big house" after Max acknowledges his wrong suggests its parallel as a national story: that integration of a kind is possible, and in a form that does not require Catherine to give up her rights, dignity, or culture. Yet the novel is also bitterly militant in its depiction of the racial violence that the law inflicts on the Salish with impunity. As Ferreira da Silva writes, it is precisely this racial violence that marks the body other; that Archilde is a victim of it as is Louis merely suggests that race is a determining field and that cultural freedom is not enough.¹⁰¹ That the novel is at once nationalistic and integrationist should not be understood as a problem—it is, rather, the lived contradiction of a movement and a politics that at once engaged with federal policy yet worked and imagined beyond its limits.

I would also suggest the novel implicitly performs the problematic articulated by Phinney in "The New Indian Intelligentsia." Archilde is the most sophisticated observer and narrator in the text, in terms of his complex understanding of the limitations of both the reservation and white US culture. Yet he is also the character least able to act in any meaningful fashion. In one sense, that is the "tragedy" of the novel, the uniqueness of Archilde's dilemma. Yet Phinney's formulation turns the reading of the novel on its head. Rather than see Archilde as a lone individual who has a "tragic" flaw that renders him unfit for an integrated society, we may read Archilde's outsider status as precisely what makes him typical and exemplary. Rather than see Archilde as the master of one form of modernity, the violin, and victim of another, the modern gun, we can see Archilde lacking a context in which his own form of hybridity is allowed political, cultural, and social expression. For Phinney, a group like the NCAI is about more than just advocating for the rights of Native Americans as a collective, it is about the situation modernity has forced on many Native peoples—neither offering a way to live "the old ways" on reservations nor willing to assimilate at the lowest rung of "white proletarian culture." Thus

precisely what is radical about McNickle's novel is the way Archilde's isolation is placed, as Phinney's "Indian Intelligentsia," within the generic structures of a Popular Front political and cultural lexicon while also demanding autonomy from them. By locating the text within the two recognizable radical forms, the "structure of feeling" of *The Surrounded* is very much in dialogue with other texts by radical writers of color who acted within a similar dialectic of belonging and separatism. Like Wright's dialectic of modernity, or the often-cited unevenness of Bulosan's *America Is in the Heart*, Phinney's "Indian Intelligentsia" demands modernity, but on the terms of his own intellectual sovereignty. *The Surrounded's* alternative, radical bildungsroman is thus the cultural corollary to Phinney's radical congress of "bona fide Indian leaders."

By stating some of the thematic similarities between *The Surrounded*, Phinney's critical essays, and writings by Popular Front-era black nationalists, I do not wish to flatten obvious differences among texts or suggest that "Native American self-determination" and "black nationalism" share identical roots and contexts.

Yet despite these differences, these texts and movements display similar tensions around questions of belonging and nationalism that articulate themselves through Popular Front literary and cultural modes. I also would hope that by pointing out crucial commonalities among texts by writers of color, I can begin to suggest how Native American literature and activism were in dialogue with the Popular Front. I would not go so far as to say there was a "Native American Popular Front," as Mullen and Kelley have suggested there was an "African-American Popular Front," but I would say that Native American issues and Native American intellectuals played a crucial part in the dialectics between and among race, class, and nation that formed the movement's most intense political currents. While Collier's reforms were enacted as part of an attempt to renew US national identity—which he accurately saw as reliant on incorporating Native Americans for its cultural reproduction—such a view was supported and challenged by Native Americans acting as independent political agents who understood both the opportunities and the limitations of working at least partly within the structures of the New Deal. Writers within the FWP and intellectuals within the Collier administration, such as McNickle and Phinney, saw the space opened by his reforms to pursue their own more radical vision of Indian life. By approaching Native American policy and literature in the 1930s through the lens of the Popular Front, we can see the breadth and depth of the movement, as well as understand how radical modernisms were embraced and challenged. At the center of *The Surrounded's* political structure is the conflict between a telos of radical and alterior modernity represented by Archilde and

the history of racial violence represented by Sheriff Quigley. While these two narrative strands would seem unbridgeable, it is precisely this gap between a new universalism and the history of exclusion from such universalisms that embodies the horizons and contradictions of the Popular Front. And I would go further to say that intellectuals such as Phinney should be given their proper due as modernist thinkers, posing questions with other intellectuals of his age, as well as rethinking the meaning of Native American modernity.

