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Disrupted but Not Destroyed: Fictive-Kinship Networks among Black Educators in Post-Katrina New Orleans

Daniella Ann Cook
University of Tulsa

Drawing on Adkins’ (1997) notion of reform as colonization and using ethnographic data from African American teachers in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, this article discusses how black educators’ fictive-kinship (Fordham 1996, Chatters, Taylor, and Jayadoky 1994, Stack 1976) networks have been altered in the changing landscape of reform. I argue that the importance of fictive-kinship relationships among educators and students was ignored in school-reform efforts in post-Katrina New Orleans. Post-Katrina school reforms disrupted, but did not destroy, these fictive-kinship networks. I discuss three themes: (1) fictive-kinship networks created before Katrina cultivated an environment centered on cooperation, collaboration, and solidarity, (2) fictive-kinship networks allowed black educators to advocate on behalf of their students, which included supporting the nonacademic needs of students, and (3) black educators used existing fictive-kinship relationships to build resiliency in their students. Fictive-kinship relationships among educators and students can inform our understanding of resiliency in African American schooling and thus contribute to deeper knowledge of school-reform efforts in New Orleans.

On August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina slammed into the city of New Orleans, not only wiping out a major U.S. city but completely decimating a public school system. The Orleans Parish School Board placed 7,500 school employees on disaster leave without pay on September 15, 2005, and 4,500 teachers lost their jobs, resulting in the single largest displacement of African American educators since desegregation. Pre-Katrina, New Orleans had a strong black teaching force. The United Teachers of New Orleans (UTNO) was the first integrated teachers’ union in the South and the first to win a collective-bargaining agreement in the state without the protection of a state employees’ collective-bargaining law. The creation of UTNO represented the first time that an all-black organization in the
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South had become integrated by accepting whites (Dingerson 2006). At the heart of the rebuilding effort in New Orleans is the public school system; pre-Katrina, 80 percent of the city’s school-age children attended public schools (Dingerson 2006).

Although there are many ways to approach understanding what is happening in New Orleans schools, it is important to include viewpoints from both the community and the schools, which provide insight into the effect of reforms on the classroom, students, and the community. Therein lies the importance of black educators. Research has documented the value of educators as agents of change and as necessary partners in any school reform (Payne 1984, Anyon 2005, Rothstein 2004, Perry 2003, Noblit 1986, Fruchter 2007, Mirón and St. John 2003). Black educators are both powerful and powerless: as educators, they have access to traditional hegemonic constructions of schools; as black folk in America, they have a “perspective advantage” that allows them to see and speak not from a place of disadvantage but with “wide-angle vision” (Ladson Billings 2000: 262). The notion of perspective advantage echoes the DuBoisian notion of double consciousness. DuBois (1903) asserts that as a result of being black in America, one has been “gifted with second-sight in this American world” (7), which leads to a “peculiar sensation...this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others” (7). Therefore, black educators not only are positioned to understand their work and value in schools by community standards but must at the same time contend with the larger society’s beliefs about the inferiority of blacks and, as a consequence, those who work and learn in black schools. This article documents school reform in post-Katrina New Orleans through the eyes of black educators as one way to speak to the larger narratives of urban school reform in which they are often rendered invisible.

Given the possibilities of improving the academic achievement of black students by using black teachers’ pedagogical strategies (Walker 2001; Jeffries 1997; Foster 1993, 1997; Dixson and Dingus 2008), the purpose of this study is to shed light on a neglected aspect of school reform by recounting the experiences of African American educators with urban school reform in post-Katrina New Orleans. Black educators are part of the community and the schooling structure. Thus, they are intimately affected by what happens in both. African American educators are an important starting point for seeing and understanding the complexities and nuances of schooling in New Orleans after Katrina.

This article discusses ethnographic data from a larger study on the narrative experience of black educators in post-Katrina New Orleans. The notion of fictive kinship materialized as a prominent factor in the stories and experiences shared by educators in the study. One main purpose of the larger project was to share the stories and perspectives of black educators in regards to how they understand the sweeping school reforms in post-Katrina New Orleans. Two research questions guided the larger project: (1) What stories do these educators tell about schooling in pre- and post-Katrina New Orleans? (2) What are the implications of these educators’ perspectives for urban education reform? In the end, four stories
emerged from the data in response to the first research question: (a) losing kin and the disruption of fictive-kinship networks after Katrina, (b) the impact of the disruption of these networks on the expanded role of black educators, (c) the ways in which whiteness as property operates in regards to teacher recruitment and retention in post-Katrina public schools, and (d) the contested meaning of reform. For the purposes of this paper, I focus on the first two stories to discuss the effect of post-Katrina school reforms on fictive-kinship networks and the expanded role of black educators.

Specifically, this paper addresses three themes I gleaned from the data: (1) fictive-kinship networks allowed black educators to advocate on behalf of their students, which included supporting the nonacademic needs of students, (2) fictive-kinship networks created and cultivated an environment centered on cooperation, collaboration, and solidarity, and (3) the importance of these fictive-kinship relationships among educators and students was ignored in school-reform efforts in New Orleans. After briefly describing the New Orleans educational context, both before and after Hurricane Katrina, I discuss the methodology employed for this study. Then, I move to a review of relevant concepts and literature that informed the analysis of the data. Next, I explore the themes gleaned from the data and conclude with a discussion of implications for urban education reform.

**The Big Easy: Relevant Background on New Orleans Public Schools**

Located in the Mississippi River Delta on the east and west banks of the Mississippi River and south of Lake Pontchartrain, New Orleans has a rich cultural tradition emerging from the various art forms (music, visual, performance) woven throughout the fabric of its communities. Public education in New Orleans has been shaped by the racial, cultural, and economic complexity of the community. Understanding post-Katrina New Orleans requires understanding the historical context of the city. One defining and unique aspect is that it is a largely Catholic city in a Protestant state and country. The non-Americanness of this American city is also evident in its vestiges of ecclesiastical governance, such as the term “parish,” rather than “county,” as in the rest of the United States, being used as a geographical and jurisdictional marker (Rasheed 2006, Devore and Logsdon 1991). There are sixty-six parishes in the state, each with an elected school board (Rasheed 2006). To the east and west of Orleans Parish is Jefferson Parish, to the southwest is St. Bernard Parish (not to be confused with St. Bernard Projects, in Mid-City), and to the north, St. Tammany Parish. Orleans Parish and New Orleans are coterminous.¹

Similar to the rest of the nation, however, New Orleans has a history of racial division. According to the 2000 Census, the population of New Orleans was 66.6 percent black and 26.6 percent white (which, coincidently, is the opposite of the racial composition of the state of Louisiana, which was 62.6 percent white and 32.3 percent black). In this paper, New Orleans Public Schools (NOPS) and Orleans Parish Public Schools are used interchangeably.

---

¹ In this paper, New Orleans Public Schools (NOPS) and Orleans Parish Public Schools are used interchangeably.
percent black). Canal Street serves as the dividing point between the northern and southern sections of various streets (e.g., South Broad becomes North Broad upon crossing Canal Street into downtown). “Downtown” means downriver from Canal Street, while “Uptown” means upriver from Canal Street. Downtown neighborhoods include the Vieux Carré or French Quarter, Treme, the Seventh Ward, Faubourg-Marigny, Bywater (the Upper Ninth Ward), and the Lower Ninth Ward. Uptown neighborhoods include the Warehouse District, the Lower Garden District, the Garden District, the Irish Channel, the University District (Audubon), Carrollton, Gert Town (Mid-City), Fontainebleau, and Seventh Ward. Historically, Uptown neighborhoods were home to the white, wealthy, and powerful. Downtown was home to American and Creole blacks, with Creoles settling in the Seventh Ward. Although the bonds of race, activism, and music blurred the divide between Creole blacks and American blacks, geographical and cultural distinctions remained (Landphair 1999).

Complicated race relations in antebellum New Orleans make it difficult to draw generalizations about the history of race in the city. This complex racial history emanates from many factors, including (1) the heterogeneity of the black population, especially the role of free black Creoles (gens de couleur) (Landphair 1999), (2) the absence of racial segregation, with whites and free blacks living alongside each other, and (3) the integration of the Catholic Church (Blassingame 1973). Similar to the rest of the United States, social classes were racialized by complexion. For example, in 1860, 77 percent of free blacks were mulattos, and 74 percent of slaves were black (ibid.). The racial intimacy in New Orleans was due in large part to Louisiana being one of the few Southern states that permitted interracial marriages and outlawed segregation in schools and places of public accommodation after the Civil War (ibid.). The indifference to the established race rules led to a social milieu in which “free Negroes and whites drank, danced, gambled, and caroused together in many bars and restaurants in the city in spite of regulations against such activities, and houses of prostitution often had an integrated clientele and an integrated staff” (ibid.: 17). It was in this context that New Orleans public schools developed.

Three unique features have shaped the growth of public schools in New Orleans. Their late establishment (compared to other cities), in 1841, reflected the reliance of early French and Spanish colonists on the Catholic Church to educate their children. The presence of a large, private Catholic school system was another unique feature of education. Finally, the growth of the public school system was underwritten with a private endowment by John McDonogh. McDonogh, a wealthy businessman and philanthropist, left more than one million dollars to public schools in his will, which led to the building of thirty-six schools (thus the large number of schools named McDonogh, e.g., John McDonogh, McDonogh 35, McDonogh 42). Finally, unlike other major U.S. cities, immigration did not play a role in shaping schools until after the 1870s (Devore and Logsdon 1991).

Pre-Katrina, the New Orleans Public Schools (NOPS) had been plagued with problems similar to those of many urban districts, with a large percentage of economically poor students (75 percent of students were receiving free or
reduced-price lunch). The system consisted of 117 public schools, of which 102 were underperforming. Before the hurricane, school buildings were in disrepair, teacher salaries were low, and state school spending had declined. The governance structure mirrored those of most school systems: there was a central office directed by a superintendent accountable to an elected school board.

After Katrina, rather than a single, centralized governance system, a decentralized-system approach was adopted to govern public schools in Orleans Parish. The passage of Legislative Act 35 by the state legislature, on November 30, 2005, made Recovery School District (RSD) the operating entity for the 107 New Orleans public schools that performed at or below the state average in 2004–2005. Although the RSD had been established prior to Katrina to operate failing schools, only one charter school, P.A. Capdau, was under the RSD during 2004–2005, before the storm. The system of schools is composed of three entities: the RSD, NOPS, and charter schools. Only twenty schools were open six months after Katrina, and only fifty-three were open a year after the storm. Of the fifty-three schools open during the 2006–2007 school year, the first full school year after Hurricane Katrina, twenty-one different entities (each charter school functions autonomously) operated schools, with ten using selective admission policies (Dingerson 2006). Nationally, the federal government unilaterally supported a decentralized charter-school system, marked by the September 30, 2005, announcement by Secretary Margaret Spellings of a $20.9 million grant to Louisiana for charter schools, with no funds specifically allocated to traditional public schools. Navigating the system of schools was overwhelming for both black educators and the larger community of students and parents. During the 2006–2007 school year, the focus of this study, there were ten different start dates for schools, ranging from mid-July to early September. There was a lack of clarity regarding where and how to register your child for school, apply for employment, and address concerns about services (e.g., special education, transportation, etc.). This was complicated by the RSD initially being understaffed with only ten employees and located in Baton Rouge, more than an hour away from New Orleans. It was to this environment of decentralized governance that black educators returned.

This study did not seek to generalize any findings to all African American educators in urban districts or in New Orleans. Rather, I sought to capture a snapshot of the perspectives of African American educators who were part of the single largest displacement of black educators since desegregation. Pre-Katrina, Louisiana schools had a population of 724,000 students in sixty-eight districts.

2 Act 35 changed the definition of a failing public school by raising the bar for what was considered failing, expanding state authority to take over entire districts rather than just single schools and redefining what constituted a failing district. First, a failing School Performance Score (SPS) was defined as “below the state average,” which substantially raised the passing score. In the 2004–2005 school year, the state average SPS was 87.4. Second, Act 35 expanded the state’s takeover authority to entire school districts, rather than individual schools. Act 35 defined a failing school district as one that had more than thirty failing schools or one where at least 50 percent of students attended failing schools (Dingerson 2006; Boston Consulting Group 2007).
comprising sixty-six parishes. Although the overall state population is 64 percent white and 33 percent black, the state public-school student population was evenly split between white (48 percent) and black (48 percent). In contrast, of the 65,349 students enrolled in New Orleans public schools pre-Katrina, 93 percent were African American, 3.5 percent white, 2 percent Asian, 1 percent Hispanic, and less than ½ percent American Indian (Louisiana Department of Education), with 80 percent of the city’s school-age children attending public schools (Dingerson 2006). Although the population of the schools, like the city, decreased substantially after Katrina, the student population of 9,150 remained overwhelmingly black (76 percent), with whites comprising 15 percent, Asians 6 percent, Hispanics 2.7 percent, and American Indians .12 percent, respectively. Similar to the student population demographics, the black-educator population of the NOPS was distinct from the state of Louisiana. In the 2004–2005 school year (the year prior to Hurricane Katrina), black educators comprised approximately 34 percent of administrators and 25 percent of teachers in Louisiana (approximately 66 percent of administrators and 74 percent of teachers were white). During the same year in the NOPS, black educators comprised 89 percent of administrators and 73 percent of teachers (11 percent of administrators and 25 percent of teachers were white). The first full school year after Katrina, with the mass dismissal of educators, the black teaching force alone was cut in half, shrinking from 2,759 teachers in the 2004–2005 school year to 801 in the 2006–2007 school year.

**Methodology, Data Collection, and Analysis**

The project from which this paper emerges focused on two questions: (1) What stories do black educators tell about schooling in pre- and post-Katrina New Orleans? (2) What are the implications of these educators’ perspectives for urban education reform? Since qualitative inquiry typically centers on relatively small samples selected purposefully to permit inquiry into and understanding of a phenomenon in depth (Patton 2002), purposeful sampling was used in recruiting and choosing participants for this study. Patton (2002) states that this sampling strategy is useful because it involves actively seeking those participants who provide “information rich cases...from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry” (2002: 230). As the project director for The National Coalition for Quality Education in New Orleans, I was quite familiar with the educational, social, and political terrain of post-Katrina New Orleans, which gave me networks that I could tap when recruiting participants.  

---

3 The National Coalition for Quality Education in New Orleans is an ad hoc group of national and New Orleans scholars and educators who are working together to help insure that post-Katrina schooling in New Orleans provides excellent education for all children, especially children who have historically been least well served—those from low-income communities and communities of color. A primary principle is that communities have the right and responsibility to define and develop their educational institutions.
Seven self-identified African American educators participated in the study, two men and five women whose experience working in the schools ranged from thirteen to thirty years. All but one of the seven were from Louisiana, with five being born and raised in New Orleans. The other was from Mississippi. All of the participants attended public schools, with six graduating from public schools. One participant attended public schools through middle school and graduated from St. Augustine, one of three private, all-black Catholic schools in New Orleans. The participants’ working experience in education represented diverse positions including social workers, administrators, and K–12 teachers in the arts, science, math, and English. Although they all attended college in Louisiana, all but one of the participants graduated from a historically black college or university.

All participants met the selection criteria of having worked in NOPS prior to Katrina and during the first full school year, 2006–2007, after Katrina. Before and after each interview, I recorded field notes to capture my thoughts, perceptions, and further areas to consider. Prior to the initial interview, I answered any questions about the study, obtained consent, and gave participants the types of questions that I would ask. I interviewed three participants twice and the other four only once, for a total of ten interviews lasting between sixty and ninety minutes. The participant chose the site of the interview, with my only request being that the space was semiprivate and suitable for recording. Interviews were conducted in homes, coffee shops, classrooms, auditoriums, and school offices. Four of the seven participants were interviewed during their planning periods at their school. Interviews were transcribed, and, except for one telephone interview, I conducted all of them in person in New Orleans. Since I was unable to arrange a time with one participant during the dates I was in New Orleans, we agreed to conduct a telephone interview. If I needed additional clarification or had follow-up questions, I called participants.

After I received the transcriptions, I coded for themes emerging from interviews regarding participants’ pre- and post-Katrina schooling experiences. After coding all the data “pre-,” “post-,” or “both” in regards to experiences in NOPS, I mined the data for what questions were answered or addressed within. Three major themes emerged: loss/anger, isolation, and the importance of education. I went back and overlaid these themes over temporal codes (pre-/post-/both Katrina) to develop the thematic story emerging from these participants. For example, participants spoke of the loss of personal and professional networks as a result of Hurricane Katrina while simultaneously referencing how the existence of these networks helped them cope in the schools in the aftermath of the storm. In this sense, fictive-kinship networks existed both before (pre-) and after (post-) Katrina. Participants spoke of being and feeling disconnected from decisions made regarding the reconstruction of public schools after (post-) Katrina. Often the stages of these stories began with loss, then turned to anger over the loss and isolation not only

4 “Educator” encompasses teachers, administrators, counselors, and school social workers.
from their professional, school, and larger communities but from those making decisions about schools.

I now turn to exploring two concepts—urban education reform and fictive kinship—that undergird the analysis in this paper.

**Urban Education Reform and Fictive Kinship**

In many ways, the challenges of urban schooling must be understood in the context of the relationship between the school and the larger urban community. This relationship is influenced by the history of each particular city. If urban represents the epitome of all that has gone wrong in American society, schools are often the chosen vehicle to deal with the problems created in urban spaces, with the major issue being that of heterogeneity. Schools provide both academic training and socialization. As Bowles and Gintis (2001) assert, “schools prepare people for adult work rules, by socializing people to function well, and without complaint, in the hierarchical structure of the modern corporation...by structuring social interactions and individual rewards to replicate the environment of the workplace” (p 1). In this sense, schools serve dual, and often contradictory, functions5 (Bowles and Gintis 1976, 2001; Giroux 1981, 1983; Apple 1990).

Although education reform is a highly diverse field encompassing multiple methods and viewpoints in order to improve educational outcomes, “it is nevertheless organized by a general professional perspective about reform, namely that it is necessary, it is possible and practicable, and, unfortunately, it is still largely work-in-progress” (Adkins 1997: 41). Adkins’ (1997) review of education reform discovered three prevalent patterns: an examination of the failure of reform, a focus on implementation of reform efforts, and a critical analysis of previous studies of educational reform. According to Adkins, these patterns inform the guiding assumptions of reform research. The belief that “reform is progressive, rational and purposive” (ibid.: 66) influences the types of questions asked and the solutions sought to educational challenges. Adkins understands education reform as colonialism, in that it creates “the colonial condition [which] is the condition in which the Colonized find themselves...inferior to the Colonizer and dependent upon him to overcome their inferiority. The colonial condition, though, seems insurmountable because the Colonizer controls the terms, and, as such, he is a shifting target” (ibid.: 109–110). So although reform is often used as a neutral term, it has significant political, social, and racial meanings.

Predating Adkins’ (1997) articulation of reform as colonialism, Sizemore (1978) reminds us that the history of reform for African Americans has always been steeped in the colonial condition. She begins her analysis of school desegregation

---

5 Tracking students according to perceived ability (Oakes 2005, Welner 2002) exemplifies this notion of the dual and often contradictory function of schooling. Darity and Jolla’s (2009) articulation of segregated education after the ending of formal segregation to describe how schools systematically provide less rigorous curricula to African American students is also noteworthy.
with an analogy of Kenyan independence to construct a counternarrative about the ways in which white America defined the terms of desegregation.

When a reporter asked one white affluent Kenyan why [the White minority in Kenya did not fear revenge during independence], the Kenyan said, “We gave them the parliament and we kept the banks.” For African Americans in the diaspora, the colonial experience has often been used as an analytical framework for the interpretation of our condition...Just as the white Kenyans retained control of the banking institutions to maintain their power to confine and define, so white Americans retained control of the definition of integration in the struggle for school desegregation. They gave us busing and they took the jobs. (1978: 58)

Urban education reform in the twenty-first century has been influenced by the history of education reform, particularly the legacies of desegregation, which presupposes the belief in reform as inherently good, necessary, and reasonable. Fruchter’s (2007) assertion that the challenges of urban schools can be understood as the failure to fully implement Brown v. Board of Education is captured in this statement by Judge Robert Carter, one of the attorneys who litigated Brown:

...we had neither sought nor received any guidance from professional educators as to what equal education might connote to them in terms of their educational responsibilities. If I had to prepare Brown today, instead of looking principally to the social scientist to demonstrate the adverse consequences of segregation, I would seek to recruit educators to formulate a concrete definition of the meaning of equality in education, and I would base my argument on that definition and seek to persuade the Court that equal education in its constitutional dimensions must, at the very least, conform to the contours of equal education as defined by the educators. (Bell 1983: 290)

Siddle Walker’s (2001) call for a more full account of African American teaching echoes the sentiment of Robert Carter. In essence, there must be a deeper analysis of how black educators understood and continue to understand their role as it relates to the education of black children. Thus, any review of school reform must take into account the ways in which reform, particularly within urban contexts, is socially constructed, with particular attention given to who controls those constructions.

The Historical and Contemporary Roles of African American Educators. Research has begun to examine the role of the black teacher in raising the achievement of African American children. Stewart, Meier, and England (1989) linked the proportion of black teachers to equal education opportunities for black students, illustrating that higher percentages of black teachers in schools lowers the number of black students expelled, suspended, or placed in special education (Ware 2002). Yet research must not only examine the importance of black teachers for “improv[ing] the quality of education provided to Black students” (Ware 2002: 34) but also come to a deeper understanding of how black teachers understand and
thus perform their work. Historically, teaching has been highly respected in African American communities and a major source of employment for educated African Americans (Dilworth 1988, Cole 1986, Sizemore 1978). The high concentration of African Americans in teaching was due in large part to segregated schooling, with nearly half of black professionals in 1950 comprising teachers, compared to less than one-quarter of whites (Cole 1986).

Narrative accounts of African American teachers in the South before desegregation revealed “intimate portrayals of the school [where] the African American teacher is a critical figure in a web of caring adults who placed the needs of African American children at the center of the school’s mission” (Walker 2001: 752). In this sense, education was more than the transmission of formal school knowledge, and the teacher functioned as a community activist on behalf of African American children (Jeffries 1997, Walker 2001). Foster (1991, 1993, 1997) provides some of the earliest examinations of black teachers. Her scholarship has focused on a review of the extant literature on African American teachers as well as an examination of effective black teachers. Successful teachers of African American students are defined as being “proficient in community norms—that is, they are able to communicate with students in a familiar cultural idiom” (Foster 1993: 391). Countering scholarly treatments that tend to portray black teachers negatively, her research illustrates the ways in which effective African American teachers use their situated understanding of community norms to work with students and fellow teachers. The success of these teachers also can be attributed to their understanding of “the current as well as historic, social, economic, and political relationships of the community to the larger society. These teachers are not merely educating the mind—they are educating for character, personal fulfillment, and success in the larger society as well as for competence in the local community” (Foster 1993: 391).

Also useful to this analysis is the work of Jeffries (1997), which explores the ways in which African American teachers’ cultural performances have played out historically in segregated schools and the changes in these performances after desegregation. Three archetypes embodying these cultural-performance traditions emerged from the analysis of key phrases and patterns of African American teachers: the trickster, the matriarch, and the preacher. All teachers used the various performance traditions to enhance the education of their African American students, yet with desegregation the performance of each of these archetypes changed creating “the need for renegotiated archetypes with which to analyze the education practices and performances of teachers today” (Jeffries 1997: 44).

The role of the trickster evolved into the warrior. In both performances, African American teachers focused on building the self-esteem and confidence of their students, which was considered a necessary first step before education could begin. During segregated schooling, the matriarch supported African American students and families in their collective struggle for racial, economic and social equality. The matriarch developed into the caretaker after desegregation, attending to student needs as best he or she could. For African American teachers, building
resilience and a sense of humanity was a key responsibility (Dingus 2006). In this way, they fostered a nurturing school environment that entailed giving students the financial, emotional, and social support needed to facilitate learning. With desegregation it became increasingly more difficult for African American teachers to adopt the multifaceted roles of “admonisher, urger, and meddler” (Jeffries 1997: 93). Walker’s (2001) analysis of the ways in which African American teachers in Georgia between 1940 and 1960 understood and articulated their professional beliefs and activities sheds further light on the pedagogy of black teachers.

According to Walker (2001), five principles describe the beliefs that African American teachers held about their teaching: (1) the importance of teachers having a relationship and familiarity with black communities, (2) commitment to professional excellence regardless of extra hours or work needed, (3) the expansion of the notion of caring to encompass high expectations in and outside the classroom as well as supporting nonacademic needs as necessary, (4) adapting curriculum to make it relevant to African American students, and (5) using community and school supports as needed. This research is key in helping pose the question of what was lost during desegregation, when the “…voices in the conversation about how to teach children” never included “…those who knew the most about how to teach African American children” (2001: 774).

Building Community through Fictive Kinship. Although the role of teachers as agents of reform and change is being acknowledged, there continues to be a conspicuous absence of black educator perspectives in school reform discussions. Payne (1984) asserts that “it is not surprising while race relations is among the most studied of all topics, we have very little in the way of systematic analysis of how Blacks relate to each other...The deemphasis on intraracial relations necessarily means that we lose touch with a vital key to understanding change” (22). Participants in this study not only adapted various cultural performances in their education practice but also articulated a network of fictive kinship as one way that they, as educators, connected with each other, their students, and the larger community. The fictive-kinship networks as described by black educators in this study offer a perspective of urban education reform that speaks to the ways in which educators help build community, not only within schools but in the larger community. This can enhance our understanding of how reform can build on existing strengths in communities to improve educational outcomes for African American children in urban schools.

Emerging from the field of anthropology, fictive kinship refers to people not related by birth with whom a person shares essential reciprocal social and economic relationships (Fordham 1996). Originally explored by Stack (1974) as a way to illustrate the collective adaptations to poverty of women, men, and children within the social-cultural network of the urban black family, a fictive-kinship network was a frame for understanding strategies adopted by the poor to survive. This seminal work shed light on an aspect of fictive-kinship networks, namely, the distinction between natural and social parenthood.
Stack’s (1974) ethnographic study of the poorest section of a black community in a Midwestern city richly described how people established socially recognized kin ties “...to maintain a stable number of people who share reciprocal obligations at appropriate stages in the life cycle” (29). Pushing studies of black families that neglected the adaptive strategies, resourcefulness, and resilience of urban families, this study highlighted the stability of kin networks that “cooperated to produce an adaptive strategy to cope with poverty and racism” (28). In this sense, fictive-kinship networks are sources of informal social and psychological support (Chatters, Taylor, and Jayakody 1994).

Fordham (1996) expanded this definition of fictive kinship in the African American community to include a political and prestige function, asserting that “this porous system enables members of the community to gain prestige, obtain status, survive, and in some instances, thrive in a social context filled with obstacles and impediments to success” (35). The essence of the African Americans’ imagined community of fictive kin is its focus on the survival of the group rather than the individual. Moreover, fictive kinship encouraged an emphasis on the value of cooperation, collaboration, and solidarity. As the archetypes of black educators have evolved, they continue to demonstrate the dynamics of fictive kinship, particularly those values of cooperation, solidarity, and collaboration. Although they occupy a unique space in urban communities and schools, black educators are often ignored as a source of input on school reform. Describing the fictive-kinship relationships among educators and students can inform our understanding of resiliency in African American schooling and thus contribute to a deeper knowledge of school-reform efforts in post-Katrina New Orleans.

**Fictive-Kinship Networks in New Orleans**

Although post-Katrina school reforms disrupted their fictive-kinship networks, black educators were able to draw on them to create supports for themselves, students, and schools. The notion of fictive kinship permeated these educators’ articulation of teaching and schooling before and after Katrina. Three findings were gleaned from the data regarding the fictive-kinship networks of black educators in New Orleans. First, the fictive-kinship networks created before Katrina cultivated an environment centered on cooperation, collaboration, and solidarity. Second, these fictive-kinship networks allowed black educators to advocate on behalf of their students, which included supporting their students’ nonacademic needs. Finally, black educators used existing fictive-kinship relationships to build resiliency in their students. Each theme is explicated in the following sections.

**Black Educators as Kin and Carers.** In New Orleans, fictive kinship in the African American community enabled members of the community to survive and, in many instances, thrive in a social context filled with obstacles and impediments to success. This idea of community survival is exemplified by Ruth Thompson, the youngest teacher, who spent her formative years in South Mississippi. When sharing her story and discussing schools in New Orleans, she stated, “I actually did come here just to teach my people.” Deborah Barber, who began work as a
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In 1979 and eventually became an elementary-school teacher, expressed a similar sentiment. Responding to why she chose to teach in public schools after working in private schools, she stated, “My heart is just in educating African American children. That’s where my heart is.” Later in the interview, Mrs. Barber, commenting on why black teachers stayed after Katrina, revealed that this was “because this could be our sons or our daughters that were failing.” These statements speak to a shared destiny and illustrate how black educators understood their relationships with students. This sentiment, coupled with Walker’s articulation of an expanded notion of caring, explains how the black educators in this study perceived their relationships with students, and overall student well being, in and outside of the classroom. In addition to granting social and psychological support for themselves, the relationships that black educators had with each other provided a foundation for collectively supporting the needs of students.

Educators described an expanded role for themselves as part of a larger community effort to nurture the children in their schools. Lewis Griffin, with more than twelve years of experience, had served as an elementary-school teacher, school social worker, and now administrator in the public schools. He described his colleagues as part of his family, who “know when your children were born, when they graduate from school, and when they take their first driving lessons.” Mr. Griffin and study participant Sarah Steve talked about the trust built among black educators that allowed them to collaborate to meet the needs of their students. In this sense, pre-Katrina black educators’ conceptualization of their expanded role was captured in their use of the possessives “my” and “our” as a defining marker for their relationships with students. This reinforced their role as a communal one, with every adult member of the school being responsible for the children. Steve, a thirty-year NOPS veteran born, raised, and educated in New Orleans, explained the relationships in her school before Katrina as familial:

...we were a very close-knit staff, you know, principal, administrators, custodians, cafeteria workers, students, parents, as well as the alumni. You know, we just all were family. It was like, if the custodians saw you do something or say something, you know, there was some tie or something that would enable that individual to feel close enough to you to say, “Look! You know this is unacceptable behavior to you.” And things would kind of change for that particular incident. Now I might see you or you may do something else and some other individual may encounter you and be able to correct that behavior while you’re present with them.

Educators felt as if the other adults were more than coworkers or colleagues. They were, in a sense, coparents to the children in their schools. As such, an important function of these familial networks was to provide informal social and psychological support to each other and their students.

The fictive-kinship networks of black educators facilitated a more intimate understanding of and connection to resources in the larger community. This understanding was grounded in a strengths-based, rather than deficit, view of
black communities. Mrs. Barber spoke to the strengths of communities in New Orleans:

Well, traditional community [in New Orleans] rallied around those things that were in their community. They supported the schools. They supported whatever went on in their communities, and so not having that support, then we have to depend on all of our funding and everything else that we need from the school district [after Katrina], and that didn’t happen prior to that. We were allowed the freedom to have community people come in and do whatever it took for that school to function as best possible.

Echoing this sentiment, Hattie Johnson, a music teacher of thirty-three years, saw the community as providing connection and ownership. She emphasized the importance of community schools, noting, “There was continuity, and children felt a sense of ownership because they were going to school pretty much in their own neighborhoods.” Before Katrina, fictive-kinship relationships with the community allowed black educators to advocate on behalf of their students, which included supporting both the academic and nonacademic needs of students. Mr. Griffin spoke of the connection among school, home, and the larger community.

DC: Can you describe for me what you saw the role of the community or neighborhoods were in the schools, because you mentioned earlier that that was something that changed.

LG: Sure. Pre-Katrina, we had what we would call parent advocates. They would be in the school; they would be responsible for recruiting parents to be involved in their children’s education. The community folk knew that this was their community school, and as a result they lent their resources and their talent to that school, where now you have children who may be at a community center in their community but in a school that is almost ten miles away from their home. So those kids couldn’t benefit from those community resources at that school. That school now is linking their resources through another channel.

DC: What types of community resources?

LG: Well, you have mental-health services, we had afterschool programs, we had mentoring-type issues, where we had people coming out mentoring to younger kids, reading programs. We had a program where grandparents were involved in the children’s education. So we had those types of programs in communities that were cemented there. But as a result of Hurricane Katrina and the turn of the administration, those types of social programs don’t exist now. It’s more of a “pull yourself up by your own bootstrap, find the resources where you can find them at.”

The fictive-kin networks that supported community programs were disrupted as a result of school reforms enacted after Hurricane Katrina. As described previously, the decentralized approach to school governance discontinued community schools. As a result, access to schools became more challenging for parents and the larger community. Study participants spoke angrily of this loss. Mrs. Barber, responding to a question about what was lost after Katrina, stated,
And I think [of] the loss of community involvement, because community involvement can actually make a difference within the school, how it functions. The aspects and the needs of the students, the community, you know, that community tie. I think that’s a tremendous loss. We don’t have that anymore, simply because communities are no longer the traditional New Orleans communities that we were accustomed to.

All participants, to varying degrees, spoke of the importance of relationships with each other and the larger community as an integral part of student success. Familiarity not only strengthened the bonds between educators and the community but created an avenue for collectively addressing student needs. The disruption, and in some cases loss, of these relationships after the storm was felt deeply. Mrs. Steve, while speaking of her experience during the 2006–2007 school year, said, [The high school served] the St. Bernard housing development, and as a result of that we were family, you know. We, I with my years of experience, I taught your mother, your father, your uncle, cousin, friend. So when I had a problem with you as a student, and your parent came, “Oh, that was my teacher [too].” With the community, the kids from that St. Bernard, we had that same type of woven relationship where kids could come to us and, you know, share something, and we could get to the agency or someone if we couldn’t help the situation. So we lost kind of that piece of the puzzle last year.

Jeremiah Snyder, a band teacher of twenty-one years, asserted a similar sentiment regarding the loss of the kinship networks.

Well, the biggest loss was actually just the kinship between teachers and students that you develop over the years. You know, these kids, like, they’re our kids, and they’re our family. You know, we care about them more than anything. So the loss was the relationship that we had with the students, and because once that happened, you know, not only people, but everybody was just scattered all over. That’s the biggest loss that I feel. And then by that not being in place, it really hasn’t been the same since, to be honest with you.

Not only were the values of cooperation, community, and solidarity not shared or embraced in the American system of schooling, as reflected in school-reform research that documents how the desegregation process systematically disregarded conceptions of school quality valued by the African American community (St. John and Cadry 2004, Noblit and Dempsey 1996), but these values were not embraced in the restructuring of the New Orleans Public Schools after Katrina. Although the post-Katrina decision to shift from neighborhood schools and a single system to a system of systems district with multiple entities operating schools disrupted the fictive-kinship networks, the educators relied heavily on these networks to deal with the stress of the first full school year after Katrina. Throughout her interview, Ms. Steve reiterated the familial bond she felt toward her colleagues and school staff, which provided support during that first post-Katrina year.
So I think that was a lot of the stress that, you know, we faced last school year, of just trying to teach kids as well as trying to hold everybody together. You know, we lean upon each other a lot, and as I said, we’ve always been a school where, you know, we were family. You know, my kids, my babies, you know, I had my babies here with some of the other teachers who had their kids. We were just family. If you needed something, if you were going through something, we were there for each other. This type of caring within the articulation of relationships in the schools speaks to Walker’s (2001) work, in which she found that African American teachers use an expanded notion of caring facilitated by relationships and familiarity with black communities. In this manner, fictive-kin relationships among educators led to fictive-kin relationships with students and the larger community.

**Resiliency of Fictive-Kin Relationships.** While the RSD was struggling to become fully operational, fictive-kinship networks continued to function after Katrina. In Mrs. Steve’s high school, three days before school was to open, a principal had not been selected and there was no master schedule. She described:

And we came together and we said, “OK, we don’t have a computer system to schedule students, so I’m saying to you all that the only way we’re going to be able to open this school is for us to hand-schedule students.” So we decided we were not going to wait on RSD because we knew the chaos and situation that they were involved in, because they were trying to hire and staff schools. And we just believed that we needed to take charge and do whatever we needed to do.

In addition to supporting the structural aspects of schooling (such as scheduling) and helping others cope with tremendous personal loss, black-educator fictive-kinship networks continued to provide a system of nonacademic support for students. Ms. Thompson, Mrs. Barber, and the other educators in this study expressed having a responsibility to their students that extended beyond traditional notions of the teacher-student relationship. While walking in the hallways of her high school between classes, Ms. Thompson shared with me how teachers pooled their money to purchase clothing and toiletry items for students after Katrina. Mrs. Barber related how “we [teaching staff] were feeding and buying clothes for kids.” In this sense, their students were their children and, as such, part of their familial network, requiring teachers to care for the whole child. This type of caring was evident in how these black educators described their relationships with each other, students, and the broader community, which not only endured Hurricane Katrina but, I would argue, were strengthened by it. Although he was speaking about “the loss of kinship relationships between teachers and students that you develop over the years,” Mr. Snyder recounted:

One of my students was living in Texas in Houston, and he got sick, and he wound up getting on a life-support machine, and the other people that were with him called me, other band members called me and said, “Well, Frank is really sick, you know.” He was on his deathbed, so I drove to
Texas that night, my wife and I. Because I knew just being there, it would give them that support. And then he wound up being really sick, and his family decided to take him off the life-support machine, and he wound up crashing. And he was just, like, nineteen years old.

The kinship that African American educators felt with their students was an important aspect to their expanded notion of caring. At its heart is the belief that providing for their nonacademic needs is a crucial component in the high achievement of African American students. Supporting students began with a deep belief in the students’ ability to not only do well in school but make an impact in their communities.

The Building-Resilience Function of Fictive Kinship. Participants also articulated building resilience and a sense of humanity as a key responsibility of educators (Dingus 2006). They talked about the importance of fostering a nurturing environment in schools that gave students the financial, emotional, and social support needed to facilitate learning. This became even more important when addressing the challenges faced by students after Katrina.

For these educators, an important aspect of building the resilience of their students was having a shared background with them. Mary Brown, a twenty-five-year high-school teacher, believed that since “a lot of us have come from the same environments, we know, so we can relate much better.” The educators often used their own stories to inspire students to see beyond current challenges. Ms. Brown, who grew up in the Lower Ninth Ward, shared what she does when she first meets her students:

MB: I try to establish rapport with them, and I try to let them know where I came from, and the problems and things I had coming up, and things of this nature.

DC: What would you tell them, for example?
MB: I would tell them that it was six of us. With my mother, there were six of us, and although my father was in the home, it wasn’t a good situation, but my father was there, and we didn’t have everything. We had some things, and I came through some of the same things that, you know, they came through, but always I knew I wanted to have more than my mother had. I always did. My mother was my focal point. I always knew I wanted to have more than she had, and that’s what would cause me to strive. Then I came up in the Lower Ninth Ward, and those people down...that wasn’t, let’s say, the best environment, but I didn’t let the environment take me down. So that’s the way I would relate to my kids. I would let them know, “Oh, you’re from the Lower Ninth Ward, and those people down...that wasn’t, let’s say, the best environment, but I didn’t let the environment take me down. So that’s the way I would relate to my kids. I would let them know, “Oh, you’re from the Lower Ninth Ward, then you don’t mind dying.” And that’s still a slogan. When you tell people, “Oh, you’re from the Lower Ninth, you don’t mind dying,” I know I say, “That is what they would say.” But I wanted to have more and do better, and that’s what I feel that I have done. And that’s what I explain to my kids. And I tell them, “You don’t have to remain in your environment. You can get up and
come out of it.” And that’s what I tell them, “You can get up and come out of it. You don’t let the environment take you down.”

The importance of sharing stories of individual struggle to build collective resolve in their students was central to the participants’ pedagogy. This desire to impact the lives of their students and communities guided their pedagogical beliefs. As such, teaching was more than a job; it was a calling to instill the holistic goals of education in the schooling of African American children. Students needed to have a sense of their racial history and legacy as well as an understanding of their responsibilities as community members. Although he was the band teacher, Mr. Snyder emphasized, for example, the importance of having his students participate in community meetings at the Treme Center in support of the Black Indians.

Inspired by their own struggles and schooling experiences during segregation and desegregation, these educators believed it was of the utmost importance for students to have an understanding of history. History could be a vehicle to build solidarity among students. This was especially important in addressing the turf and ward issues among students. The educators in this study believed that the curriculum could be used to help students see and honor notions of community that existed beyond their particular wards. Yet it is important to note that their articulation of solidarity “acknowledge[s] that we are divided and must develop strategies to overcome fears, prejudices, resentments and competitiveness” (hooks 2000, 65). In short, these educators explained the importance of connecting the curriculum to the real conditions and struggles students were facing. Data from this study reveals their appreciation for students’ needs and their responsibility in addressing those before schooling could begin. In this way, their focus was on the development of the whole person. Educators believed it was their job to provide nonacademic support as needed in order to help students develop as whole people. After Katrina, the multifaceted roles and functions of black educators were even more crucial.

**Expanded Role of African American Educators.** The educators in this study did not shy away from giving students additional support that was structurally unavailable in order to cope with the trauma resulting from Hurricane Katrina. They felt compelled to meet the needs of students despite policies that dictated otherwise, such as giving access to medication if needed. In the midst of attempting to deal with their own issues, educators took on various roles after Katrina, including those of advocate, parent, and social worker. This was a daunting task when considering the trauma and loss they had experienced themselves.  

Ms. Thompson shared, “I really haven’t dealt with my Katrina issues.” Nevertheless, black educators in this study felt responsible for the needs of their students. Mr. Snyder asserted:

> Any quality teacher—and I mean quality in a sense where teaching is not just showing up at work from 9 to 5 or 8 to 3, whatever the time may be,
and receiving a check. Teaching—and the reason why I relate to students so well—teaching is life lessons. It doesn’t matter what subject matter you teach. It’s about life. And the reason that I know that and can say that is because I now have been teaching long enough to have former students who have become band directors, and hopefully I was a good influence on them. So it’s a process. It’s really about sharing and caring. And students and kids seem to be very perceptive about that, you know. They know who’s real and sincere. So it does make a difference.

As captured in this quote by Mr. Snyder, teachers accepted full responsibility for students with the goal of “…impart[ing] to African American students the ultimate purpose and use of a good education—social, economic, and emotional equity” (Jeffries 1997: 110). After desegregation, the preacher, the last archetype explored by Jeffries (1997), transformed into the enforcer and as such maintained the philosophical ideals of the preacher while being viewed as the “strong-arms of law at school” (100). Yet for these teachers, discipline was connected to students being loved and both giving and receiving respect.

The pedagogy of these educators was guided by their understanding of what their students needed to know as African Americans in America. The educators believed that it was necessary, as Mrs. Barber shared, to “go beyond the curriculum to teach the curriculum.” Memoirs and autobiographies were used to give students a sense of history and their place in it, thus writing themselves into history via biography. The educators often focused on the significance of history, story, and biography in reaching students and teaching them about their racial legacy. Mrs. Barber used the biographies of King, Wheatley, and Hughes to give students examples of black people who, just like them, had struggles that were overcome. History was important in teaching students to not have “ills about your own race.” Stated another way, these educators wanted the students to value their blackness. Thus, the educators created conditions in their classrooms and schools that simultaneously countered negative narratives about black people and reinforced the broader value of shared struggle while reinforcing a community narrative of overcoming obstacles.