Notes

I offer my thanks to the Indiana University New Frontiers Foundation for a generous travel grant to the National Archives Northwest Region, the Library of Congress, and the American Philosophical Society Library, and especially thank the archivists for their dedication, skill, and assistance. I would also like to thank the following individuals for their help, suggestions, and feedback at many stages of this research: Jane Li Wang, Chris Vials, Alan Wald, Nicole Tonkovich, and the members of my writing group, who patiently read an early and very rough draft—Jim Buss, Joe Genetin-Pilawa, Robert Smith, Wendy Kozol, and Rachel Ida-Buff.

1. Vincent Spotted Eagle, "Indian Tells Upton Sinclair One, and Why He Joined C.P.," letter to the editor, *Western Worker*, March 14, 1934, 6.
2. Michael Denning periodizes the "long Popular Front" from the Sacco and Vanzetti trial in 1927 to the dawn of the Cold War, a generational formation that still resonates within US culture. In addition to being an antifascist and prolabor coalition, Denning describes twin cultures of ethnic pride that wildly oscillated between radical ethnic nationalism and a sense of newfound national belonging as "ethnic Americanism" (*The Cultural Front: The Laboring of American Culture in the Twentieth Century* [London: Verso, 1998], 9). See also George Lipsitz, *American Studies in a Moment of Danger* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 38–42; Alan Wald, *Trinity of Passion: The Literary Left and the Antifascist Crusade* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 1–16; Mark Naison, *Communists in Harlem during the Depression* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983); Robin D. G. Kelley, *Hammer and Hoe: Alabama Communists during the Great Depression* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990); and Kelley, *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class* (New York: Free Press, 1994).
3. Kenneth Philp, *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform, 1920–54* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1977), 245. For more sources on the IRA, New Deal programs, and Native Americans, and John Collier's tenure in the Bureau of Indian Affairs that are sympathetic to at least the goals of the Collier administration's reforms, see Lawrence Kelly, *The Assault on Assimilation: John Collier and the Origins of Indian Policy Reform* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1983); Graham Taylor, *The Indian New Deal and American Indian Tribalism: The Administration of the IRA, 1934–45* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980); Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford Lytle, *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty* (New York: Random House, 1984). For more critical perspectives, see Ronald Takaki, "The End of the Frontier: The Emergence of an American Empire," in *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America* (New York: Back Bay Books, 2008), 228–45; Jodi Byrd, "Killing States: Removals, Other Americans, and the 'Pale Promise of Democracy,'" in *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 185–220; E. A. Schwartz, "Red Atlantis Revisited: Community and Culture in the Writings of John Collier," *American Indian Quarterly* 18.4 (1994): 507–31.
4. In his essay "The New Indian Intelligentsia," Archie Phinney lays out his blueprint for a new, militant pan-Indian organization, what became the NCAI. Phinney is insistent that "American Indians" adopt a "racial identity" as a way to join other communities of color agitating for their rights. Acknowledging