Foster’s (1991, 1993, 1997) examination of excellent black teachers found that the task of educating African American students was focused not only on the academic but also on the understanding of larger societal relationships. Black educators spoke of the kids’ anger as having roots in pre- and post-Katrina structural conditions, and they felt that it was their responsibility to help them cope. Ms. Brown expressed an important belief of these educators, stating, “The kids have to feel that they are loved. And I’m not talking about just loved by parents. I’m talking about by society. Their teachers, other people on the outside, someone they could go and could talk to.” These educators used their situated knowledge and proficiency in community norms to communicate that love to students.

Participants also believed that being able to identify with students was of great value. Their experiences as African Americans uniquely positioned them
to understand the challenges faced by their students. According to these black educators, the lack of understanding on the part of the new, predominantly white teaching force led to conflicts in the classroom. Although these conflicts were not unique to urban schooling (see Delpit 1995), in post-Katrina New Orleans, they took on new magnitude in light of the trauma experienced by the students. All of the participants commented on the effects of losing black veteran teachers and replacing them with mostly novice white teachers. Deborah conveyed,

Nobody can reach our kids like us [black teachers]. I think it has to be us because we can see through their eyes. We know their struggles, and we’re not blind to them. And this year alone, a lot of new teachers have come in from all over the United States into the school, and they really cannot reach and deal with our kids. And they’re probably fantastic teachers, but it takes people who have been there, have seen it and worked through it to help our kids work through it.

In this sense, black educators in this study felt that having the ability to teach would not be enough for teachers who desire to effectively reach students in New Orleans.

**Conclusion**

Before Katrina, educators in this study felt as if their coworkers were not just educators, they were family. St. John and Cadry (1996) highlight the enhanced qualities of care and community that were strongly emphasized in schools controlled by African Americans. Within the African American tradition, the strong culture of care can be used as a foundation on which to restructure urban schools (ibid.). Furthermore, participants articulated that the importance of these fictive-kinship relationships among educators and students was ignored in school-reform efforts in New Orleans.

In the New Orleans context, reform was not a neutral term; it had and has significant political, social, and racial meanings. Sizemore (1978), reflecting on desegregation, was deeply troubled that “the child is no longer the center of the controversy, desegregation is. The means have become the end” (62–63). In the aftermath of Katrina, reform is the center, with researchers and reformers alike having again ignored the knowledge of black children held by black educators. Research and, arguably, public opinion often see teachers as part of the problem rather than part of the solution in school-reform efforts. Thus, the voices, knowledge, and experiences of black educators are not explicitly included in urban school-reform practice and research. In this study, I seek to offer an alternative to the dominant narrative of school reform by focusing on the experiences of black educators in post-Katrina New Orleans. However, if the voices of the marginalized matter, then research must take into account the voices and experiential knowledge of black educators. It is important to legitimize those people who are often ignored in the school-reform literature and research.

The educators in this study articulate an understanding of professional
excellence that attends to the needs of the whole child. These educators fostered a nurturing environment that gave students the financial, emotional, and social support they needed. This study reinforces the importance of relationships for improving urban schools. Rethinking school reform requires a wider conceptualization that identifies and works from the strengths of a school system, not just its weaknesses. Of course, this requires viewing urban schools and the communities they serve as more than the compilation of their problems and challenges. The focus on fixing urban schools often results in reifying schools, their students, and their teachers as the problem. If school reforms continue to take the position that black educators are the problem, we will miss the opportunity to learn from and build on the knowledge and experience of these educators, which can lead to sustainable change. Seventy-four percent of schools demonstrated growth the year before Katrina. With the national call for more diverse teachers, and given the large percentage of black educators in New Orleans before Katrina, reformers had a unique opportunity to build on the work of black educators, particularly the way in which fictive-kin relationships were used to support the academic and nonacademic needs of students.

The importance of fictive-kinship relationships was ignored in school-reform efforts in New Orleans. In his exploration of the persistence of failure despite the reforms in urban education, Payne (2008) asserts the importance of relational trust as a crucial factor associated with improving schools. As a multidimensional notion that encompasses how to think about social relationships among teachers, students, administrators, parents, and the larger community, it is a kindred notion of fictive kinship that operates from a strengths-based rather than deficit model approach to the larger communities served by schools. Fictive-kinship networks among black educators, students, and communities in New Orleans represent this integral element of improving schools and should be considered an asset. How can school reforms build on the existing relationships educators have with schools and the larger community that contribute to better learning outcomes for students if the relationships are unacknowledged or not valued?

This article represents my attempt to produce research that meaningfully takes into account the strategic role of black educators in the very real and complex racial realities of twenty-first-century public schooling. This daunting task cannot be left only to those who study twentieth-century desegregation-era schooling. Given the possibilities of improving the academic achievement of black students by using black teachers’ pedagogical strategies (Walker 2001; Jeffries 1997; Foster 1993, 1997), this study begins to address the gap in knowledge specifically by recounting the unique experiences of African American educators during urban school-reform efforts in New Orleans. Future research questions could address the following: How can the notions of fictive kinship inform measures of teacher quality and quality teaching in post-Katrina New Orleans? How do black educators account for the vast improvements that occurred the year before Hurricane Katrina? This work offers just a small glimpse into what post-Katrina school reforms not only added but almost swept away.
Acknowledgements

A shorter version of this paper was presented at the American Educational Research Association annual conference in spring 2008, New York, NY. Original material was collected during numerous research trips to New Orleans between August 2007 and December 2008. Special thanks to Tanisha Buford and Tiffany Green, who provided insightful comments on an early draft. I would also like to express my appreciation to the editor and anonymous reviewer for their constructive feedback.

References Cited


DeVore, D.E., and J. Logsdon.  

Dilworth, M. E.  

Dingerson, L.  

Dingus, J. E.  

Dixson, A. D., and J. E. Dingus.  

Du Bois, W. E. B.  

Engvall, R. P.  

Fordham, S.  

Fossey, R.  

Foster, M.  


Fruchter, N.  
Giroux, H.
1983 Theory and Resistance in Education. South Hadley: Bergin & Garvey.

Jeffries, R.B.

Kessler, Ronald C., Sandro Galea, Russell T. Jones, and Holly A. Parker

Ladson-Billings, G.

Landphair, J.L.

Miron, L.F.

Mirón, L. F., & E.P. St. John
2003 Reinterpreting urban school reform: Have urban schools failed, or has the reform movement failed urban schools? Albany: State University of New York Press.

Noblit, G.W.

Noblit, G.W., and V.O. Dempsey.

Noguera, P.

Oakes, J.

Patton, M.Q.

Payne, C.M.
Perry, T.

Rasheed, A.

Rothstein, R.

Sizemore, B.A.

Stack, C.B.

St. John, E.P. & J.P. Cadray

Stewart, J., K.J. Meier & R.E. England

Walker, V.S.


Ware, F.

Welner, K.G.
“I Know You!”: Understanding Racial Experience and Racial Practice within the Lumbee Indian Community
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Over the past three centuries, academic and public discussions of race have been divided into two distinct spheres: an understanding of race as “blood” and, alternatively, an understanding of race as that which is defined by visualization of human phenotype. In contemporary anthropological and Native American research, scholars of Native America have been mostly concerned with communities that are defined by blood. These scholars have presumed that notions of blood (or “blood quantum”) ought to structure how we (as scholars) discuss Native American existence. These scholars have, subsequently, ignored the notion that Native American peoples still live in large numbers in the U.S. South and are as enveloped in U.S. Southern racial practice and experience as both white and black peoples. In this article, through a literature review of scholarship on race and the Lumbee Indian community, and an equally important auto-ethnographic discussion of his becoming a member of the Lumbee community, the author explains racial practice and experience in the Lumbee community. He asserts that instead of being conceptualized as a “problem” (to use a term employed by anthropologist Karen Blu), the Lumbee community’s racial practice and experience provides a solution to the divide between the two racial spheres that has made it impossible to comprehend Native Americans as ongoing citizens of the U.S. South.

As a member of the Lumbee Indian community, I am aware of the multi-faceted, multi-layered nature of Lumbee Indian identity. One of the most interesting things to hear is a Lumbee person try to describe why they know (beyond any doubt) that another person, with whom they are not already familiar, is Lumbee. As many people in our community say, “I don’t know how to describe it; you just know somebody is Lum (a term that is shorthand for Lumbee)...you just know it.” When pushed to give details about why we are sure of our designation of another person as Lumbee, many of us cannot explain our actions in identifying another person as being Indian. But even without meeting a stranger, and before we know anything about them, we process a strange individual through the storehouses of our
knowledge of the Lumbee community – of our knowledge of how Lumbee Indians look – and we take action according to perceived bodily features.

Lumbee people are not just Native Americans, they are Southerners as well. With that said, they describe their being Indian not in some sense of being “full blooded” or “half blooded,” but in a more direct sense of being recognized as Indian within the Southern racial milieu. They are physically Indian in addition to being socially and spiritually Indian. This is why the context of the U.S. South is very interesting and important to include in our conversations about Native American racial practice. We must be willing to address what it means for Native Americans to have been as equally caught up in the politics, experience, and practice of race as any other persons (Black, White, etc.) in the U.S. South over the last three centuries. Examining the Lumbee Indian community adequately is impossible if we do not take into account the academic bias toward studying race in the U.S. and U.S. South in Black-White terms and the equally troubling bias in Native American studies toward “blood” or “blood quantum.” The Lumbee community’s presence as a third (or fourth) racial type in the U.S. South, and collective awareness of how we look, demand that writers on race (especially in the U.S.) reconsider the value of race as phenotype that is perceived and given importance within specific social environments. Thus, in the following sections of this article, I will introduce the reader to Lumbee voices in early 20th century anthropological research and in my own experiences. We will take a journey through previous literature of the Lumbee community, through previous literature on race, all the while using my auto-ethnography as a Lumbee Indian to help contextualize my argument. I argue that Lumbee racial practices place Lumbee people in conversation with their world as a continuously experienced and acted upon place, where critiquing what we perceive - even if it is our own bodies - is a product of our long history of being a community of people that have had to battle our invisibility in innumerable ways. My point, ultimately, is not to describe how Lumbee people look in some objective sense. Rather, I explore conversations had by Lumbee people about their physical presences, the activity of which defines the importance of race in the Lumbee community given the legacy that they represent: Native Americans living in a U.S. South that has been the epicenter of the experience and practice of racial identification for the last three or four hundred years.

**Becoming Lumbee, Becoming Comfortable with Race**

I grew up outside of Saint Louis, Missouri from birth to age ten. During that period, people confused me for the child of our Honduran church pastor, as a child of “Mexicans,” and otherwise. My father was stopped by police a couple times in the 1970s and 1980s. They would tell him that they were not aware that “Mexicans” were up that far into Missouri. My sister, during the heart of the First Persian Gulf “war”, in 1990, was told by a customer at a local restaurant to “go back where she came from” (we assumed to the “Middle East”). My sister was supposedly the reason her son was fighting in Kuwait.

When we moved to North Carolina a year later, and I became keenly aware of how
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Lumbee people converse about how they look, I found comfort when I recognized that Lumbee people knew at least a little bit about what I went through growing up in Missouri. It is not uncommon to hear one Lumbee tell another Lumbee, “You better watch it, they will confuse you for a Mexican.” After 9/11, I was warned by a few Lumbee folks that flying out of Boston (where I attended school) would put me at risk of being misidentified as a “terrorist.” At first take, it would sound like Lumbee people recited the same hegemonic, racist talk as people in Missouri. But actually, Lumbee warnings were based in a comfortable understanding of how we perceive ourselves and how we could possibly be perceived by people outside the Lumbee community. This is a powerful juxtaposition, which verifies both anthropologist Karen Blu’s experiences in the 1960s and 1970s and the commentary of Lumbee folks who endured the anthropological inquiries of Carl Seltzer and his team of anthropologists in the 1930s – two distinct anthropological studies that have defined how contemporary scholars look at the Lumbee community. Lumbee people balance an appreciation for how we look as Lumbee people with the notion that we could be identified – or better yet, misidentified – in a world outside the Lumbee community.

When we lived in Missouri, Lumbee people visited us in Missouri. Additionally, since Saint Louis was a minor hub in the Lumbee urban migration in the mid-20th century, there were several Lumbee people who lived in Missouri whom we visited. However, I was never fully integrated into the “Lumbee world” until I moved into the heart of the Lumbee community in North Carolina. Moving to North Carolina was not important just because it was the place where Lumbee people were. It was important because Lumbee people were present in a physical form that could be touched, critiqued, and integrated into a landscape of sorts. When my parents moved us to North Carolina in the early 1990s, being around large numbers of Lumbee people who interacted by identifying with and providing commentary on the body allowed me to see race as experience and practice. For example, my sisters had been living in Robeson County for a few years before my parents and I moved there. I remembered how they interacted with me before they moved to North Carolina; but being in the Lumbee community, among many Lumbee people, on a consistent basis, had changed them. “Look, you have pretty hair,” one sister would say often after we moved. It was not just my sisters who provided remarks about my hair. When sitting down in a classroom in the Lumbee community, attending church, or joining others for a family reunion dinner, Lumbee women (usually older Lumbee women) would frequently stroke the back of my neck and state that I had “good hair.” Why did I have “good hair”? I came to the conclusion that it was good because it is Lumbee – not Black, not White. But Lumbee people were not arguing that my hair was the epitome of Lumbee hair. Rather my hair was one of the possibilities for how Lumbee hair could look and feel. There is Lumbee hair much curlier than mine, much lighter than mine, or a totally different color altogether. Likewise, Lumbee eyes come in all types of colors, and Lumbee skin comes in all types of shades of peach and brown.

I remember the first time I heard the term “eat up”. It is not uncommon to hear
one Lumbee person tell another Lumbee person something to the effect of: “Boy, you are eat up with the Chavis.” (This means that one really looks like people who have the Chavis family name.) Not only did the funny dialect strike me when I first heard it, but it was interesting to see – again, on an everyday basis – how looking at and critiquing how someone looks is central within the Lumbee community to making connections and building understandings of who “we” are. Even though one person may look like a Chavis, another person may disagree and say that he or she looks like an Oxendine or a Jones (which are other examples of Lumbee family names).

These are loving, caring, and protecting practices that play a central role in facilitating relationships among Lumbee people, but which also give us the ability to engage the outside world. They are an important part of defining who is assumed to be part of the Lumbee community. For example, my wife and I have a Colombian friend whom other Lumbee people mistake for a Lumbee when she visits the Lumbee community; that is, until she speaks. Coming from Missouri, and having lived away from Robeson County many years, my speech makes many Lumbee people question my identity at least a little bit. Much like the immediacy of identification that plugged Karen Blu’s Filipino friend as a possible Lumbee (Blu 2001:162), my experience as a person coming into the Lumbee community in Robeson County, North Carolina was subject to the speculation of people who were also Lumbee – not people of other races. Lumbee people identified me and incorporated me into their community, into their kin network; not only through an understanding of who I was but also through an understanding of what I was – how I looked, spoke, acted towards them, and so on. I was appreciated not just as a Lumbee person by surname or family connections, but as a Lumbee body in a historical and social context where being Indian – being Lumbee – competed with the popular images of who occupied the US South: Black and White peoples. At the same time Lumbee people were patrolling the boundaries of their community, they were also inviting new ways of seeing, hearing, and experiencing one another. Therefore, identification and appreciation of the Lumbee body was one thread – but a very important thread – in a cloth of Lumbee identity formation, reformation, and reification.

What I discovered when transplanted into the Lumbee community in North Carolina was what I had been prepared for throughout my childhood. The identity with which I had been born, having learned it through relationships that my parents had maintained when they lived outside of North Carolina, and through the way they interacted with their world in Missouri, depended on a constructive cultural positioning of the body. While most uses of the concept of “home” draw upon common land (Malkki 1992: 27), language, and cultural practices, “home” for me was also centered on the presences (or absence of presences) of certain bodies. In the Lumbee community, the inspection of my body and my whole person was supposed to unite me with those who observe me. I learned that when a Lumbee person has a good understanding of who another Lumbee person is as an entire individual (for example, with regard to history, family, how one looks, etc.), they
easily proclaim “I know you!” And if they don’t know you, but you look like a Lumbee, they ask “Do I know you?” or “Who’s your people?” Importantly however, like the notion of land in the concept of “homeland,” my body became a singular point within a large collectivity of bodies, which tied together with other elements of culture, history, and kinship mark “home.” An alternative to “homeland,” especially in what I am describing, might be “homebodies” or “homepersons.” In my experience coming into the Lumbee community, bodies of Lumbee people, along with other aspects of “Lumbee culture,” became the material through which people experienced each other and, ultimately, home.

Welcome to the Carolinas

Walking into the Alumni building at University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill (the home of UNC’s anthropology department) during my first year of graduate school, I quickly became aware of the special way that my racial identity fits together with my identity as an anthropologist. As part of the presentation of ethnological research of Native Americans, in which members of the department had taken part, the archaeology staff had placed a collage on the wall that described the history and archaeology of Catawba Indian pottery. Nestled among shards of unearthed pots and diagrams of archaeological Catawba excavation sites in South Carolina were pictures of Catawba peoples from the early to middle 20th century. Immediately the faces of these people, captured softly in black-n-white photos, caught my attention. “That looks like my cousin” I said to myself. “Actually, are these pictures of Lumbee people?” I looked down at the captions beneath the photographs. This was a family whose members had the last name “Blue”. I thought again, “There are plenty of Blues in the Lumbee community.” These people, framed in this display of ethnological and archaeological research, were simultaneously being wrapped into my world and it began with a glance.

This moment has been repeated hundreds of times in my life. In the oddest places – or, rather, when I often expected it the least – I have been jarred by appearances of what I perceive to be Lumbee people. In particular, in out of the way places, my gaze has picked up the faces of people and I state to myself or another person who may be with me, “They could be Lumbee.” In this particular case in the basement of UNC’s Anthropology Department, however, the people that I saw as “my people” were situated within a very complex ethnological exhibit. As a reviewer of this exhibit, I was asked to see them as more recent craftspeople of certain pottery-making techniques that I assume date back hundreds of years. But it wasn’t the context of their being “makers of Catawba pottery” that made me aware of or interested in who these people were in the old photographs. Rather, it was their bodies that elicited interest. I recognized them as my people or as individuals who could easily be part of my community – the Lumbee Indian community. However, the context of the exhibit artificially cut off any community making abilities outside of my observation of these pictures. I wanted to get to know them myself. I would have asked them questions about their ancestors and about other ways they were possibly interlinked with the Lumbee community. I wanted
other people in my discipline and throughout UNC to understand that despite the context of anthropological science in which these people were identified, despite my being Lumbee and having no grounds to claim the craft that was identified as “Catawba,” I felt a connection to these people. I looked into their eyes, and it seemed that they looked back at me as well.

The body – our perceptions of the body – has been lost in the post-civil rights discourse on race. I know anthropologists mean well to state outright that race is only an illusion, but oftentimes I think that our discussions of race have served to concurrently blind us (as scholars and everyday people) to the importance of personal interactions with one another and the bodies of one another. When I hear voices of Lumbee people from the past and discussions by Lumbee people today, I hear the conscious intertwining of two systems of thought and two worldviews. It is especially interesting when this happens while one’s body is the subject. I hear Lumbee people say, “You look like a Maynor” or “You look like the Locklears”. Simultaneously, they can and do say that someone has “that Chavis temper” or that someone “favors the Hammonds”. In these statements, if one is the subject, their whole person is taken up and carefully placed in the constellation of Lumbee kin and community. One wants to be able to answer the question: “Who’s your people?” Answering this question not only speaks to your lineage and family, but to your being the continuation of a community that has existed in the shadow of more commonly held beliefs about how people have created and maintained relationships in the US South. Lumbee people have maintained their community through a constant conversation about who, what, where, and how they are. Our ways of thinking about ourselves are not themselves unchanging; what does not change is the fact that we look at, think about, and discuss who we are. It is important that this insistence on discussing and critiquing ourselves not be seen as escapism of some sort, but as indicative of the continual interaction between two worlds that have existed in conversation for many generations: one that circulated around Native American community and the other that is often categorized as the U.S. South, with its racial categories, ways of living as a member of a particular racial group, and so on.

The Separate Spheres of Race: Literature on Race and Native America

The prolific number of ethnographies that deal with race in the United States, while extremely valuable, have yet to identify the value of racial identification or acknowledge the troubling silence about racial visualization, discussion of which is at best residual in many of these ethnographies. Even when ethnographies of race approach racial identification as it exists in everyday experiences, race is very often framed as rooted in the relationship between Black and White identities and as overshadowed by what really matters (e.g., class, economics, education, etc.). These ethnographic descriptions become grand pictures of lived experience that depict race as a straw-man of sorts that impedes our understandings of what is really important in the lives of peoples of particular racial groupings. Thus, if we talk about the legacy of racial experience and practice, it is often coded in terms that
are themselves reminiscent of the narrative of Black and White social relations in US history, and it is depicted as a non-nuclear element within lived experiences.

Thinking specifically about well received ethnographies of race in the United States (e.g. Steven Gregory 1998, Elijah Anderson 1990, John Hartigan 1999, Phillipe Bourgois 2002), racial experience is strongly situated within the economics of subalterity and in a stereotypical urban environment that, to say the least, is fetishistically framed by a reliance on a Black-White binary. This binary is only challenged by substituting the “Black” end of this binary with other ambiguous terms such as “people of color” and the “White” end of this binary by moving “people of color” into the American middle class. In practically all of these ethnographies, race is one component in a stew of American inequality. And oftentimes, because race is socially constructed, it is depicted as an obscurity over our understandings of much more complex issues of social inequality. With that said, little anthropological attention has been given to the racial experiences (much less the racial practices) of non-Black and non-White peoples. Meanwhile, since Boas’ students, little interest has been paid to racial experience in the U.S. South outside of, again, urban areas (e.g., New Orleans with its eclectic mix of identity formations and the stigma of post-Hurricane Katrina).