- that race is a “modern” and “European” concept, he embraces it in dialectical fashion as the mode by which also to achieve power. While he does not mention the National Negro Congress or the Congress of Spanish-Speaking Peoples by name, his insistence that “American Indians” must organize in modern, political formations and in ways that use race politically would seem to suggest that he had such organizations in mind. For further treatment of the essay, see the section on Phinney (Archie Phinney Papers, National Archives—Pacific Alaska Region, box 2, RG075; hereafter cited as APA). Charles E. J. Heacock, one of the other key founders of the NCAI along with D’arcy McNickle and Phinney, argued along similar lines that Native Americans needed to create an organization that could work alongside other growing civil rights organizations of the 1940s (quoted in Thomas Cowger, *The National Congress of American Indians: The Founding Years* [Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999], 34).
5. Archie Phinney, “The New Indian Intelligentsia,” APA, box 2, RG075.
 6. Archie Phinney, “On Understanding Soviet Russia” (address to the Tescemini Club, Lewiston, Idaho, 1943, APA, box 2, RG075).
 7. Jodi Byrd, Russell Means, and Ward Churchill have, among others, suggested that the international socialist Left offers indigenous people merely another form of assimilation. See Byrd’s critique of Antonio Gramsci and Slavoj Žižek in *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 29–31, 124–30; Russell Means’s critique of Marxism, “The Same Old Song,” in *Marxism and Native Americans*, ed. Ward Churchill (Boston: South End, 1992), 19–34; and Churchill’s critique of Marxism, *Since Predator Came: Notes from the Struggle for American Indian Liberation* (Oakland, CA: AK, 2005), 311–27.
 8. Robert A. Warrior, *Tribal Secrets* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 111.
 9. Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 36–38.
 10. Philip J. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004), 6.
 11. Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States from the 1960s to the 1990s*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 1994), 14–23, 96.
 12. *Ibid.*, 14–23.
 13. Bill Mullen, *Popular Fronts: Chicago and African-American Cultural Politics, 1935–46* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 1–17; Robin D. G. Kelley, “To Be Red and Black,” in *Race Rebels*, 103–60.
 14. Robin D. G. Kelley, “‘Afric Sons with Banner Red’: African American Communists and the Politics of Culture, 1919–1934,” in *Race Rebels*, 103–22.
 15. Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (London: Verso, 1985).
 16. Kevin Bruyneel, *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Post-Colonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 125.
 17. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, 191–95.
 18. Anthony Dawahare, *Nationalism, Marxism, and African American Literature between the Wars* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2003), 75.
 19. Langston Hughes, *I Wonder as I Wander* (1956; rpt. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1993), 116.
 20. *Ibid.*, 172.
 21. William Willard, “Nez Perce Anthropologist,” *Journal of Northwest Anthropology* 38.1 (2004), 5–19; Philp, *John Collier’s Crusade*, 221.
 22. Philp, *John Collier’s Crusade*, 176.
 23. Howard Fast, *The Last Frontier* (New York: Press of the Readers’ Club, 1942).
 24. Edmund Wilson, *American Jitters: A Year of the Slump* (New York: Books for the Libraries, 1968), 303, 253.
 25. Carey McWilliams, *Southern California Country: An Island on the Land* (New York: Stratford, 1946), 29.
 26. *Ibid.*, 42.
 27. Hartwig Isernhagen, “Identity and Exchange: The Representation of ‘The Indian’ in the Federal Writers’ Project and in Contemporary Native American Literature,” *Native American Representations: First Encounters, Distorted Images, and Literary Appropriations*, ed. Gretchen Bataille (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001).
 28. “There was no Nazi atrocity—concentration camps, wholesale maiming and murder, defilement of women or ghastly blasphemy of childhood—which Christian civilization or Europe had not long been

- practicing against colored folk in all parts of the world in the name of and for the defense of a Superior Race born to rule the world" (W. E. B. Du Bois, *The World and Africa* [New York: International Publishers, 1947], 23).
29. Howard Rushmore, "Singing Warrior," *Peoples' Daily World*, May 1938, 5.
 30. The CPUSA of course called their Popular Front policy a "United Front Policy" in the years between 1934 and 1936 (*ibid.*).
 31. Chief Benito Altaha, "Custer's Last Stand: An Indian Chief Who Fought with Sitting Bull Tells the True Story of That Mighty Battle on the Banks of the Little Big Horn," *Peoples' Daily World*, April 1938, 7–8.
 32. Aron Kirch, "This Land Is Ours," *Peoples' Daily World*, April 1938, 8–9.
 33. "Interested in Indian Issues?," advertisement, *Western Worker*, July 15, 1932, 4.
 34. "Calls upon Indians to Join Communists," letter to the editor, *Western Worker*, June 15, 1932, 4.
 35. "Corcina, Rumba Indians Come to Jobless Council for Help," *Western Worker*, November 7, 1932, 2; "Forced to Give Indians Relief after Struggle," *Western Worker*, March 16, 1933, 2; "Indians Organize Relief Fight," *Western Worker*, August 21, 1933, 3; "Indians Robbed by GOP-Democrats; Turning to CP," July 15, 1932, 4; "Indians Fight Removal to Poor Location," *Peoples' Daily World*, May 20, 1937, 5.
 36. "California Indians Betrayed and Bled of Their Money," *Western Worker*, May 20, 1937, 5; Ned Dahl, "Working Class History of California," *Peoples' Daily World*, March 3, 1937, 2; Harrison George, "Chamber of Commerce Inheritors of Earlier Genocide: Column Left," *Peoples' Daily World*, January 11, 1938, 4; "Deported Indians Starve in Mexico," *Western Worker*, July 24, 1934, 1, 5; "Indians Ask Collective Bargaining Rights," *Peoples' Daily World*, July 29, 1937, 2.
 37. "American Indians in the Communist Party, U.S.A.," *Western Worker*, November 12, 1934, 3; John R. Salter, "Civil Rights and Self-Defense: A Memoir," *Against the Current*, July–August 1988, 23–25; Alan Wald, e-mails to author, March 8, 2011.
 38. Cory Pillen, "See America: WPA Posters and the Mapping of a New Deal Democracy," *Journal of American Culture* 31.1 (2008): 49–65; Mindy Morgan, "Constructions and Contestations of the Authoritative Voice: Native American Communities and the Federal Writers' Project," *American Indian Quarterly* 29.1–2 (2005): 56–83.
 39. Siobhan Senior, "Henry Mitchell, Indian Canoe Maker: A Penobscot Modern in the WPA," *European Contributions to American Studies* 54 (2005): 120.
 40. Morgan, "Constructions and Contestations," 76.
 41. Christopher Schedler, "Formulating a Native American Modernism in John Joseph Mathews' *Sundown*," *American Indian Quarterly* 55.1 (1999): 127–49; Gaetano Prampolini, "American Indian Novels of the 1930s: John Joseph Mathew's *Sundown* and D'Arcy McNickle's *Surrounded*," in *Transatlantic Voices: Interpretations of Native North American Literatures*, ed. Elvira Pulitano (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007), 65–88.
 42. Andrew Roy Potter, "Archie Phinney as Archetype," "Climbing into the Ring: Indian Employees in the Office of Indian Affairs, 1934–1946" (MA thesis, Western Washington University, 1992), 45.
 43. David Price, "Archie Phinney, the FBI, and the FOIA," *Journal of Northwest Anthropology* 38.2 (2004): 26.
 44. William Willard, "Remembering Archie Phinney, a Nez Perce Scholar," *Journal of Northwest Anthropology* 38.2 (2004): 1; Price, "Archie Phinney, the FBI, and the FOIA," 28–31.
 45. Price, "Archie Phinney, the FBI, and the FOIA," 34. The FBI's motivations hardly lay in the truth. Rather, as Price articulates, the FBI sought to undermine liberation movements of people of color, and thus branding Phinney as a communist was a highly effective means to do so, whether or not Phinney actually belonged to or sympathized with the CPUSA.
 46. Archie Phinney, "Numipu among the White Settlers," *Wicazo Sa Review* 17.2 (2002): 42.
 47. In a series of letters to Boas, Phinney repeatedly stresses his desire for a BIA staff position in Collier's administration: "I have written Collier stating in a general way some of my ideas about the proposed Indian program, and explaining in what way I could make myself useful. I am very anxious to get into this work—it has been my goal for many years, and now through your help I am at last being considered" (Archie Phinney to Franz Boas, September 6, 1934, Franz Boas Papers, correspondence N-Q, box 70, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia).
 48. Archie Phinney, "Racial Minorities in the Soviet Union," *Pacific Affairs* 8.3 (1935): 321.
 49. *Ibid.*, 322.