Despite a plethora of very valuable ethnographies of Native America and “race”, race is mostly conceptualized in these works in terms of “blood” or “blood quantum.” Various contemporary ethnographies of Native America include the politics of race in their analyses of particular Native American communities (e.g., Cattelino 2008, Lambert 2007, Sturm 2002). Race as an issue of blood quantum informs larger arguments about Native American “nation building” or “Indian resurgence,” while the concept of blood is also used to speak about the scope of interactions between Indian people within their private lives in particular Indian communities. One of the shortcomings of a few of these ethnographies of Native America, especially Circe Sturm’s Blood Politics (2002) and Valerie Lambert’s Choctaw Nation (2007), is a lack of connectivity between Indian people in their studied communities and the society from which they came in the U.S. South. If anything, only historians have tackled these connections1, and the history of these communities as “Southern” communities has had little bearing on more contemporary ethnographic issues such as “sovereignty” and tribal-national politics. Again, while these ethnographies of sovereignty and Native American nation building are valuable for explaining the politics of more contemporary Native American “nations,” there is great need for conceptualizations of Native American identity within paradigms that acknowledge how race as visualized element and race as “blood” are equally worthy landscapes of inquiry in Native American studies and the anthropology of Native America.

The horrible situation regarding Lumbee Indian federal recognition, and the equally troubling tension between the Cherokee Nation and the Freedmen, makes one wonder if we will ever be able to see Native Americans in any paradigm outside

---

1 Alternatively, a great example of this connection between “removed” Native American communities and the US South is Claudio Saunt’s Black, White, and Indian (2005), a book that provides an explicit description of Southern loyalties and social patterns that remained present in the Creek Indian community even after removal.
the casino-establishing, nation-building, federal-recognition seeking entities that they have been described to be. The Lumbee tribal government is currently working with legal advocates to obtain “federal recognition” for the Lumbee community. This process of gaining an official stamp of approval from the U.S. Federal Government that Lumbee people are Indian is in no way a new endeavor. In the early 20th century, anthropologists were asked to come to North Carolina to research the legitimacy of Lumbee claims of being Indian (which I will describe in more detail a bit later). However, the presence of these efforts, in my opinion as a member of the community, has never been the “end all be all” of Lumbee identity. We as Lumbee people have in various ways learned to deal with the grand notion of Indianess that we have never squarely fit into. For the last century or so, we have had people approaching us and asking “are you full blooded?” – a question that requires one to at least somewhat understand the early U.S. eugenics mindset from which this question is always asked. Indeed, it is nice to hear Lumbee people critique these sorts of interactions. I have often heard other Lumbee people say, “I bet you they think we don’t know where we come from.” Or, alternatively, I’ve heard my Lumbee friends say, “Yes, we are part of the Lost Colony.” Either way, Lumbee people often assert that if they “mixed” with people non-Indigenous to the United States, that presence of non-Indian blood has been only mildly significant. As a Lumbee acquaintance states with a great smile, “You know we are more Indian than most of those federally recognized folks. Look at us.” Based on conversations I have had with other Lumbee people over my life, I can confidently say that our minds are always at a proverbial crossroads when asked to explain the authenticity of Indian identity: should we assert our “bloodedness” or should we assert what is more commonsense for us - that is, that we look Indian? Bloodedness seems absurd in a way. How is anyone full blooded? What does that mean? But all Indian people have been given an ultimatum of sorts: assert your blood quantum or don’t exist as Indian. It’s a heart breaking and insulting ultimatum.

Furthermore, thinking mostly about Jessica Cattelino’s notion of the interaction between Native American communities and “settler states” that is at the crux of her book titled High Stakes (2008), contemporary ethnography of Native American community has focused on the notion of the interface of Native America and European colonization as being the struggle over sovereignty and the governmental and political activities that follow that struggle. However, it is apparent to me that Native American people, especially in the U.S. South, have also (if not alternatively) inherited a position in the politics of identity that is evidenced in racial practice. What has not been made entirely clear in previous ethnographies of Native Americans and race is that Native Americans maintained currency in race as it has been practiced in the U.S. South. But the evidence of that currency has been slighted by many historical and ethnographical narratives, their often privileging Native American identity as dependent primarily on a relationship between the Native American individual and the Native American tribal nation, the language of which is “blood” or “blood quantum.” Race as “blood” becomes almost perfectly synonymous with the notion of community maintenance and “nation.”
To prove you are Indian - to assert your Indian identity - you don’t state that you look Indian. You state that you have a certain percentage of Indian blood. As a tandem, Native American “nation” and Native American “blood” become an almost insurmountable paradigm in the study of Native Americans, in very pointed ways excluding the terrain of race as visualized phenotype from conversations about the making and maintenance of Native American community. Even where the racial dynamics and racism within Native American “nations” has been critiqued (e.g. Jones 2001), they have been described in such a way that the “national” character of Indian identity has been maintained and often overshadows descriptions of racial experience and practice within Native American communities as these experiences and practices involve visualization of Native American physical features.

In her discussion of the phenomenology of race, philosopher Linda Alcoff suggests our use of “contextualism” as a framework for discussing race. In the “objectivist” form of this framework, scholars of race would objectively define race by invoking grand and totalizing narratives of historical experience, cultural traditions, or processes of colonization. In the “subjectivist” form of this framework, they would describe race by “beginning from lived experiences of racialization [to] reveal how race is constitutive of bodily experience, subjectivity, judgment, and epistemic relationships” (Alcoff 2006: 183). She states that “such subjective descriptions . . . show how one’s designated race is a constitutive element of fundamental, everyday embodied existence, psychic life, and social interaction” (ibid.). Agreeing with how Frantz Fanon (1967) and Michael Omi and Howard Winant (1994) insist that race has to be discussed in both subjective and objective terms, Alcoff observes that “subjectivist approaches have . . . been underdeveloped in the recent theoretical literature, even while there are many first-person memoirs and rich description of racial experience that might be tapped for theoretical analysis” (2006: 184). Alcoff’s reasoning for this lack of “subjectivist” analysis is her identification of a general fear among the scholars that “phenomenological description will naturalize or fetishize racial experiences” (2006: 184). Following the logic of Merleau-Ponty, she explains how these experiences are often described in the visibility of the racial body:

Visual differences are “real” differences, and by that very fact they are especially valuable for the naturalizing ideologies of racism. But there is no perception of the visible that is not already imbued with value. And the body itself is a dynamic material domain, not just because it can be “seen” differently, but because the materiality of the body itself is . . . volatile.

(185)

Alcoff, in a discussion of “racial seeing”, explains the significance of a “volatile”

2 Rhett Jones, for example, describes the Native American nation as a hiding place away from American racism. While this at first appears enlightening, at closer look it reaffirms the notion that Native American racial experiences exist on Native American territory/reservations, implying a strong correlation between Native American identity (and Native American racial experience) and an existence in communities separate from the rest of the United States.
body vis-à-vis human perception:

[P]erception has the added attribute of being, as Merleau-Ponty said, “not presumed true, but defined as access to truth.”...

[From] Foucault we have developed a sensibility to the disciplining potential of visibility...

[The] look of the other is a source of domination. (197-198)

It is important to note, however, the privileged place of the “look of the other” over the look of self or members of one’s community in scholarship on race. It appears that many scholars, even those that have genuine interests in understanding the function of racial practice within particular communities, understand race in “etic” terms. By “etic” I mean that views of race – and specifically of the “pedigree” of the people being studied – were looked at from an outside, “objective,” scientific vantage point. Outside of outstanding examples like Zora Neale Hurston’s *Mules and Men* (1935/1990) and John Jackson’s *Harlem World* (2004), “emic” views of race – where the body was/is identified in a certain way within a community – are not found in anthropological literature. Subsequently, the views of race from the “outside”, “objective” vantage point are often privileged as the only gaze that can “access” the “truth” about someone or some peoples. Despite Hurston’s warning in the introduction to *Mules and Men*3, a continued disparity in emic versus etic perspectives sustains the framework of race as experience vis-à-vis some obvious outside forces instead of as practice within community specific contexts. The presence of racial interaction within a local community setting does not necessarily mean that those who practice race within their local communities are being necessarily affected by hegemonic realities that have invaded their communities. Rather, the practice of race, like the experience of race, can be and oftentimes is grounded in local understandings that inform how one interacts with others racially. It is indeed difficult for someone to see these realities without intimate grounding in local worldviews.

Making sense of racial encounters within the Lumbee community, importantly, requires or not attributing them entirely to a Lumbee individual’s reliance on or internalization of US Southern racial meanings. As Karen Blu points out quite succinctly in her ethnography of the Lumbee community titled *The Lumbee Problem* (2001), the Lumbee Indian community has, over generations, learned to operate within the US South. This does not mean that they have necessarily come to believe or “buy into” U.S. Southern rhetoric and ideals. Much of this rhetoric has been written in terms of racial classifications which have come to be major points of reference in the U.S. South and, consequently, have guaranteed blindness to the large numbers of Native Americans there. As Blu points out often in her text, racial classification often eliminated categories for Lumbee ancestors. She points to a long history of Lumbee ancestors dealing with their invisibility vis-à-vis these

3 “You see we are a polite people and we do not say to our questioner, “Get out of here!” We smile and tell him or her something that satisfies the white person because, knowing so little about us, he doesn’t know what he is missing. The Indian resists curiosity by a stony silence. The Negro offers a feather bed resistance, that is, we let the probe enter, but it never comes out. It gets smothered under a lot of laughter and pleasantries” (1990: 2-3).
racial categories, and her descriptions point to the fact that the tension created by lack of Indian social and racial categories created other tensions, often on the individual level:

Tensions over the classification of the people later recognized as Indians rose rapidly after the North Carolina constitutional revisions in 1835, which cancelled many of the rights of free persons of color. Before 1835, Lumbee ancestors had been able to vote and a few had served in the War of 1812...As a result of a series of restrictive laws termed the “Free Negro Code” by John Hope Franklin (1943), which began in 1826 and continued to be modified into the 1850s, the Indians, who had been classified as “free persons of color” at least since the 1790 census, lost their right to vote, legally bear arms without a license, or serve in the militia...They had lost their right to testify against Whites in court in 1777, when the General Assembly of North Carolina forbade “Negroes, Indians, Mulattoes, and all Persons of Mixed Blood” to be witnesses except against each other. (2001: 45-46)

One can imagine the implications of these mandates. Not only did the “mixed” person not have a right to testify against the “White” person, but the authority of the “mixed” individual could only be turned against people who were like them. This, most definitely, festered in certain ways within Native American communities, turning Indians against themselves in certain instances. According to stories from elders around the Lumbee community who lived in the early 20th century, there was a sense that you were just as suspect of what another Indian would do to you (whether positive or negative in context) as you were suspect about what a White or Black person would do. However, importantly, these mandates may have also served to heighten intra-community awareness of “who we are” as Indian people, providing the social conditioning for preserving what before had been a very normative coming together of Native American communities to survive U.S. colonialism. So not only did Lumbee people suffer U.S. Southern racial policies together, they were partners in building identities and community structure in awareness of (but not in complete subjugation to) U.S. Southern standards of racial classification. This meant practicing racialization within the Indian community to reaffirm community members’ dual identities as Indians and as Southerners.

Anthropologist Robert K. Thomas points out in his early 1970s unpublished manuscript on the Lumbee people that the “cohesion” he witnessed in the Lumbee community was identical to the “cohesion” that has helped aggregate remnant Indian groups into other new or transformed Indian communities. His argument is quite clear:

Now, Indian tribes simply do not disappear because they disappear from the records. A number of things happen to such tribes. Indian tribes are not divisions of some larger unit. Each Indian tribe is a small national group in and of itself and it is very hard to do away with whole national groups. National groups tend to persist if possible. Now, it is true that sometimes American Indian “tribes” (national groups) have disappeared through
being exterminated by military hostilities and disease. Usually, however, these factors have simply cut down the population of an American Indian tribe without exterminating them completely, although in some instances there has been extermination. On rare occasions an Indian tribe will be assimilated by the white or black population that surrounds them. This has been true of a very few Indian groups. Generally, what happens is that tribes merge together to form larger groups if they are small, and in dire circumstances sometimes they will be assimilated by larger Indian groups. The Six Nations are an example of a large confederation of tribes which incorporated quite a few small eastern Indian tribes. The Catawba are another example of such a process. . . . Indian tribes usually prefer a general peoplehood, by merging with other tribes, over against losing their local peoplehood by assimilating into white or black society. (Thomas n.d.: 40)

Thomas’s opinion, however, as witnessed in the research from earlier in the 20th century, was not the norm even in Thomas’s own era. There was (and, often, still is) a very strong consensus that a lack of certain information about a Native American community’s background is detrimental to their claims of being Indian peoples. The “mixing” that had taken place in the U.S. South during US colonization of the Eastern United States made this lack of information synonymous with an alienation from being authentically Indian. At a later point in his text, Thomas provides his opinion on how scholars and the public have treated Lumbee people and Lumbee history:

I must put in a personal reaction here. I am getting very weary of snide remarks about the Lumbee’s “Indianess.” The Comanches, some Pueblos, and some Mission tribes in California are largely Mexican by blood. Some Chippewa communities are primarily French in blood and very French culturally, as well. I don’t hear any snickers directed at these groups. Nor do I hear anyone say that the people in a large section of northern Italy are not “real” Italians because they are largely descendants of invading German tribes. I find American racism boring as well as annoying. (ibid.:52)

Thomas acknowledges that peoples from Europe, Africa, and the indigenous United States did interact and, most probably, “mixed”. However, what Thomas gives us, most importantly, is a larger national and global map upon which to place this “mixing.” Are people, who some say are “mixed,” bound to this status?

Thomas’s argument in his text is a firm no. His argument points to the notion that any notion of “mixing,” if anything, should be deemed socially constructed. Thomas’s acknowledgement that Indian people must first and foremost be seen for how they have “mixed” and “interacted” as Indians speaks to a need to consider how even if Indian people did interact with and “mix” with non-Indian peoples, the principles of their Indian community and kinship networks determined what ultimately became of their family structures, community structures, and the realities of everyday life. Indeed, Thomas leaves room for us to understand that, even in the active movement of internationally derived groups of people and the
hierarchy of race that became important in US colonial context to categorize and control peoples, Native American peoples within Native American communities might have grown accustomed to acknowledging these categories even as they lived within traditionally Native American social patterns. It was not racial categorization that empowered Lumbee ancestors. Categories of race in the South did not acknowledge Indigenous peoples. However, Indian people were privy to the practice of race, which within the community created an ability for Lumbee people to know themselves (in the context of the U.S. South) and tell others who they were.

Circe Sturm, in her groundbreaking ethnography about the Cherokee of Oklahoma titled *Blood Politics* (2002), is interested in how Native American communities may have hybridized racial understandings from the colonial environment around their communities with notions of kinship and community that are still very present and have been passed down through generations of Native American families. Her observation of visual-racial themes in the Cherokee community becomes a major point in her analysis:

> Blood can stand for shared biological, racial, or cultural substance, as both Cherokee national identity and individual social identities are manipulated along a race-culture continuum. Recall, for instance, the full-blood Cherokee medicine man with green eyes, or how Cherokee citizens have elected national leaders with increasingly greater degrees of Cherokee blood as the tribal population has become less blooded since the mid-1970s. This trend toward more blooded political, social, and religious leaders shows how Cherokees have internalized various blood hegemonies and how they have become increasingly concerned with blood, both literally and metaphorically, in everyday life. More importantly, Cherokee blood has come to represent the national whole, symbolizing the biological, racial and cultural substance that Cherokees use to define the sociopolitical boundaries of their community. (142)

Sturm’s take on race in the Cherokee community of Oklahoma makes it at once externally and internally important. Sturm argues that Cherokee people live with race as it exists within their worldviews as Cherokee people:

> The larger point is that Cherokees have neither completely internalized nor resisted the powerful racial ideologies to which they are subject and to which they subject others. Instead, they simultaneously reproduce, reinterpret, and resist dominant race-thinking, as race is mediated through their own local and national categories of meaning. (205)

Sturm’s thinking about these ideas is very important if we are to garner an appreciation of the hybridization of local, regional, and intimate Indian understandings of community with the ideas of racial identification that have defined the national-racial contexts that have surrounded Native American communities. But I would add that Sturm studied people who saw themselves in that “green-eyed” medicine man and fairer skinned tribal leaders. As scholars of race, we should be careful not to make assumptions about what does and does not
belong to a community or to reify certain racial ideals as not being “indigenous” to a particular community. Sturm seems to allude to the fact that, when all was said, “green eyes” were not Indian and were only negotiated to be “Cherokee.” My point is not to make an argument about how Indian people look, but to point out that even in an argument where Sturm treads lightly on issues of hegemony and community negotiation of racial ideas, she misses the fact that Indian people – in the here and now – appreciate certain racial identifiers as part of their community and that these do not necessarily fit the stereotypes (e.g., those shown through the media) of “what an Indian looks like.”

Following sociologist Eva Garrouette’s study titled Real Indian (2003), there is not a space to talk about Native American identity or what a Native American “looks like” outside of cultural wardrobe or a debate over “Indian blood.” According to Garrouette, even in the U.S. South, an individual was ultimately subject to the rules of blood quantum, placing the visual inspection of a person at the periphery of racial understandings:

In the move Raintree Country, Liz Taylor’s character articulates [the “one drop” rule] in crassly explicit terms. The worst thing that can happen to a person, she drawls, is “havin’ a little Negra blood in ya’ – just one little teensy drop and the person’s all Negra.” That the one-drop method of racial classification is fundamentally a matter of biological inheritance (rather than law, culture, or even self-identification) is clear from the 1948 Mississippi court case of a young man named Davis Knight. Knight, accused of violating anti-miscegenation statutes, argued that he was quite unaware that he possessed any black ancestry, which in any case amounted to less than one-sixteenth. The courts convicted him anyway and sentenced him to five years in jail. “Blood” was “blood”, whether anyone, including the accused himself, was aware of it or not. (44 – 46)

Garrouette follows this case with descriptions of a couple other Southern, racial cases, one of which is about a Mrs. Phipps’s who discovers that though she doesn’t look black, she has enough “drops of Black blood” to be designated black. However, it is at this point which Garrouette carefully distinguishes these stories of Southern racial classification based on blood, which leave room for at least modest protest dependent on the way one looks in the South, from the narrative of Indian race and blood:

Mrs. Phippe’s story in and of itself is an interesting study of the way Americans link ideas about racial identity and biology. But it becomes far more intriguing when we contrast the logic underlying the definition identity in operation there with the one that applies to Indian identity...

Far from being held to a one-drop rule, Indians are generally required – both by law and by popular opinion – to establish rather high blood quanta in order for their claims to racial identity to be accepted as meaningful, the individual’s own opinion notwithstanding. Although people must have only the slightest trace of “black blood” to be forced into the category “African American,” modern American Indians must
formally produce strong evidence of often) rather substantial amounts of “Indian blood” to be allowed entry into the corresponding racial category. The regnant biological definitions applied to Indians are simply quite different than those that have applied (and continue to apply) to blacks. Modern Americans, as Native American Studies professor Jack Forbes (Powhatan/Lenape/Saponi) puts the matter, “are always finding ‘blacks’ (even if they look rather un-African), and...are always losing ‘Indians.’” (47-48; emphasis added)

As Garroutte demonstrates, even when we get into the nitty gritty of what blood and blood quantum means regarding identity with any racial group, there remains an inability to address the separate spheres within which many scholars talk when discussing race: one of these is Southern and Black/White, and the other is Indian and reserved somewhere away from the U.S. South. Even though Garroutte is explaining that issues of blood and blood quantum have operated in the South, she maintains a sense that they were always at least balanced by the idea that Southerners visually identified one another. Garroutte takes this one step further and asserts that the “biological definitions applied to Indians are simply quite different than those that have applied...to blacks.” But taking the Lumbee community into account, along with many other Indian communities around the U.S. South including the various Native communities around North Carolina, one cannot believe the assertion that Native Americans exist in different racial rule sets than Blacks and Whites. And, in a society defined in various ways as only Black and White over the past three centuries, one must assume that Native Americans in the South dealt with their place in this visually oriented social order in particular ways that have escaped popular scholarship.

Lumbee people, as I have argued, see one another and are seen by one another – so much so that we are constantly critiquing the “other” in expectation that they may be one of us. Moreover, while “race as blood” remains at the forefront of government policy, academic literature, and popular culture, it does not address the ideologies (to use Sturm’s language) that continue to inform how Native American people live with one another. (For example, whereas the Cherokee Nation and other “removed” Indian tribes are indeed involved in “blood politics,” they also share a long legacy of commitment to U.S. Southern racial practices and ideas.) In a landscape where an “Indian” body is an invisible body – where describing individuals as Indian has not been made an official practice in official governmental policies, for example – how do Indian people interact with our bodies? Describing these practices escapes the notions of “blood” and “blood quantum” that we have been asked to privilege in our studies of Native Americans and race up to this point.

The Lumbee Solution

For previous scholars of the Lumbee community, it has not been easy to explain the interface between racial practice and Native American community. In the “preface” to The Lumbee Problem (2001), Blu describes what makes Lumbee
people intriguing for social scientific inquiry:

A look at the Lumbee as both Southerners and Native Americans shows that some common notions about the (U.S.) South, about Indians, and about what it takes to make a viable society must be altered. If Southern racial ideology appears rigid and unyielding, its workings are far more flexible and complicated than has generally been acknowledged. The evidence of the Lumbee and many other “interstitial” peoples neither Black nor White is compelling on this point. (xii)

Blu’s positioning the Lumbee people as Southerners is quite significant, and it is a point that I wholeheartedly adopt. In fact, Blu’s positioning of Lumbees as Southerners helps frame the entire history of Lumbee community building:

As Southerners, the Lumbee have participated in the great events of Southern history, from the Revolutionary War, when a few Indian men fought beside Whites for independence, to the Civil War and Reconstruction, during which a guerilla band led by a young Indian named Henry Berry Lowry held local Whites at bay for several years. The Indians share with Whites and Blacks the memory of ancestors’ stories about these events, if not the same interpretations of them. But of all aspects of Southern experience, the most pervasive is the system of racial classification and the institutionalized segregation of races based on it. It is within this system that the Lumbee have had to work to establish their identity. The Lumbee struggle for a separate Indian identity has had to be fought in terms of racial ideology and its institutionalization. At the same time, by steadfastly refusing to accept the classification assigned them by Whites, the Indians changed the course of events in Robeson County and paved the way for the legal recognition of other “third race” groups in North Carolina. As they have responded to changing racial and economic conditions in the state, the Lumbee have managed to exert political influence far greater than their numbers alone would suggest. (5)

Blu’s description of the “problem” that Lumbee people occupy (or signify) is based on her research among the Lumbee Indian community in North Carolina during the late 1960s. Along with her former husband, anthropologist Gerald Sider, Blu endeavored to study and complete an anthropological study of the Lumbee Indians. Because of the period in which she was writing, her research was also a mirror to political conversations about race, civil rights, and equality – all topics that were political and theoretical lightning rods during the mid-20th century in the US South. Blu was also fascinated with the then-current debate over where Lumbee people fit into regional and national notions of Native American identity. Her study, following theoretical trends of the time, examined Lumbee people through the lens of “ethnicity”. Blu recognizes prior scholarship on the Lumbee, and pays particular attention to the importance of geographer Brewton Berry’s contribution to Lumbee scholarship. Countering the normalized use of the terms “mulatto” and “mestizo” to describe the Lumbee, Blu states that:

Any term that suggests mixed-bloodedness, such as “mulatto” or “half-
breed” or “mestizo,” a term that Brewton Berry (1963) hoped would be a “neutral” term of reference, is viewed by Indians as unacceptable and insulting. It is one thing for Indians to discuss among themselves their varied ancestry, but they resent any outsider’s doing so. This is partly because, in the South, the terms “mixed-blood” and “mulatto” have usually meant a combination of Black and non-Black ancestry. Because one cannot be a little bit Black any more than a woman can be a little bit pregnant, Robeson county Indians could not be Indians by Southern standards if they were a little Black. Indians have had a long and difficult struggle to be differentiated clearly from Blacks, and they become angry at any implication that they have not succeeded. (2001: 32)

Blu’s notion of “success” in correlation with Lumbees being “differentiated clearly from Blacks” seems a testimony to the era in which she researched. At this critical theoretical juncture, Blu pushes to complicate race in support of her own theorization and the efforts made against racism throughout the United States. Both the notion of “ethnicity” and fights against racism required that the history of race and identity, as based on how an individual’s body is visualized by other individuals, be severely challenged. Thus, in subsequent sections of her text, to support a very intimate disconnection between what Blu describes as Lumbee identity and their being called anything but “Indian,” Blu states that Lumbee people describe the “physical” body as the “least reliable” element used in identifying a Lumbee person (ibid.: 162).

However, Blu’s description of interactions with Lumbee people contradicts this. During a visit from one of her friends from the Northern United States, for example, Blu states that a Lumbee person, overcome with curiosity, asked about the person’s “nationality”. After the friend replied that he was Filipino, the Lumbee person replied: “You could be one of us” (Blu 2001: 162). Blu ignores this event when she later describes the significance of “physical appearance”:

In refusing to define membership in terms of presumed biological ancestry, either in degrees of Indian “blood” or in notions of “racially” determined appearance, the Indians have rejected White criteria and set up their own. Physical appearance is obviously significant to Indians because they know that Whites evaluate them on that basis, but Lumbees today refuse, and insofar as can be determined in the past refused, to characterize themselves as a group according to physical appearance. They do not refer to themselves as having “red” skin . . . and straight dark hair, for example, even though early White observers described some of them in that light. (180; emphasis added)

While Blu understands how notions of “blood” and “blood quantum” did not apply to Lumbee Indians like they did within the tribal-national infrastructure, she simultaneously misses the fact that race as visualized element was very present in the mind of Lumbee people. Blu dismisses the fact that the Lumbee person who encountered her Filipino friend opened up the possibility of accepting him
as Lumbee via the doorway of physical inspection. Additionally, she reifies the importance of how she viewed racial interaction among the Lumbee while not acknowledging that she may have not been able to contextualize or identify how and for what reasons Lumbee people used physical inspection. In an earlier section of her book, when describing Lumbee “cohesiveness,” Blu quotes a young Lumbee man who is trying to explain what happens between Indian people. The man states that, “if an Indian sees another Indian, they’re drawn together like – to a magnet. Indians won’t stay by themselves; it’s in their blood not to” (ibid.: 147). In this context, “Indian” is equivalent to “Lumbee”. This young Lumbee man brings Native American cohesion down to the level of individual encounters. The metaphor of the magnet foregrounds an ability that Lumbee people have of recognizing one another, and it opens up a critique about what identification means within the Lumbee community as opposed to outside the Lumbee community. Thus, Blu’s bypassing the identification of the Filipino as possibly “one of us” becomes a very important omission. The Filipino man is inspected by a Lumbee person and is asked if he shares the same community relationships as the questioner. When this relationship is denied – when the “magnet” did not take hold – the Lumbee person is left to ponder his being wrong about the initial recognition: “You could be one of us.”

Blu, in her text, effectively presents the outline of a Native American community whose members were active in their identity making. They weren’t just defined by the laws, statutes, and other confining social elements that made them act in certain ways. Rather, they needed and were willing to define who they were in a very pro-active sense. Not only were Lumbee ancestors present in the US South, they were willing to define the US South and their places in it. However, what Blu is not quite able to grasp is that in moments when Lumbee people interacted with each other and looked outward from their community, they were being proactive and using race as a tool. They were willing to look out and see who “could be” one of them via their ability to identify another person as Lumbee using understandings of how “Lumbee” people look. If Blu had seen this phenomenal aspect of Lumbee community building and kinship reification, she might have discovered that what the Lumbee community exhibited was a solution for understanding the peculiar ways that Indian community existed even in a Southern landscape which, according to media and historical sources, overwhelmingly pitted Black identities and White identities against one another.

Old School Lumbees Meet Old School Anthropology

Suffice it to say, Lumbee people have been aware of this tension – between how you talk about an Indian (e.g., according to “blood”, certain cultural attire, etc.) and how Lumbee people have identified themselves in terms of how we look at and associate with one another – for many generations. Carl Seltzer, a physical anthropologist from Harvard University, conducted interviews with pre-selected...
groups of Lumbee in the 1930s. Members of the Lumbee community chose who would be interviewed, creating a group that consisted of Lumbee men and women who appeared to represent a broad range of Lumbee families, Lumbee community settlements, and racial features. In these interviews, Seltzer pursued several modes of inquiry: he took “mug shot” style photographs of each person with a front and side view of their head; he documented a wide range of phenotypes that he placed on a complicated chart of possible physical details; and he had each individual answer a series of questions about how they personally determined and justified the blood-quantum status (for example, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, full blood, etc.) that they claimed coming into the examination. Seltzer was working under the auspices of the Indian Reorganization act of 1934, which was written to aid the distribution of US federal government funds to Indian tribes. Seltzer’s goal was to determine who was Indian in the Lumbee community. As a hired gun of sorts, Seltzer’s analysis was directed at saving the Department of Interior from responsibility to these people as Indian people. In pursuing this goal, Seltzer most likely assumed that these people in North Carolina, even when asked directly about what made them Indian, would not be able to articulate what made them live as Indians in North Carolina. And, maybe more importantly, he knew that they could not describe their identities in ways that met U.S. government standards for being “Indian”. However, within these interviews, an array of faces appear and a number of voices speak out in very unpretentious ways about how they, as Indians in the U.S. South, preserved their Indian community borders and Indian identities in the midst of the racial pressures that defined living in the U.S. South.

In his testing, Seltzer asked a standard set of questions about where one lived, who one’s siblings were, and how long one’s parents had lived. Afterward, however, Seltzer (or whoever was performing his questioning) seems to have conducted open-ended conversations with some of those being interviewed. The answers to the questions in these open-ended conversations, as I would expect, interweave the lives of these people into a very complicated fabric of Native American identity. An example of this interweaving comes from the testimony of Hugh Brayboy, a Lumbee man from Maxton, N.C., who was interviewed on June 10, 1936. He claimed to be half-Indian. In answering a series of questions, Brayboy contextualized not just his self but also the community in which he grew up:

Q: Is there anything further that you would like to say about your ancestors?
A: No. My grandmother did say that when the white men came here, they prevailed on the Indians to throw away their language and take up theirs so that they could understand them when they traded. My grandmother said that she heard her father talk the Indian language and often my grandmother would have to go and do the trading because her father wouldn’t know whether the traders were saying fifty or seventy-five cents.

---

4 This study is fairly well known by experts on Native American and issues of blood quantum, the U.S. government, and early 20th century anthropology. In fact, Eva Garroutte mentions it in her book *Real Indians* (2003) on pages 58-59.
Q: Did you ever hear of herb doctors or root doctors?
A: The first doctor I ever heard of coming here was Dr. McBride. We didn’t use to have doctors; the only way we got medicine was to make it. Uncle Aaron Revel was an Indian doctor and was 104 years old when he died. [He] would use herbs and stayed on missions all of the time. I have seen him rubbing folks and I have seen him give medicines that he made himself. He would sing and make motions over the people.

Q: Did you ever hear of any treaties being signed by any Indian?
A: When I was a boy they elected representatives to go to The Indian Territory. Jim Oxendine and Wash Lowry were representatives. They had to go before my grandmother, Clarissa. She was to pass judgment as to whether they were full blood Indians. Jim Oxendine was turned down but Wash Lowry could be traced back to his great grandparents and could find no trace other than Indian blood in his ancestry. Accordingly he was made the tribal delegate and went to Indian territory for the purpose of finding out how to proceed in getting recognition from the Congress of the United States. He stayed there for a few years and seemed not to have learned anything of importance. Money was then sent for him to come home.

Q: Did you ever hear your grandmother say that she ever heard of any clans among your people?
A: I don’t know that I did. They didn’t want you to marry negroes or white folks so that we wouldn’t get mixed up.

Q: What do you know of the treaty signed by Lazy Will Locklear?
A: They told us about how much land he owned. She (grandmother) said the government was to furnish Lazy Will with a water mil and the things that go with it but they never did. (Seltzer 1936, Application 22)

Brayboy speaks in hybridizing terms in response to the questions. When asked about there being any type of “herb” or “root” doctor in his life, Brayboy remembers the first doctor that he knew the questioner would recognize as a doctor. However, he also acknowledges the question that the questioner is asking, indicating the explicit presence of Indian medicine that he witnessed in his lifetime. This hybridity is also present when discussing the role of family and kinship in his worldview. When asked about clans, Brayboy simply states that his grandmother told them that to marry white or black people was not good. However, when discussing treaties being signed in the past, Brayboy recalls the time when his grandmother gave her consent for someone to visit “Indian territory,” which I assume is in Oklahoma. This consent was based on, as Brayboy notes, the fact that Wash Lowry could be “traced back to his great grandparents” and Brayboy’s grandmother “could find no trace other than Indian blood in his ancestry.” In his memory of events, Brayboy simultaneously speaks with the system of symbols of both being Indian and being in the world that was the segregated, hierarchical Southern United States. To interact with Seltzer, Brayboy unabashedly professes his understandings of both worlds – of a friction between his senses within his Indian community and the demands of racial commonsenses that defined the US South – even when it was
his body that was going to be the determining factor as to whether his personal, family, and community narratives were judged as Indian or not.

Additionally, it is important to note that Brayboy’s description of his grandmother gives us insight into the practice of visualizing the entire person within the context of the Lumbee Indian community. It is apparent that within the Lumbee community the inspection and critiquing of the fellow Lumbee was considered to be a normal and necessary process. In fact, the history of the Burnt Swamp Baptist Association, a union of Indian Baptist churches around eastern North Carolina, provides some evidence that Brayboy’s grandmother may have been a leader in mission trips from the Lumbee community to Indian communities outside Robeson County, North Carolina. In a recently published history of the Burnt Swamp Baptist Association, Reverend Mike Cummings states that “a Domestic Mission Board and local missionary involvement led by women brought growth in Christian missions in communities beyond Robeson County. Teachers from Robeson County gained opportunity in other tribal communities outside Robeson County and new relationships formed among several tribes” (Cummings 2008: 14). This organization, which was ratified in the first decade of the 20th century, most probably influenced or was influenced by a relationship between the Lumbee community and communities outside Robeson County. More importantly, for my argument, this stated interest with missions or representation of the Lumbee community in far off lands, which was at least occasionally led by women, affirms Brayboy’s description of a grandmother whose visualization of a Lumbee community member for work “out west” is indicative of visualization that is present within the Lumbee community today.

Other testimonies by members of the Lumbee community do nothing less than turn the U.S. historical narrative of Indian presence in the South on its head. Among these interviews are the testimonies of Braxton Strickland and Britton Maynor. In Strickland’s discussion of his Indian identity, he is asked: “Will you state as concisely as possible your basis for claiming ¾ Indian blood?” Strickland’s answers are concise, though his words, like Brayboy’s before them, tie Lumbee people into a national Native American community, while threading together the substance of what it means to talk about Lumbee ancestry. His answer to the question of blood-quantum is as follows:

My father is John Strickland, living. His father was Harmon Strickland who died about 50 years ago, and his mother Armaretta Locklear Strickland who died in 1921. Harmon Strickland’s father and mother were Sanday Strickland and Peggy Locklear Strickland, whose ancestors are unknown to me. The father and mother of Armaretta Locklear Strickland were William Locklear and Mary Ann Locklear. William Locklear’s father was Isam Locklear and Mary Ann’s father was Allen Lowry and Allen’s father was James Lowry. I am not sure of the degree of Indian blood of my ancestors but my father claims ¾. The father and mother of my mother, Elvie Jones Strickland were Plez Jones who died in 1920 who was known as a full blood Indian and Elizabeth Hodge Jones, a white woman who died
a long time ago. The father of Plez Jones was Esau Jones who claimed to be a full blood and the mother Emily Bass was a mixed blood. It is claimed that Esau Jones and his brother, Alvie, came here from Oklahoma. My father’s brothers were: Pettieway, Max, Aralen, Noah, and Jim Strickland. My mother had two sisters: Mandy Jones Hunt and Julia Jones Hunt; and three nieces the children of Daniel Jones, a deceased brother as follows: Clara J. Oxendine, Lizzie J Chavis, and Melinda J Lowry. I have a brother and sister as follows: Romie Strickland and Buryl Elizabeth Strickland Lowry. (Seltzer 1936, Application 33)

Maynor goes one step further in his analysis of his family’s blood quantum. He offers a description of “being Lumbee” that implies less of a reliance on an understanding of blood quantum and more on a positioning of oneself and one’s ancestors in encounters between powers in the emerging U.S. nation:

To the best of my knowledge my father Jordan Maynor and my mother Martha Jane (Oxendine) Maynor were full blood Indians, and considered themselves[..] I am only making claim to be ¾ or more Indian, since they may have been a lesser degree of which I have no knowledge . . . .

I have been told that my paternal great grandfather, Henry Chavis, was the son of Hugh Chavis and Clarissa Lowry, the grandson of John Chavis. . . and great grandson of Ishmael Chavis. . . . This Ishmael Chavis, my grandfather four times removed is believed to have been a tribal chieftan, who led the fighting in a last stand against white invaders. . . . John Chavis, the son of the above is thought to be the number six on the muster rolls of the war of 1812. . . . The Clarissa Lowry who married Hugh Chavis mentioned above was a daughter of James Lowry, said to be ½ Cherokee and ½ White. . . . His wife was Mary Trumble (Cumbo?) said to be ½ Tuscaraora and ½ White. (Seltzer 1936, Application 4)

At relatively the same time that scholars of race in the US South were limiting the identities of Indian people in North Carolina to their tentativeness within the racial structure of the US South, and during the actual process of having their bodies stripped of all dignity for the sake of finding out the “truth” about regional Indian populations, Brayboy, Strickland and Maynor bypassed the authority of these academic voices and the critique of physical anthropological testing. In fact, as Brayboy keenly notes in the telling of his history, the “judgment” that was “passed” onto Wash Lowery by Brayboy’s grandmother demonstrated the merging of the world of kinship and community that Brayboy and Strickland knew well with the conceptions of the body being an oracle of or access to some type of truth. However, when Brayboy states that his grandmother “passed judgment” on Lowry, I am persuaded that it was not entirely based on what racial features he did or did not have. From the evidence available, Brayboy’s grandmother, as a significant community figure at least in her part of the Lumbee community, was responsible for looking at Lowry’s character, history, personal relationships, and physical appearance as collaborative elements of Lumbee identity.

It is important to also note patterns in how Lumbee ancestors use blood
quantum fractions (i.e. “½”, “¾”, etc.) to describe themselves. Maynor is most decisive with the use of this fraction in his ancestral descriptions, perhaps because this notion of “½ blood” somehow symbolizes how Lumbee people were defining themselves vis-à-vis U.S. society and each other. Essentially, they were half-way between two worlds – not stuck in the proverbial middle, but somehow able to communicate about themselves using their own language of kinship and the tools of race that people outside the Indian community were using. In certain cases, these interviewees took it upon themselves to discuss themselves as having more blood quantum than their parents. This did not mean, as may be easily assumed, that they did not understand fractions. Rather they took the importance of blood quantum fractions as the measurement of Indian authenticity (as exercised by the anthropologists) and appropriated this measurement to describe to what degree an individual was part of the Lumbee community. Thus, an individual whose parents moved into the Lumbee community late in their lives, and who himself or herself was raised in the Lumbee community, may be ¾ Indian while both of his or her parents may be ½ Indian. Anthropologists would have interpreted this as indicative of the lack of proper understanding of the “blood quantum” concept. However, in reading these interviews, it is quite obvious that a child saying that they are ¾ Indian and that they come from two parents who are both ½ Indian illustrates the ways that individuals were situated vis-à-vis the Lumbee community. A child who was born in the Lumbee community of parents who had just recently moved into the Lumbee community would have been a larger degree Indian than his parents because his bond with the Lumbee community was perceived to be greater than those of his parents who did not share such a deep connection with that same community. In this example, the language of racial blood quantum was practiced by this Lumbee person to articulate interconnections within the Lumbee community that, in the end, had nothing to do with the science of racial pedigree that anthropologists were studying. But to define themselves in that moment, Lumbee people adopted the language of their interlocutors, attempting to bridge different understandings of what Indian identity means.

The record of this vivid look into the merging worlds of Lumbee people and U.S. Southern society, however, gets lost in translation. At the conclusion of his research, Seltzer published a report – well known in the contemporary Lumbee community – declaring that only twenty-two Lumbee ancestors passed the test of Indian authenticity. The official stamp of approval from authoritative voices was starting to be officially removed in the shadow of a grand narrative that had already metaphysically and socially erased Indians from a meaningful space within the U.S. South. Despite the very upfront way that Lumbee people had tied their existence to the existence of Indian people both present in the U.S. South and absent in the far-off place called “Indian Territory,” they now became fodder for social analysts who would, ultimately, characterize their Indian identity as a manipulation of the racial rules that were important throughout the US South. Yet, despite this more well known set of results that continue to haunt how a general public views the authenticity of Lumbee identity, returning to the voices of Lumbee folks in the
past reveals that they possessed an understanding of their situation between the politics of race and authenticity in Native America and those Southern racial rules that had been artificially removed (and continue to be removed) from scholars’ descriptions of Native American kinship and community.

Conclusion

What if we acknowledge that the history of the U.S. South is significantly wrong regarding race? In this article I have attempted to step into the gap between the U.S. South and Native America, with my emphasis being that race as identification of human phenotype ought not to be a singularly Southern element that is distinguished from Native American race as “blood” or “blood quantum.” Rather we ought to investigate their interface and how the mutual exclusion of the two notions has hidden us from the presence of Native Americans in the South and, alternatively, “Southern” racial practices in Native America. In anthropological scholarship, Native American experiences and practices have not been conceptualized within the rhetoric of Southern racial politics or the activity that is associated with the maintenance of Jim Crow and slavery before it. It has been conceptualized in such a way that removes Native Americans from the U.S. South of post—“Indian Removal.” Moreover, unlike some scholars such as historian Nell Irvin Painter, I have not been willing to view economics as the blueprint for the infrastructure of race that is present today within Lumbee community contexts. Painter’s notion that race is a “handy surrogate” (2002: 6) for class is, in my opinion, based on her internalization of the same Black-White binary that has haunted anthropologists writing about race. Any ambiguity surrounding the Black-White binary is articulated as a class difference.