50. Warrior, *Tribal Secrets*, 111.
51. Phinney, "Racial Minorities," 325–26, 327.
52. Archie Phinney, "On Minority Languages in the Soviet Union," written on the back of notes for *Nez Perce Texts*, APA, box 2, RG075, 2.
53. *Ibid.*, 5–6.
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*, 13.
56. *Ibid.*, 17.
57. *Ibid.*, 18.
58. Archie Phinney, "Personal History and Experience Record," Office of Indian Affairs, OPF of Archie Phinney, NCPRC, quoted in Potter, "Climbing into the Rings," 49.
59. Dolores E. Janiewski, "'Confusion of Mind': Colonial and Post-Colonial Discourses about Frontier Encounter Author(s)," *Journal of American Studies* 32.1 (1998): 101.
60. Cowger, *National Congress*, 34–36.
61. Phinney, "New Indian Intelligentsia," 1.
62. *Ibid.*, 2.
63. Cowger, *National Congress*, 35–39.
64. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places*, 153, 234.
65. Archie Phinney, "Travels of an American Indian into the Hinterlands of Soviet Russia and Siberia," APA, box 2, RG075, 2.
66. *Ibid.*
67. Phinney, "New Indian Intelligentsia," 2.
68. Archie Phinney to Franz Boas, August 8, 1933, Franz Boas Papers, correspondence N-Q, box 70, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia; Phinney, "Numipu among the White Settlers," 15.
69. Phinney, "Numipu among the White Settlers," 14–15.
70. Warrior makes a similar point about Deloria and his reading of the "progressive" Indian tradition of the turn of the century, suggesting that "these figures failed to recognize that the ideals they sought for U.S. society and Natives were far from realizable and that the Indian situation at the turn of the century was a battle of community values versus individualistic chaos rather than a battle of one set of cohesive, livable values against another" (*Tribal Secrets*, 7).
71. *Ibid.*, 124; Bruyneel's "third space of sovereignty" also articulates this concept.
72. Janiewski seemed to read Phinney's founding of the NCAI as a response to his failure at ratifying the IRA as the Nez Perce BIA superintendent—and had internalized his failure to his own sense of being an "outsider," deracinated from his Indian identity through formal education. I find this view thoroughly inconsistent with Phinney's own statements about his decision to found the NCAI or his commitment to Indian sovereignty ("Confusion of Mind," 100).
73. Dorothy R. Parker, *Singing an Indian Song: A Biography of D'Arcy McNickle* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 30–58.
74. *Ibid.*, 76.
75. *Ibid.*
76. D'Arcy McNickle, *The Surrounded* (1936; rpt. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1978).
77. Richard Wright, *12 Million Black Voices* (New York: Thunder's Mouth, 1995), 35.
78. Schedler, "Formulating a Native American Modernism," 132; Prampolini, "American Indian Novels of the 1930s," 66–68.
79. Barbara Foley, *Radical Representations: Politics and Form in U.S. Proletarian Fiction, 1929–1941* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993), 32–33.
80. McNickle, *Surrounded*, 97, 108.
81. *Ibid.*, 18.
82. *Ibid.*, 49, 47.
83. *Ibid.*, 47.
84. *Ibid.*, 48.
85. *Ibid.*, 73.
86. *Ibid.*, 74.
87. *Ibid.*, 49.
88. *Ibid.*, 1.
89. *Ibid.*, 11.

90. Ibid., 108.
91. Ibid., 103, 192.
92. Ibid., 18, 12, 87.
93. Ibid., 99, 3.
94. Ibid., 117.
95. Christopher Vials, *Realism for the Masses: Aesthetics, Popular Front Pluralism, and U.S. Culture: 1935–47* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2009), xvii.
96. Jeri Zulli, “Perception in D’Arcy McNickle’s *The Surrounded*: A Postcolonial Reading,” in *Telling the Stories: Essays on American Indian Literature and Culture*, ed. E. H. Helson and M. A. Nelson (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 76.
97. McNickle, *Surrounded*, 128.
98. Ibid., 146, 297.
99. Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Chapel Hill: Duke University Press, 1996), 44.
100. Ibid., 297.
101. Denise Ferreira da Silva, *Toward a Global Idea of Race* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 267.