Rather, I would argue that “class,” in its Marxist sense, may actually be a surrogate for the conversations that we are not willing to have about race; conversations about race as experience, practice, medium for human experience and social survival. Biological racism has been overturned in the social sciences and we understand that there is no biological difference between “races.” However, in a world that contains great migratory movements (across national, state, local, and institutional borders), racial identification must be appreciated for its function within various parts of society. Anoop Nayak asserts that “post-race” thinking reveals that the body is not a “source” of “race truth” (2006: 423). I agree, but might we have a different conversation if the body is defined as access to truth by members of particular communities (as Alcoff alludes to), especially in a social and political environment where people articulate what they see in a social landscape where the body is just as important as other topographical features? People that I meet continue to not understand how Lumbee people identify one another. They almost always ask, “how can you tell?” or you look “Puerto Rican” or “Mexican.” But as we see often, if anyone has ever lived or worked around Lumbee people for extended periods of time, they often say we Lumbee people have a “distinct look” that they begin to understand and identify. Often times this “distinct look” comes in triplicate with our distinct behavior and our distinct dialect. But, importantly,
people who know Lumbee people recognize Lumbee people. In a Southern U.S. which has functioned within social order governed by the reading of physical, racial distinctions, and in a larger United States that has contained various communities of people who reject the large presence of Native Americans, I think it is easy to ignore the fact that Lumbee folks look at one another and are symbols to one another, as a sort of oracle of truth for each other about the past, the present, and the future. Maybe, just maybe, Lumbee people along with the large numbers of other types of Native Americans around North Carolina and around the South have interjected their vision of the past, the present, and the future by maintaining an orientation around who and what they are, based at least partially on what they look like. Yes, Lumbee Indians might “look like” people from other racial/ethnic groups or like other Native Americans, but their shared history, community, and understanding of how they look circulate into a vortex of Lumbee identity that reinforces those relationships that are summed up with one Lumbee person saying to another about a total stranger: “They look like they are from home.”
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Sturms, Circe

Thomas, Robert K.
This paper reports on siting Central Florida as a part of the South for birth research among midwives, a physician, and their clients. A comparison is made between historical and modern beliefs about what is represented by Southern values and ideals, and how the women and birth practitioners in this study do or do not conform to those ideals.

Introduction

Geographically speaking, you can’t get further south in the continental United States than Florida, but is Florida “Southern?” This point has been argued for many years in the popular and scholarly press. Examples include an article in the St. Petersburg Times (Roberts 2004) and multiple chapters of Reed’s study of the modern South (1982). Even common bastions of public information such as Wikipedia cannot state whether or not Florida is Southern on their map of the “modern South,” only that it is usually included in definitions of the South (Wikipedia 2009). The US Census Bureau includes Florida as a part of the sixteen states encompassing the Southern region (US Census Bureau, accessed 2010). Holloway includes two essays focused on Florida in her edited volume entitled Other Souths: Diversity and Difference in the US South (2008) and Miracle situates his experience at the University of Florida in the 1970’s as one among a cohort of Southern students (1997). The Florida panhandle south to Ocala, often called “the redneck Riviera,” is included in most colloquial definitions of the South, whereas anything from Orlando down is denied “Southernness” due to an influx of people from other states and nations.

Distinct differences in the state’s populace from other Southern states, which has been heavily influenced through both national and international migration patterns, have caused Florida to evolve away from traditional Southern culture in many ways, while some values, such as those associated with pregnancy, childbirth, and motherhood, have remained. Women in Florida are rediscovering the tradition
of midwifery, which was heavily utilized in the South until the mid-1900’s. In her book on midwifery and birth, Susie situates Florida as a part of the South in her book describing the rise and fall of the midwife in historical perspective (1988).

Studying birth in Florida focuses on differences in women’s gender roles and expectations, available options in choice of birth practitioner, and the historical position of Florida in the Old South. The transformation of the birth culture in Florida and its shift away from traditional “Southern” values such as the use of granny midwives (often older non-professionally trained African American women) to the use of biomedical physicians for birth practitioners has followed a trajectory similar to that of almost all other American Southern states. However, unlike other states such as Alabama and Georgia, Florida has re-integrated direct-entry midwifery (as opposed to certified nurse midwifery), allowing pregnant women greater choice of birth practitioners and birthing locations. This paper explores how the birthing culture in Florida is and is not “Southern” using information gathered from historical sources as well as interviews with current birth practitioners and women who have given birth in Florida. The evolution of birth practitioner choice in Florida has allowed women more freedom to control who will attend them throughout their pregnancies and birth, giving women who may experience health inequalities due to their race/ethnicity, income level, or geographic location greater power in easing those disparities.

History

Prior to anthropological interest in the South, historians, authors, and travelers wrote copious amounts on Southern “culture”. Traditional anthropological studies of the South have identified two main subcultures, divided along the ethnic lines of European American and African American, and have sought to understand the cultural variations and social complexities within and between these two groups. There are myriad other subcultures that, when combined with the former, make up what could be considered an ethnic entity of its very own: the Southerner. Carole Hill (1977) argued that studies of the South, especially those of the early 20th century, were concerned with characteristics that defined what was distinctly Southern in nature compared to the broader culture of the United States including racism, agrarianism, dominance of the plantation system, and anti-Semitism.

Hill wrote that the South is distinct because of images created about it by other writers (1977). She also wrote that there is a tendency among writers and researchers to forget that while certain subgroups are classified as “blacks” or “Indians,” they are at the same time “southern” because the South is a complex amalgamation of subcultures that create what it means to be a southerner (1977).

In a more recent article in an edited volume, Hill revisits her description of anthropological studies of and in the South (1998:12-33). There are still lingering categorizations of southern people and culture types, even though the South is changing on multiple levels. Hill believes that the two types of studies, those in and those of the South, are beginning to merge (ibid). In this edited volume by Hill and Beaver, the diversity of the South is addressed by several studies of
other culture groups in the South such as Latinos, Indochinese, and other urban immigrants (1998). Racism is still a factor today, with African American and other non-European American populations suffering economic, educational, and health disparities (Baer and Jones 1992), however this should not be thought of as an indiscriminate descriptor of Southern life today. The concept of the South as a geographic or cultural region decisively divided by color lines is an outdated one on which to solely base the problems of health disparities. Through continuing studies in and of the South, these notions begin to dissipate somewhat; however, the idea of the South as a bastion of racial inequality still lingers in the mind of the general public. Thus it becomes important to problematize the use of “Southern” as a descriptor for Florida as the term itself may cause negative links to be made in the mind of the reader concerning racism and inequality, when in fact, the inclusion of midwives as legally viable options for perinatal care mitigates inequality by providing women with social support and greater freedoms through the use of this type of practitioner. Furthermore, the use of anthropological theory and methods to examine these disparities can lead to improvements in health care access and treatment of ethnic minorities and women from different economic classes.

An example where anthropological history and theory can inform research on the health disparities in the modern South is in the cultural evolution of childbirth and birth practitioner choice. A great deal of literature has been devoted to the historical changes that have taken place in the way birth has been viewed in American culture (Davis-Floyd 1993, Litoff 1978, Mitford 1992, Wertz and Wertz 1989). To understand birth in the South, one must also understand the role of the woman in Southern culture. In the Old South, pre-dating the Civil War, a woman’s roles were that of mother and wife (McMillen 1990). McMillen refers mainly to the middle and upper class European American women of the time, but these roles were also important to the African American communities as well. The occupation of motherhood was highly revered and exalted as the ultimate way to gain status and respect as a woman. Pregnancy was glorified and yet was fraught with risk, so much so that it was hardly spoken of until after the baby had been delivered and both the baby and the mother were declared healthy. Motherhood and birth were linked to identity formation, both socially and regionally (Kennedy 2010). Women continued to be stoic in the face of hardships as the South began to evolve into its modern form, yet they had to deal with racism, sexism, and classism to get their babies delivered.

Motherhood continued to be a pathway to womanhood for women in Florida through the late 20th century. Molly Dougherty (1978) lived in and wrote about a black community in Northern Florida in the mid-Seventies before Hill began to analyze the cultural studies in and of the South. Dougherty focused on the women in the community and showed how they lived their lives being “black women” in the South as a consequence of the social forces acting upon women’s roles in an African American community. She detailed how a girl becomes a woman in this culture taking the reader through young life, dating, pregnancy, childbirth, work, and matriarchy (Dougherty 1978). Dougherty was able to show how women in her
case study were Southern, as well as African American by explaining that, while men held dominant positions in the community, the women were the ones who held strong positions within the household. This gendered division of power is defined by Dougherty as an aspect of Southern culture and as especially important to young African American women, as they gained status and power through becoming mothers.

Southern women have to navigate their world in a complex dance of kinship, economics, and gender role ideology that incorporates traits such as strength and being demure as key elements of acting the part of the Southern woman (Mathews 1989). Even as women tried to maintain control over their bodies, they had to contend with the burgeoning medical establishment that sought to usurp power from the local midwives and wet nurses, bringing pregnancy and birth into the man’s world of the hospital from the woman’s world of the home. The same changes were taking place in other parts of the country as well, however living in poor and rural areas limited people’s contact with professionalized medicine in the South.

In the South, most women relied on midwives to help deliver their babies from the time before colonization until the mid-20th century. Physicians were not utilized until the 1840’s, and even then a physician’s attendance at a birth was a luxury that many Southern women could not afford (Litoff 1978). Many of the area midwives who attended white women were originally immigrants from Europe who may have been trained as birth attendants in their home country (Litoff 1978). Midwives who attended African American women as well as some rural white women, including the mistresses of plantations (Kennedy 2010), were often older African American women in the area who had experience attending multiple births but no formal training (Litoff 1978). These women were known as granny midwives, and their practices existed up until the 1980s throughout much of the South (Reeb 1992, Smith and Holmes 1996). In rural areas of the South, women often could not make the long distance trip to the nearest hospital or clinic in time to give birth, so county health officials throughout the South relied on the midwives to perform deliveries in the interest of time and safety for the families. Accounts from diaries from the 1800s indicate that women showed preference for trusted midwives, regardless of race, over possibly incompetent rural doctors across the South (Kennedy 2010). In Florida in 1850, there were only 135 physicians for a state with a population of 87,445, meaning there was one physician for every 648 people, and not all of these were trained in obstetrics (McMillen 1990).

Racial prejudice and gender bias impinged upon midwifery practices as white physicians attacked the practices of African American and immigrant midwives who were still serving white women (Kennedy 2010). Playing to cultural and racial stereotyping, physicians followed suit of their Northern counterparts, some of which had outlawed midwifery altogether, in portraying midwives in the South as illiterate, ignorant, and dirty (Wertz and Wertz 1989). These physicians saw revenue being removed from their hands by capable midwives; using their power as licensed medical professionals, they were able to campaign to end the reign
of the midwife as the traditional Southern birth attendant (Marland and Rafferty 1997). Physicians united on this issue and overcame differences in ideology or training to put an end to the practice of midwifery so that they could gain control of the new medical specialty of obstetrics (McMillen 1990).

Florida and South Carolina, among others, sought funding from philanthropic organizations and federal public health programs under the guise of creating midwifery education programs (Fraser 1998). The actual intention of these programs was not to educate, but rather to subsume control of the lay midwifery community in favor of biomedical clinics and physicians (Ibid.). The elimination of the granny midwife started with licensure requirements that included formal education, testing, and monitoring (Litoff 1978). This effectively removed about half of the practicing midwives due to economic constraints associated with getting and maintaining a license. By the 1930s, Florida’s lay midwives, or those without a nursing license, were only allowed to practice in areas where there was no medical competition (Susie 1988). Traditional midwives did not have the resources to fight against the hostile attack on their profession (Foley 2005).

These developments show some of the same themes that echoed in the early anthropological studies of the South. Class divisions separate the women who could afford physicians from those who had to rely on the local midwife. Racism tainted the way that granny midwives were viewed by a larger society, whereas formerly the skill of the attendant was more important than skin color or ethnic background. Although many physicians and politicians sought to categorize granny midwives as ignorant and dirty, these women were often an integral part of the community and were highly revered by women they had delivered (Mongeau, Smith, and Maney 1961). Financial and geographical factors limited the abilities of midwives to stay in practice, yet women in isolated communities and poor women often had no other choice but to have their baby with a midwife.

This is an historical example of stratified reproduction, as described by Ginsburg and Rapp (1995), wherein women’s experiences of pregnancy and childbearing are different according to race, class, gender, migration status and existing inequalities in how they are viewed by the larger society. Because the granny midwives of the Old South were attending all pregnant women until physicians were available and obstetrics became a specialty, and the midwives themselves were often poor and either immigrants or African American, physicians, seeing their opportunity, began to challenge the system of birth. Once physician-attended birth became an option to upper class white women who had the financial means to pay for the services, the attack on midwives began. However, there were not enough physicians to treat all women, and many women could not afford their services. During this time, physicians were also spreading the ideology that pregnancy and birth were risky, dangerous, and must be managed by trained medical personnel (Wertz and Wertz 1989).

The myth of the ignorant granny midwife is alive and well today, not just in the South, but in much of America. In some areas, such as Florida, midwives have survived repeated attempts to eliminate their profession due to this prejudice.
Fictional accounts with racist overtones were used to portray granny midwives as ignorant to state legislators, with medical physicians and local bureaucrats writing up stories of how the midwife caused the death of the mother and baby she was attending because she did not know the proper protocol for medical procedures (Susie 1988). Florida began phasing out midwifery in 1931 by requiring granny midwives to be licensed (Susie 1988). There were still a few granny midwives in rural areas around the state in the early 1980s, although at that time Medicaid would not reimburse them for their work. This was a final blow to the system of traditional midwifery. The 1931 law was later thrown out in two separate cases in 1979 and 1981, leading to a new law in 1982 requiring three years of midwifery training and attendance at 50 births total – while nurse midwives only needed two years of training (Susie 1988). The lay midwives who had existing licenses were allowed to continue to practice, but new regulations and paperwork, including a reliance on gaining permission to practice from the very physicians who were trying to force them out, caused many of them to close their practices (Susie 1988, Denmark 2006).

In the early 1990s, the late governor of Florida, Lawton Chiles, focused much of his attention on maternal and child health. Several of his grandchildren had been delivered by midwives at birth centers, and one was an unplanned breech home birth where the baby was delivered by an EMT who was a retired midwife (Denmark 2006). The governor’s daughter had planned to have a hospital birth with a local obstetrician, but when her water broke and the baby’s feet presented at her home on one of the barrier islands near Tampa, her husband called for an ambulance. The back-up Emergency Medical Technician crew included Doreen Virginiac, a retired licensed midwife, who took emergency measures to correct some of what the first EMT crew had done and successfully deliver the baby (Denmark 2006:240-41).

Pro-midwifery legislation in the form of the Midwifery Practice Act was passed in 1992, through the tireless work of the Midwives Association of Florida, with a broad range of ethnicities and political parties lending their support to the bill (Denmark 2006). A professional lobbyist was hired, mailings were sent to the state representatives and senators, position papers were written, fundraisers held, and individual senators were engaged. Direct-entry midwives were no longer required to practice under the auspices of a physician, and through the Florida Healthy Start program, a goal of 50% of well-woman pregnancies were to be handled by midwives by the year 2000 (Midwives Association of Florida, 2007). Florida fell well short of this goal, with only 1.3% of pregnant women receiving their prenatal care at birth centers, but it was a noble goal nonetheless, and Florida is often upheld as one of the states where direct-entry midwifery is working (Florida Department of Health 1996). The new direct-entry midwives are schooled and licensed, but they are not in the same sphere as the granny midwives of the past. Susie explains:

Middle-class midwifery is a movement to take back this right of childbirth. It is replete with feminist ideology, reacting to fifty years of stolen goods.... [The old midwifery] evolved organically from a culture, while the [new midwifery] is a self-conscious acculturation. (1988: 67)
In the states that currently license non-nurse direct-entry midwives, such as Florida, the modern midwives are well educated, completing a training program and licensing of several years, and are well-respected in the communities where they practice. In Florida, to become a licensed midwife, one must graduate from an accredited program, have an emergency management plan, and pass a national accreditation test (Denmark 2006). They are often highly involved with the women of their community, but they are professional, rather than folk healers, now. They have certificates from the state allowing them to practice, many have offices much like that of a physician, and so birth has been taken out of the hospital, yet not entrenched in home life as it once was. These states that allow direct-entry midwifery have given women another option for birth. In contrast, other states, such as Alabama, still do not allow direct entry midwives to practice, even with education and apprenticeship. The Alabama granny midwives were forced out of practice in the early 1980s when the state declared that no new licenses would be issued (Holmes 1986).

Mainstream birth-related beliefs in the United States, and particularly in the South, have changed from home-based delivery with midwives to hospital-based delivery with physicians (Dougherty, 1978). As physicians and technology have become readily available to the lower classes, there has been a rejection of the use of midwives among these women (Fraser 1995). Some women in the upper and middle classes who have historically enjoyed the prerogative of choosing a physician or hospital-supervised birth are now opting to birth with a midwife. Throughout the history of the South, women have had to contend with shifts in power, control, and racist attitudes, when choosing a birth practitioner.

**The Women and their Birth Practitioners**

While researching birth in Florida, I was fortunate enough to interview three midwives and an obstetrician, all of whom provided me with their own views on pregnancy and birth as well as access to their clients. Two of the midwives were in Gainesville, Florida while the other midwife and physician practiced in Orlando. Only one of the practitioners, a Gainesville midwife, was Southern.

This midwife considers herself a Southerner, “born and raised in the South” although she mentioned that the Southern drawl had escaped her. This may be, in part, from attending midwifery school in California. Her hometown is Jacksonville, FL, close to the Georgia border in the Florida panhandle, which is often included as Southern when other parts of Florida are not. The other Gainesville midwife was from the northeast – a certified Yankee, who also attended midwifery school in California before settling in Florida to practice.

The midwife and physician from Orlando were both originally from Europe. The Orlando midwife was born and raised in London, completing midwifery training there before immigrating to Florida. She is the child of immigrant parents of African descent who came to England from Barbados. The Orlando physician is from Poland and completed his training there before working in various countries
in Europe. He then immigrated to Africa and worked with traditional midwives before moving to Minnesota for additional training, and finally settling in Florida to practice.

I also conducted interviews with 80 women, 40 of whom were clients of the midwives, while the other 40 were clients of the doctor. Prenatal interviews covered demographics, thoughts on birth, preparation, choice of practitioner, and an agree/disagree schedule on beliefs about pregnancy/birth. The interview schedule about beliefs was used to determine if the women held more traditional beliefs often associated with midwifery, or more biomedical beliefs in line with the mainstream medical model of birth used by physicians.

The women in the study shared some common demographic elements with the traditional Southerner, although not all were Southern. The majority of the women were of European descent, with the next largest group being African American, reflecting a traditional ethnic Southern composition. There were also women representing Native American, Asian, Hispanic, and Amerasian ethnicities as well, showing the multi-ethnic populations present in Florida today.

Many of the women in the study have ethnicities that show the changing diasporas of Florida. Gregory (2005) explains that Southerners themselves created a diasporic movement throughout the United States over the course of the 20th century, and that Florida is peculiar in that other diasporic movements have changed its Southernness during the same time period. Moving populations that have changed the face of Southernness in Florida and are represented in this study include those from other states such as New York and Colorado, Caribbean nations and territories such as Puerto Rico, Cuba, Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and other countries such as Japan and China.

The majority of the women whom I interviewed were married and Christian, with almost half the women staying at home rather than working, which reflects traditional Southern female mores. Twenty-four of the women who were not working described themselves as stay-at-home-mothers. See Table 1 for further demographic information on the women interviewed.

Women choosing a midwife as their practitioner may be choosing a more traditional Southern view on motherhood, such as the women interviewed in Gainesville, and 8 of the 32 clients of the midwife in Orlando who purposefully chose to retain the services of the midwife for pregnancy and birth care. The other 24 women were referred to the midwife in Orlando because she would help them get Medicaid, so they did not necessarily select the midwifery model of care.

**Gainesville.** Gainesville is just off of the lower part of the Florida panhandle in the area researchers consider to be part of the South (Reed 2003). Peninsular Florida is usually an entity not associated with Southern culture due to the large population of northerners as well as immigrants from other nations. Two women I interviewed in Gainesville were from outside the South; one woman was in the Army, following in the footsteps of her father and had moved many times, and another was from Canada attending graduate school at the local university. The other six women I interviewed were from the surrounding area of Alachua County.
One of the midwives said that she thought most of their clients were Southern although as the birth center was located in a college town, there would always be a percentage of women from other areas.

As a part of my research, I conducted postpartum interviews in the homes or businesses of several of these women. I was invited to conduct one of the interviews in the family’s tattoo parlor, while another woman directed me to “turn by the white church sign and follow the dirt road about 7/10ths of a mile before turning by the power pole into the yard with the big hound dogs.” Half of these women did not work outside of the home and reported some form of Protestant Christianity as their religion in keeping with traditional Southern views on womanhood and religion. Only one of these women reported negative feelings about pregnancy and birth, as she had a previous complicated birth. All of the other women reported feeling excited about their upcoming births and felt that birth was a natural process. These women all chose to deliver with midwives as a part of their “natural”, and likely more traditional, views on birth.

“Sally” was one of the Southern women interviewed in Gainesville who seemed to have more traditional views on birth. She was a stay-at-home-mom who chose a midwife for her second birth upon the recommendation of friends. One of the reasons she chose the midwife was because she wanted a more intimate birth where other female friends and her family could surround her.

Another woman, “Margo,” also stated the importance of having a good female support system at her birth since her husband was deployed overseas in Iraq. She wanted her sister, mother, and friend who had experienced two midwife-assisted births to be by her side. She stated that her expectation of the midwife was to guide her through the birth and help her when she needed it, but that she relied on her own intuition as well.

“Bethany” chose a midwife because she wanted a practitioner who was skilled in more natural ways of delivery. She felt that birth should be a celebrated and appreciated event rather than medicalized. She said in the pre-partum interview that she trusted her body. She ended up delivering a 9-pound baby boy with the midwife 12 days after her due date.

All of the midwifery clients in Gainesville shared certain ideas about birth. They agreed that women should listen to their bodies, follow the advice of their midwife, have a close relationship with their midwife, and that the midwife should trust the women. They disagreed with aspects of the “technologization” of birth such as the necessity of intravenous drips used continuously throughout labor and the lithotomy position used for birth. This follows the more traditional midwifery model of birth that rejects technology in favor of allowing the woman to trust her body and give birth without intervention unless medically necessary.

**Orlando.** The rest of the 62 women interviewed lived in and around Orlando, FL, approximately 100 miles south of Gainesville. Orlando could be considered to lie on the cultural fault line between “Southern” Florida and South Florida as it is quite far from a typical Southern town, yet areas surrounding it, such as Bithlo and Narcoossee, are firmly entrenched in the Southern lifestyle including valuing tight-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Physician Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Midwifery Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Total (N=80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerasian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Physician Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Midwifery Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Total (N=80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Physician Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Midwifery Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Total (N=80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Pregnancies</th>
<th>Physician Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Midwifery Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Total (N=80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>Physician Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Midwifery Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Total (N=80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-25K</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50K</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75K</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100K</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101K+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Physician Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Midwifery Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Total (N=80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Physician Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Midwifery Clients (N=40)</th>
<th>Total (N=80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Demographic Data of the Women Interviewed by Practitioner Choice
knit communities, outdoor sportsmanship, conservative religious and political values, and more traditional Southern foodways. When I asked one woman, who considered herself both a Floridian and a Southerner, if she considered Orlando part of the South she told me “Honey, you’d have to go north to find the South from here.” The current population of Orlando is made up of a small proportion of local families and a large transient population from around the United States, and also the world, who come to Orlando to work in the tourist service industry. Founded in 1875, Orlando became a place where wealthy Northerners visited during the cold winter months, or moved to because of failing health (Conomos 1976). In the early history of Orlando, a group of English settlers arrived to populate the area; thus Orlando has been an international town from the very beginning.

Since Orlando was not founded until after the close of the Civil War, its citizens did not experience the history of oppression and slavery felt by other towns in Florida and the South. The leading influx of settlers throughout the late 1800’s and early 1900’s from the United States came from nearby Southern states including Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Alabama, giving Orlando a large Southern population (Dyer 1952). Although Orlando has immigrants from around the globe, it is a traditionally conservative town, embedded in conservative ideals about healthcare, women’s rights, and family values; most women here readily accept the medicalization of childbirth, choosing obstetricians as care-givers.

About one third of the women interviewed in Orlando were not from the South, nor were their practitioners as stated earlier. The women who were not from the South came from various other states such as Colorado, New York and Utah, and diverse countries such as Poland, Mexico, Haiti, and China. Some women from the Orlando area shared how their Southern culture was reflected in their thoughts on pregnancy and birth, such as use of intuition about their bodies, their desire to have as many children as God provides, and to stay at home with the children. Others thought their careers were of the utmost importance, with motherhood equal to or below their careers in terms of status showing a shift from traditional views on Southern womanhood. Some women had to continue working, as they had no other choice, although several mentioned wanting to have a more traditional family by staying at home. Ideas about pregnancy and birth varied widely among these women as many reported being scared about the impending birth and upset about being pregnant, while others were excited and thought birth was a beautiful thing.

“Anna” was one of the women from central Florida who was a stay-at-home mom with three other children whom she home-schooled. She spoke about how her last birth with the midwife involved complications but that she trusted God to pull her and the baby through, and she also trusted her midwife implicitly. During the birth the baby’s cord broke and the midwife had to resuscitate the baby. When asked if the baby survived, the mother said yes and pointed to a four year-old little girl running around the birth center. Anna delivered again with the midwife and had no complications. During the postpartum interview, Anna described how she had to have a malignant melanoma surgically removed from her shoulder a month
after the birth and how she used prayer to see her through the surgery because she did not want follow-up treatment involving chemicals. Anna was one of the more traditional mothers in the study in the choices she made about her family and her body because of her Christian faith and her continued choice of using a midwife as her birth attendant, even though she had experienced a traumatic emergent complication during her previous birth attended by the midwife.

Another of the more traditional women, “Naomi,” described how during the birth, she listened to her body and “my body just knew what to do.” She had her previous two children with obstetricians but decided to switch to a midwife with her third child because she wanted a practitioner who trusted her body as much as she did so that she could experience natural birth.

“Juana” moved to Florida from Puerto Rico as a young child, and was on her ninth pregnancy when interviewed. She described working up until her thirty-eighth week when she was induced due to “stress,” according to the information provided in her chart. She was very stressed by working and trying to care for her six living children and had decided to get her tubes tied after this birth so that she would not have any more children. She explained that this went against her religious beliefs, as she is Pentecostal, but that her family did not have the resources and she did not have the strength to have any more children. Her physician was very understanding of her situation as she said he counseled her about options for sterilization for both her and her husband.

One of the Southern clients of the physician was working until she experienced complications as well; “Melissa” was diagnosed with facial neuralgia in the middle of her pregnancy, and later preterm labor and was forced to quit working as an attorney. Even though she was put on bed rest, she decided to pull her four year-old daughter out of daycare although this ended up causing her stress. She said that being on bed rest for three months was the longest she had ever gone without working. She had returned to work soon after the birth of her daughter even though she was delivered by cesarean. Melissa was disappointed that she had to have a repeat cesarean due to hospital regulations because she would have liked to try for a vaginal birth after cesarean. Although she was more non-traditional in choosing to work even though she did not need to, she was traditional in the sense that she wanted to trust in her body, and she wanted to have her older child at home with her since she was unable to work even though this caused her stress.

The women in Orlando who actively chose a midwife as their practitioner had similar beliefs about pregnancy and birth as the women in Gainesville choosing midwives did. They also agreed that women should use intuition, that the midwife should trust them, and that following the advice of the midwife was important. The women who chose a doctor all agreed that following the doctor’s advice was important, but they also believed that birth is best managed by technology, straying away from traditional beliefs to a more medicalized ideal of birth. Embracing technology was also a key aspect of the beliefs of the women in Orlando who went to the midwife for care but did not actively seek out midwifery. These women were in the lower income brackets and were traditionally denied physician assistance
and technology as birth moved out of the home and into the hospital in the South (Fraser 1995).

Many of these poor women in Orlando experienced racism and classism, much like their foremothers, when trying to find maternity care. The midwife in Orlando took on women without insurance or the ability to pay, gave them care without receiving payment, and had her office staff assist the women with their Medicaid forms. These women would have to go to the health department clinics or forego prenatal care without her help. Even though the midwife was not a Southerner by birth, she took on the community engagement and responsibility role the granny midwives once occupied.

The staff of the physician’s office, especially the office manager, was more concerned with keeping finances in order in line with their job descriptions, though the physician himself seemed to be quite caring towards the women. He admitted to taking on women who were unable to pay and continued service to those with financial problems who became unable to pay as their pregnancy progressed. The attitude of a staff member at the obstetrician’s office was in direct opposition to the midwife’s office, as she stated that the Medicaid women were nothing but problems, expecting a free ride from the government or the physician himself.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, Central Florida may still be viewed as at least liminally Southern in nature, especially in regard to beliefs about pregnancy and childbirth. As the rest of the South globalizes, it moves towards Florida, rather than Florida moving away from the South. Waves of new immigrants have come to other Southern states creating a changing diaspora that has begun to reflect changes that Florida has felt over the past century. Vietnamese and Latino populations have grown exponentially across the South and are just two of the new waves of immigrants who are changing the definition of those who call themselves “Southerner”.

Certainly in all of these states, “Southerness” abounds in dietary practices, political beliefs, religious beliefs and attitudes towards community, even in areas where the populace may be shifting. Across the South as populations and beliefs shift, changes in traditional views of motherhood have occurred. Some women reject traditional beliefs about pregnancy and childbirth and embrace the physician-assisted technological models of birth, while others hold onto traditions of intuition and care surrounded by women.

Some women in Florida also retain traditional values of religious beliefs, including having as many children as God provides, women staying home to care for and/or school their children, and motherhood as the ultimate status of becoming a woman. Others embrace more modern ideas of working outside of the home, not only gaining status as women because they are mothers but also because they are providers and economically valuable in their own right. Other women have had to cast aside their ideals of being able to stay home with their children because they are forced to work to make a living to support their families due to changing economic and political circumstances.
Unlike some of the women in surrounding Southern states, Florida women are fortunate to be able to choose from midwives and physicians as their birth attendants, although some women are denied choice due to geography or ability to pay. Racism and classism, unfortunate realities throughout history in the South, are both still playing a role in maternity care in Florida although some practitioners are trying to change attitudes. Many traditional aspects of Southern culture may be changing in Florida and other parts of the South, but motherhood, for the most part, remains revered whether you travel north or south. Postmodern midwifery is perhaps trying to fill a void in the Southern woman’s consciousness from the memory of traditional granny midwives and their representation of care and community. As Davis-Floyd says, the line between professional midwives and traditional birth attendants is blurred in the modern world vision (2005), yet women in Florida are actively choosing midwives, in part for this linkage to tradition while leaving behind the now conservative choice of medical doctor as birth practitioner. Southern women in Florida are given the choice between medicalized care that some see as impersonal, and a more woman-centered, time-honored approach, and this article shows that some women are embracing what midwifery offers in line with longstanding Southern values.
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A Chinese Case Study in Using Psychoanalysis for Ethnography

Maris Boyd Gillette
Haverford College

In this article I explore a surprising conversation that I had with a Chinese Muslim woman named Sheng Lanying. Her persistent tendency to see images of Mao that were no longer present led me to examine how personal, emotional meanings informed her experience of nation-building. After providing basic historical context about the Chinese revolution, I present the conversation between Sheng and me. Then I discuss how anthropologists can use, and have used, psychoanalysis for ethnography. I next apply the psychoanalytic approach that I find most useful to Sheng’s memories. I conclude with a discussion of what anthropologists can gain from integrating psychoanalysis with ethnography.

A brief history of 20th century China

Mao Zedong and the Chinese Communist Party founded the People’s Republic of China in 1949, beginning China’s second modernizing revolution of the 20th century. Like the Chinese Revolution of 1911, which toppled the Qing dynasty, the Communist revolution was iconoclastic. Until Europeans and Japanese colonized Chinese territory in the late 19th century, Chinese elites had believed that China was the pinnacle of world civilization. Members of the Chinese Communist Party and other reformers wanted to “save the nation” (jiu guo), which had become “the sick man of Asia.” They argued that Chinese society and culture had to change.

In 1949 Chinese society was predominantly agrarian. Family and kinship were defined through male links (Baker 1979). Patrilineages held land and other assets in the name of deceased male founders and held regular rituals that promoted solidarity among male agnates (Potter 1970). Sons were preferred to daughters. Elders arranged marriages. Daughters married out and went to live with their husband’s kin, typically in a separate community. Proper women were sequestered (and had bound feet). Harmony was a key goal, and could be achieved if each person knew his or her place in the social hierarchy and performed accordingly. The concepts of zhong (loyalty), xiao (obedience), and filial piety expressed the central
values of deference and loyalty. The imperial state had reinforced these values and social practices through laws, punishments, and public honors (Baker 1979).

Chinese Muslims, or Hui, shared these practices and ideals with non-Muslim Chinese. Chinese Muslims claim descent from Arab and Persian traders who traveled the Silk Road from the 7th to 9th centuries and settled in China. They have “Muslim [patrilineal] grandfathers and Chinese grandmothers,” as my informants put it. Differences between Chinese Muslims and non-Muslim Chinese relate to Islam (Lipman 1996). An important way that Chinese Muslims express separateness from non-Muslims is food. Chinese Muslims do not eat pork, avoid pigs, and refuse to eat food cooked by non-Muslims. Currently there are about 20 million Chinese Muslims in the PRC, mostly living in the northwest.

The Communist Revolution began in the 1950s with a land-to-the-tillers program and a new marriage law that made arranged marriages illegal. The Chinese Communist Party formed mutual aid teams for agricultural production and brought women into the public labor force (Davin 1979). Islam was declared legal to practice and Chinese Muslims were given official minority status. They received food subsidies, educational assistance, and disproportionately high levels of political representation. The government also institutionalized the Feast of the Breaking of the Fast and the Feast of Sacrifice as official holidays for Muslims.

Mao Zedong, China’s premier leader from 1949 to 1976, favored a rapid transformation of Chinese society rather than a gradualist approach. In 1958 Mao instigated “religious reforms” that shut down most religious institutions and sent religious professionals to work in factories and labor camps. He began an erosion of political benefits to Chinese Muslims that would be completed during the late 1960s. Mao wanted China to “catch up with England in ten years and surpass America in twenty.” He started the “Great Leap Forward,” creating huge communes, standardizing agricultural practices, and centralizing eating. He encouraged Chinese citizens to melt down their cooking pots and other personal items to smelt iron in backyard furnaces. These Great Leap Forward policies, combined with some bad weather conditions, caused three years of famine and the death of more than a million people (Thaxton 2008).

Mao’s next revolutionary program was the Cultural Revolution. Beginning in 1966, Mao incited students to attack “old thoughts, old customs, old habits, and old culture.” He advocated public struggle sessions against China’s remaining “counterrevolutionaries.” Citizens with “bad class labels” (people who had been, or were descended from, large landowners, rich peasants, and capitalists), intellectuals, and Mao’s political rivals, were beaten, maimed, and killed. Mao sent urban youths to the countryside to “learn from the peasants” and closed most educational institutions (MacFarquhar and Fairbank 1991).

Mao died in 1976 and in 1979, Deng Xiaoping emerged as China’s top leader. Deng ended Mao’s radical politics and focused on economic development. He implemented “Reform and Opening,” or marketization and internationalization, and created China’s One Child policy to slow China’s population growth. Deng reinstated many of the affirmative action policies from the 1950s that protected Chinese
Muslims, and allowed them to have two children. The Chinese Muslim residents of Xi’an’s old Muslim neighborhood were quick to take advantage of Deng’s “Reform and Opening” policies. They started small private businesses, many associated with the production and sale of food. They rebuilt mosques, opened new Qur’an schools, and expressed their Muslim identities overtly (Gillette 2000).

Despite three decades of government policies aimed at changing the structure of Chinese society, in contemporary China harmony, loyalty, and obedience are still public values. Patrilineal kin cooperate for production and ritual activities. Most families arrange marriages—although children now can consent or refuse prospective spouses— and post-marital residence is predominantly virilocal. Sons inherit family property and are still preferred to daughters in some respects.

An afternoon conversation

One afternoon in June, 1997, Sheng Lanying and I walked together down Big Leatheryard Street. Sheng and I had been friends for three years, and I had gone to visit her at her father’s house, where she ran the Sheng family’s noodle business. That particular day she and her husband and two sons were expecting me for dinner, so she and I walked together toward her (marital) home. At that time both the Sheng home, where Sheng Lanying worked, and the Wu home, where she lived, were large compounds housing kin related through males. In 1997 Sheng’s father and mother, her father’s brother’s wife (who was also her mother’s sister), her five brothers and their wives and children, and her oldest brother’s son’s wife made up the Sheng household (neither Sheng nor her three sisters lived in their father’s home). In the Wu household lived three of the Wu brothers, their wives (including Sheng) and children, their father’s brother son, his wife, his three sons, and his oldest son’s wife and baby (For information on residence patterns in this neighborhood, see Gillette 2000: chapter two). As we traveled that familiar route, I asked Sheng about a wall we were passing on the right side of the road. The wall was twelve feet tall and made of gray stone, with a decorative molding. It looked old and important to me, as if it were in front of some special place. The wall was near the Big Leatheryard Street Mosque but was not part of the mosque complex. Gesturing in the wall’s direction, I asked Sheng, “What is that (na shi shenme)?”

1 The location of Sheng Lanying’s “home” is a problem familiar to those interested in China. Sheng referred to both her marital home and her natal home as “our home” (women jia), though never during the same conversation (for example, if she called the Sheng home “our home,” then she called the Wu home “their home”). Sometimes Sheng referred to the Sheng home as her “mother’s home” or “girlhood home” (niang jia). Sheng’s husband always referred to the Sheng home as “their home” (tamen jia), and occasionally spoke of his wife “returning to her mother’s/girlhood home” (hui niangjia). The residence listed on Sheng’s residence permit (hukou) was the Wu home on Big Leatheryard Street, and this was where she slept at night. However, we might argue that Sheng Lanying had two “homes,” and that “home” differs dramatically for Chinese men and women (for further information on women’s residence patterns in China, see Jankowiak 1993, Mueggler 2000, Wolf 1972, Watson 1986).
“That’s a portrait of Mao Zedong,” Sheng replied. “There’s a huge one across from our house [the Sheng home] too, covering the entire wall. The people with bad class labels, the “cow ghosts and snake spirits” (niugui sheshen), used to gather there every morning to receive their instructions for the day’s activities (zao qingshi), and they returned to report every evening (wan huibao). Other people came to put fresh flowers in front of Mao’s portrait, as a way of expressing their feelings for him.”

I was surprised. “That wasn’t what I meant,” I said. “I didn’t know there was a portrait of Mao there.” “Oh,” she replied, “I thought you were looking at the traces of red paint still on the wall.” I didn’t see any red paint, but said nothing as she continued. “The government puts those there,” she said, “and the big dumpster in front of our house [the Sheng home] too.” I realized that she was talking about the nine or ten trash cans in front of the wall. “Both of those buildings are state-owned (gongfang). Otherwise the government would never be able to put the trash containers there. Nobody wants to have the garbage near their home, it is so dirty and smelly.” She spoke for a few moments about trash removal, and then I explained that I had been asking about the decorated wall, and wondered if something special were behind it. Sheng replied that there wasn’t, only a semi-abandoned work unit.2 “In the old society,” she said, using a government phrase to refer to China before the founding of the People’s Republic in 1949, the walls had belonged to officials. With this we arrived at Sheng’s (marital) home and the conversation ended. Later that evening, Sheng reminisced for a long time about her girlhood experiences during the collective era and Cultural Revolution.3

When I typed up my notes that evening, Sheng’s comments made me pause. Look, I thought, a site where citizens working to build socialism had once gathered to report to and express their feelings for Chairman Mao—a kind of shrine, almost—was now a garbage dump. “How ironic,” I wrote in my notes. “The passing of an era. Great opener for a story.” Later I focused on the gap between what I had seen and what Sheng saw. Sheng and I were good friends and our conversations were usually straightforward. I often asked her to explain others’ remarks when they didn’t make sense to me. This time she had produced something weird. I couldn’t see Mao’s image on the wall that she and I were passing, and had never heard of a Mao image there. I wasn’t clear why she connected this old grey wall with a decorative molding to the wall across from her home, which was white-washed brick, had no decorations, and was much more recently constructed. I had never seen or heard of a Mao image there either. I asked Sheng a literal question: “what is that.” I had not asked “what do you think of or remember when you look

---

2 Prior to the reform era, work units (danwei) were not merely places of employment, but usually also included employee housing, clinics, and canteens. Generally speaking, the tighter the links between the central government and the work unit, the more goods and services the unit provided for employees. See Walder 1986 for a study of a Chinese work unit (a factory). In late 1990s Xi’an, most work units were privatizing employee housing, contracting out services, and renting or selling work unit property.

3 I published an earlier analysis of this story in the Journal of Urban Anthropology (see Gillette 2004).
in that direction?” Yet Sheng saw Mao and talked about two walls rather than one. Why? And what caused Sheng to speak extensively about her experiences under Mao that night?

**Psychoanalysis and Anthropology**

In a volume on psychoanalysis, gender, and culture written for anthropologists (1999), Nancy Chodorow argues for the existence of a realm of psychological life in which individuals produce personal unconscious meanings. Chodorow suggests that transference, projection, introjection, and unconscious fantasy, concepts from clinical psychoanalysis, best convey the dynamic, emotion-filled processes through which unconscious meanings are created. These psychic processes are innate human capacities, different from, though intertwined with and affected by, cultural meanings, discourse, and the external world. Chodorow writes that anthropologists must attend to individual psyche processes or the “power of feelings” to understand subjectivity, experience, and how individuals exist in culture.

Chodorow reviews anthropological writings on the person, subjectivity, and emotions from Durkheim to the present and identifies several patterns (1999: chapter five). First, cultural anthropologists write as if their informants were always rational decision makers. Second, we privilege social and cultural constructs, language, and discursive power as sources of meaning and subjectivity. Third, we disregard individual idiosyncrasies in favor of general patterns, and leave individual differences unaccounted for and undertheorized.

Chodorow’s findings apply to much of the literature in the anthropology of memory, including when authors are explicitly psychological. For example, in “Death and memory: From Santa Maria del Monte to Miami Beach” (1996), Ruth Behar gives herself a psychologically complex subjectivity while attributing rationality to her Spanish informants. Behar accepts that an unconscious desire to avoid her grandfather’s death drove her to do field work during the summer that he died. She reflects on the unconscious processes behind ethnography, writing “anthropology is about displacements” (43). By contrast, Behar’s Spanish informants experience their emotions directly and act in ways that make sense given their feelings. The elderly villagers mourn the deaths of loved ones and recognize the end of their village way of life as they consciously relinquish their patterns in favor of modern ways that guarantee greater comfort and more opportunities for their descendants. Behar identifies generational cohorts as the source of differences between villagers, with each cohort acting rationally according to its historical experiences.

Vieda Skultans in *The Testimony of Lives: Narrative and Memory in Post-Soviet Latvia* (1998) does not deny her informants psychological complexity, but her book is an example of how anthropologists who study memory privilege cultural meanings and fail to account for individual differences. Skultans studies the autobiographical narratives of Latvians in the post-Soviet period. She compares the narratives of individuals who are well with those of individuals who somatize their feelings, and demonstrates convincingly that meaningful autobiographies
are informed by Latvian narrative conventions (e.g., the forest protects us, good Latvians versus bad Russians, a quest paradigm in which the hero learns to love his family and home). However, she does not explain why particular informants choose one idiom over another to characterize their experiences, or why some of her informants are able to draw on cultural tropes as a resource and others are not.

Vincent Crapazano’s *Tuhami: Portrait of Moroccan* (1980) is an example of an ethnography that emphasizes general patterns, even though Crapazano describes the book as a study of how an individual uses cultural idioms to represent himself. Crapazano provides a series of “recitations” by a Moroccan tile maker (it is not completely clear whether these recitations are largely a response to Crapazano’s questions, voluntarily generated by Tuhami, or produced in some other fashion). He explains them in terms of Moroccan beliefs in and practices surrounding spirits and demons, gender relations, late colonial and post-colonial social history, and socioeconomic class. Crapazano also presents the recitations as examples of purportedly universal psychological dramas such as the Oedipal conflict, competitions between parents and children, relations of dominance and subordination, and sexual desire. Tuhami gains a little particularity only at the end of the book, when Crapazano describes conversations that he and Tuhami had two days before Crapazano was leaving Morocco (part five). Here Tuhami and Crapazano reveal that they have become attached to one another, and act on that attachment in what Crapazano indicates are individually patterned ways (e.g., Crapazano implies a transference relationship).

I would add a fourth pattern to Chodorow’s list, at least in the anthropology of memory. Anthropologists also apply psychoanalytic models designed to characterize the individual psyche to groups. Anthropologists who use psychoanalytic theories in this way include Michael Lambek, who discusses spirit possession in Madagascar and the Comoros Islands “in the key of object relations,” as the collective dramatization of a group’s experience of loss (1996); Charles Stafford, who uses Bowlby to define and investigate Chinese cultural practices for mediating separation and reunion, including poetry, architecture, and terms for departure and greeting (2000); and Maris Gillette, who uses Freud on separation anxiety in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* to explore the gift giving practices of Chinese Muslims who make the hajj (2003). None of these authors indicate the mechanisms by which individual psychodynamic processes come to characterize group praxis. Their use of psychoanalysis bears a resemblance to Freud’s later writings on culture, in which Freud wrote as if group actions, collective representations, and historical processes were simply individual psychodynamic processes writ large (e.g., *Totem and Taboo*, *Civilization and its Discontents*, *Moses and Monotheism*).

**Psychoanalysis for ethnographers.** Ethnographers who are interested in how people produce meaning can adopt some of the methods, theories, and assumptions of clinical psychoanalysis. Relational psychoanalysts emphasize the importance of human relationships for individuals, a perspective that ethnographers should find compelling. Like ethnographers, analysts cultivate long-term relations with their analysands to learn about their particular biographies, experi-
ences of relationships, and emotions. In detailed clinical case studies (as opposed to the theoretical work that is divorced from clinical encounters), psychoanalysts describe the personal unconscious feelings that a particular individual experiences in her relationships (e.g., Freud’s case studies in Freud 1989, Yalom 1990 and 1999, Eigen 1999; see also the brief sketches of clinical work in Chodorow 1999, chapter three).

A basic premise of psychoanalysis is that human speech and actions often manifest unconscious motivations. Freud’s *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* gives a number of entertaining examples of how a person’s repressed materials affect her speech and acts in ways that she does not consciously intend (1965). Clinical psychoanalysts attend to an analysand’s personal relationships in the present, including with the analyst, and in the past, including relations with parents and siblings. The analyst assumes that the analysand’s present experience evokes responses that she has developed in her significant relationships and relates to her feelings about them, and looks for patterns in the analysand’s relationships. In trying to understand their patients’ subjective experiences, psychoanalysts accept that a single psychic event is meaningful for the analysand on many levels. These include both manifest (surface, obvious) and latent (deep, hidden) meanings. Freud wrote extensively about the manifest and latent contents of dreams, which he regarded as “the royal road to a knowledge of the unconscious” (1909: 33), but he applied this idea more generally to his analysands’ narratives, physical symptoms, and behaviors. One method that psychoanalysts adopt to get at disguised meanings is to attend to sequences. Psychoanalysts listen to the order in which a person makes her remarks and the movement that she makes from one idea to the next. The analysand’s associations often reveal emotional connections and significances of which she may be unconscious or only partly conscious.

In her recent writings the ethnographer Jean Briggs uses psychoanalysis in a way that illuminates how individuals internalize cultural values (1987, 1992, 1998). For example, in “Mazes of Meaning,” Briggs analyses an interaction during which several Inuit adults teased small children of two and three years old. She argues that these intervals of teasing, which she calls “dramas,” force Inuit children to confront conflicting feelings and the complexity of human relationships. Briggs uses analysis of a single drama to show how cultural messages are made meaningful and intense for particular individuals. Her analysis is based on the psychoanalytic premises that humans are motivated by emotions, including unconsciously, and that close human relationships stir up powerful feelings. In what she calls her “natural history mode” of analysis—which I would call a psychoanalytic mode of analysis—Briggs scrutinizes the sequence, details, and contexts of the drama, using the participants’ particular biographical details to gain insight on their actions and responses. For example, in part of the drama, Maata teased a three year-old girl about taking her and her puppy to Maata’s home. Maata’s teasing forced the girl to confront a number of emotionally powerful questions: what happened when the

---

4 Freud saw dreaming and remembering as related. As he wrote in one of his case studies, “dreaming is another form of remembering” (1918: 419).
girl was attached to adults outside of her immediate family? To whom did she belong? To whom did her puppy belong? Could she control what happened to her and her puppy? If she chose to stay home with her family, would she lose something that mattered to her? Maata stopped teasing the child only after the child had repeatedly responded to these concerns in ways that Maata and the other adults considered to be appropriate and demonstrated that she had control over her emotions. The teasing forced the child to internalize a culturally acceptable response to a situation of conflict. It also allowed Maata to perform her personal conflicts and desires: Maata was an adult woman who had been adopted, was recently married and hoping to have children, and shared a name with the three year old girl. Briggs’ analysis illuminates how an individual agent negotiates cultural values, how diversity is possible, and how meanings are built and develop. She produces a richly textured, thick description of a process through which powerful feelings make culture personally meaningful for individuals.

Exploring personal meanings

Sheng’s afternoon memories. Returning to Sheng’s and my conversation in June 1997, two features of Sheng’s response to my question “what is that” suggest the presence of unconscious personal meanings. First, Sheng saw Mao when Mao’s portrait was not there to be seen. The wall that Sheng looked at was about 100 hundred years old and its size and decorations indicated that it was from late-imperial China. In contemporary Xi’an, the most valued past—the one most frequently referred to in public representations, and the reason why most tourists visit—is dynastic. Sheng’s neighborhood is known for its late imperial relics. In 1997 the Muslim district housed the city’s fourteenth-century drum tower and eight mosques built during the imperial period. Sheng’s response reveals Mao’s significance to her.

Sheng was born in 1948 and grew up in the Communist “New China.” Mao’s policies had an enormous impact on her childhood and young adulthood. For example, as Sheng told me later that night, when Mao called for urban students to “go down to the countryside” (xia fang) to “learn from the peasants,” Sheng went to live in a village. She was the only member of her family who lived in the countryside: because Sheng was willing to go, her seven younger brothers and sisters were allowed to remain in Xi’an. Sheng only returned to Xi’an because she was ill and had injured her back. Most “sent-down youths” could return only after Mao’s death.

Second, Sheng associated the wall we were passing with the wall of her 12 childhood home. Many walls in the Muslim district once displayed Mao’s image, so the former presence of a Mao portrait on the wall by the Sheng house cannot fully account for why Sheng brought it up. Sheng’s personal history was the impetus for her association. Sheng lived in her natal home for most of Mao’s reign. She spent only six years of the Maoist era outside the Sheng home, two years in the countryside and four in her marital home. Officially she lived in her childhood
home until 1982, when she finally changed the address on her residence permit (hukou) to her marital home.

Sheng’s natal family was extremely important to her. Sheng talked about the Sheng family as “our family” (women jia) and called going to the Sheng house “returning home” (hui jia). When she said “our family” and “our home” I often had to ask whether she meant the Sheng family or her marital family. Sheng spent a great deal of time at the Sheng household. Since 1990, she had run the Sheng family noodle shop, a job which she described as “helping my father” (gei wo ba bangmang). Sheng labored for her natal family at all of their ritual and social events. When Sheng’s husband was laid off from his job at a collective factory, Sheng asked her younger brother to find him a job in the brother’s restaurant. Sheng’s recollection of the wall across from the Sheng home reveals her strong attachment to and identification with her natal family. Reciprocally, Sheng’s connection with her family is implicated in her memories of Mao and the collective era.

Three other features of Sheng’s comments are noteworthy. First, Sheng links the Mao portrait with obedience: neighbors receive instructions and report on their activities there. Second, Sheng links the Mao portrait with devotion: locals give flowers to Mao’s portrait to express their strong feelings for him. Third, Sheng’s memories are ambivalent. The spontaneous gifts she describes her neighbors making to Mao’s portrait are pleasant. The “cow ghosts and snake spirits”—Sheng is using a phrase from the Cultural Revolution—are residents of the Muslim district who were considered “enemies of the people.” This memory points to something unpleasant.

Later that evening I asked Sheng about her class standing. Sheng said that her class label was unproblematic (she was a “city person”) but those who had bad class labels suffered terribly during the Cultural Revolution. Their families did too, she went on. “People thought then that a family was like a tree: if the trunk was rotten, the whole tree was bad.” The collective era, then, contains both pleasant and unpleasant memories for Sheng. Mao inspires obedience and devotion. But while Mao was in power some people and their families were harmed.

Sheng’s evening memories. After her husband and sons had gone to the mosque to bathe, Sheng told me many details of her life that I had never heard before. Sheng’s evening narrative revealed more about what the collective era meant to her, and how Mao and her family were related. Her reminiscences are too long to explore completely, so I quote an excerpt, and then examine it for signs of Sheng’s personal emotional meanings. Sheng began her evening remarks by talking about food, perhaps because we had just eaten dinner.

Times were hard in 1960. In those days each person received 27.5 jin of grain per month. 30 percent of the grain was rough and 70 percent was fine. I got very thin because the grain was so poor. No one had enough

---

5 See Gillette 2001 for further discussion of married Chinese Muslim women’s dual sense of “home” and the process by which married women come to regard their marital residence as “home.”
to eat. My parents sold a tree in our courtyard to get food. We used to have a big tree in our courtyard, it was hundreds of years old. It gave us shade and kept our house cool. Now we bake in the sun (shai). My father cut down the tree and sold it for 80 yuan. One yuan bought three jin of turnips on the black market, so he bought turnips for us children to eat. You could buy grain ration coupons on the black market too. A coupon for one jin of grain cost 3.5 yuan. In those days my father only earned 56 yuan per month, and we had six children in our family. My mother sold all her dowry jewelry of gold and silver to buy us food.

The government distributed vegetables, but you had to go get them. The place to get the vegetables was far out of town, very far, and you had to bring them back home yourself. My father would go to pick them up. He rode his bicycle and pulled a cart behind it. He left at 4 in the morning and didn’t return until 10 at night. My mother had to work, so I stayed home and watched my brothers and sisters. But we could only get the vegetables in the winter when the weather was cold enough for them to keep. The vegetables rotted in the summer, we couldn’t eat them. We ate their leaves too. Everyone swelled up from the poor nutrition. We were all puffy and swollen. Adults would do anything then, any kind of work to get food for their children. You could earn money, but there was no food to buy.

I finished junior middle school just as the Cultural Revolution was beginning. From 1966 to 1968 I stayed home. My braid was down below my waist, but I had to cut it short when the Cultural Revolution began. I did go on a political pilgrimage (chuanlian) to Beijing. I went with some classmates, we took the train to Beijing. We walked to Tianjin from there. We rode the trains for free, all the trains were free. It was so hot. The trains were packed with students. We female students (nü xuesheng) suffered especially, we couldn’t take off our shirts like the boys did. Boys and girls sat in separate parts of the train.

I stayed in a school in Xizhimen for a month. We lived for free. We wore signs which said that we were guests invited by Chairman Mao (Mao Zhuxi qinglai de keren). Food was brought to us by a special organization set up to take care of us students. We were treated so well. People were so honest back then. Our facilities were excellent, we had thick blankets for our beds, and no one stole them. We had heat in the dormitories. We never had to wash our bowls. There was only one small bucket where we could get water, it was too small to accommodate so many students washing their bowls. A horse-drawn cart came every day and brought new bowls for us to use. We just threw away the old ones.

I was one of the few Chinese Muslims to go on political pilgrimage. We all lined up for food, our food was centrally distributed. I stood in line for a long, long time. Finally I got to the front of the line. The man who was serving the food accidentally stuck his thumb into my bowl. He was not a Muslim. I started crying. I was so hungry and so tired, he had stuck his
thumb into my bowl and now I couldn’t eat the food. He asked me why I was crying, and I explained that I was a Muslim, and I couldn’t eat what he had given me. He was so good to me, he fried an egg for me, specially, so I could eat. Everyone was so good to us.

I was in the last group of students to see Mao, and Liu Shaoqi, at the Great Hall of the People. I was in the sixth row of students, right up at the front. I went to read the political posters at Beijing University too. But I didn’t see anything else! Can you believe how stupid I was? My one trip to Beijing in my life, and I didn’t go look at anything else.

Sheng’s memories begin with the grain rations that she received. She does not say who provided the grain rations, which was the Maoist government. She says that the rations were inadequate: Sheng grew thin from the poor quality grain, and everyone was hungry. Sheng does not attribute blame for this hunger, but her next thought is about her parents’ efforts to provide her and her siblings with food. The desperate measures that Sheng’s parents take are not enough to keep their children fed. Sheng again associates trees and families: she has already told me that the family of a person with a bad class label is like a tree whose trunk is rotten. Sheng’s family, and their tree, both suffer injury during this time of hunger.

After remembering that her mother sold her gold and silver dowry jewelry to get food, Sheng remembers that the government provided vegetables (the movement from grain to vegetables may recapitulate a Chinese sense of what makes a meal—fan (grain) and cai (vegetables)).6 Sheng’s father went to procure them. Here Sheng links being fed with the government and with her father. Sheng indicates that her father complied with the government’s requirement that he come to their distribution site to get the vegetables. She points out that her mother worked in a factory: Sheng’s mother was also complying with government policies. Sheng in turn obeys her parents and stays home from school to watch her siblings. Despite this compliance, there is still not enough to eat, not even when the leaves are consumed. Again Sheng does not attribute blame. She focuses on how hard adults worked to provide food for their children.

Next Sheng remembers going to Beijing to see Mao. Like her previous memory, with this association she indirectly names who caused her hunger and her family’s suffering. Sheng begins this story with another sacrifice: she cuts off her long hair. Sheng’s cutting off her braid parallels her mother’s sale of her dowry jewelry and her father’s cutting down the family tree. She then remembers leaving her family for a month to make a political pilgrimage, in what was probably her first trip away from home. Closeness to Mao requires “cutting” the family.

Sheng’s memory of her time in Beijing is about her being special. Because of Mao, Sheng rides the train for free. She and her classmates are Mao’s special guests in Beijing. Mao ensures she is well-treated: she and the other students have ample food and are warm, comfortable, and treated respectfully. Mao is a good provider for Sheng, unlike her natal family in Xi’an.

---

6 The significance of fan vs. cai is spelled out in Cooper 1986.
The story of the egg problematizes this fantasy. On the one hand, Sheng is again getting special treatment. The man is attentive to Sheng’s special needs as a Muslim and ensures that she gets fed. On the other hand, the man can ruin Sheng’s ability to eat because he is not a Muslim. To accept food cooked by this man, Sheng must compromise her standards. In 1966 she eats impure food (the egg) that she would never consume in 1997. But in her reminiscences she stresses the man’s, Mao’s, and everyone’s goodness.

Sheng begins the final portion of this memory by telling me again how she was special. Sheng was in the last group of students who got to see Mao and she got very close to him. However the satisfaction of her closeness does not sustain her. She interrupts her memories to berate herself for only visiting revolutionary sites on her political pilgrimage and neglecting all the wonders of Beijing’s imperial capital. Sheng’s memories after this comment continued this turn toward the negative: she remembered the hardships she suffered as a “sent-down youth” in the countryside, and the failure of the farmers to feed her when she got sick.

Sheng’s evening memories connect her family and Mao, whose policies affect the most intimate domains of Sheng’s and her family’s lives. She describes herself and her parents as obedient: her parents comply with government policies, Sheng complies with her parents’ requests, Sheng complies with Mao’s demands. Sheng’s parents make sacrifices for their children, and Sheng makes sacrifices for Mao. Sheng does not directly blame anyone for her hunger and sacrifices, although the sequence of her memories points toward who is responsible for her sufferings. Consciously, Sheng is loyal to her parents and to Mao. To apportion blame or get angry would violate the values of harmony, loyalty and filial obedience (zhongxiao), and devalue the deeply personal sacrifices that Sheng and her parents made during the collective era.

Sheng’s memories of Mao in Beijing are a fantasy of her specialness. Her trip loosely recapitulates the trip that a bride makes from her natal home to her marital home: she cuts ties with her family, is carried away in a vehicle provided by the groom, is feted and fed on her arrival, and finally gets to see the man she is marrying. Sheng idealizes her treatment, to the point of overlooking compromises such as eating unclean food. Sheng’s story of the egg captures the compromises she experiences in her memories of Mao. The hardships that she and her loved ones suffered compromise her efforts to retain a positive memory of her childhood and young adulthood. Sheng’s experiences are challenged even more by Deng Xiaoping’s reversal of Mao’s policies during the “Reform and Opening” period—all of the reasons for Sheng’s and her parents’ sacrifices have disappeared. Sheng’s interruption of her Beijing memories expresses some of her dissatisfaction: how could I only have done revolutionary things, why was I so short-sighted?

**Psychoanalysis for ethnography.** During her afternoon remarks and her evening memories, Sheng told me something about what gave her life meaning. She articulated how she participated in the project of nation-building in China, and what that meant for her personally. It seems to me that Sheng’s experiences of her relationship with the government under Mao were so deep and so intimate
that her powerful feelings must also affect her response to the government in the present. If nothing else, Sheng’s experiences under Mao influenced her expectations about how the government should treat Chinese citizens. For example, in 1997 I was shocked by Sheng’s violent reactions to some police officers who may or may not have killed a Chinese Muslim man in 1996. She wanted the policemen to be executed immediately (perhaps my shock was my counter-transference). Now, I think that her memories of Mao and her fantasy of specialness help explain her angry demands.

**Conclusion**

Malinowski once characterized the task of anthropologists as studying “native society from the native’s point of view” (1921). In my opinion, ethnographers who are interested in natives’ points of view or what makes a native’s life meaningful should not stop at investigating collective representations and discourse. We should also consider how a person’s emotions, unconscious fantasy, and biography color her experiences and influence her narratives and actions. Such an approach brings us closer to our informants’ experiential worlds. It helps us understand how individuals personalize cultural values and practices.

Writing these accounts, in turn, might cause us to add a psychic dimension to how we think about collective identities, socialization, and meaning. Sheng experienced her relationship with the government as direct, intimate, and personally meaningful. If we studied nationalism in China as subject to emotional meanings, we might be able to clarify why people of Sheng’s generation are so much more positive about the Maoist era than the hardships and violence of that period seem to warrant. We might also be able to make more sense of Chinese citizens’ vigorous, and to many Americans, unexpected responses to such international incidents as the Belgrade bombing of the Chinese embassy under the Clinton administration, the 2001 terrorist attacks in New York and Washington D.C., and the Anglo-American invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan. If individuals experience national belonging as a significant personal relationship, than nationalism is subject to the same unconscious psychic processes that characterize all of an individual’s meaningful relationships. Our anthropological understandings of nationalism or other collective identities would be enriched if we also explored their psychic dimensions.
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While doing ethnographic research in Bayonne New Jersey among my extended Italian-American family over the summer of 2008 I began to see how deeply memories were valued within Italian-American communities. From fall 2008 to fall 2009, I continued my research in Asheville and Chapel Hill, North Carolina, also with people of Italian ancestry. These interviews supported the idea that memory aids in the construction and maintenance of Italian-American identity and works as a defining feature of female agency within the community. While studying gender roles of Italian-American women it became apparent that an important aspect of feminine identity for this group is the role of “memory-keeper”. The women of this cultural group achieve valued roles within the family as they pass on the ways of the native country through their cooking of regional foods, enforcement of the traditions of past generations and through their “kin work,” or keeping up with sometimes distant family members and family lore. The work of Italian-American authors and scholars such as Edvige Giunta make reference to such a memory-keeping function in earlier generations of Italian-American women as well.

“Becoming Italian-American”: Maintenance of Identity Through Memory Keeping

In the preface of her work, Writing with an Accent: Contemporary Italian American Women Authors, Italian-American author and scholar Edvige Giunta wrote: “Becoming Italian-American: a process of splitting and joining, blending but not melting, absorbing but not assimilating; a negation with cultural identities and language that I often perceived at odds with each other; a rethinking of the question of – and the quest for-origins” (Giunta 2002: x). This cultural balance of identity can be easily observed in contemporary Italian-American families, such as my own. Observation of older family members led me to wonder how this process of “becoming Italian-American” progresses and is maintained.
observation and formal interviews in the Jersey City/Bayonne area of New Jersey and in both Chapel Hill and Asheville, North Carolina I began to narrow my focus on the construction and preservation of Italian-American identities in the women of those communities. It became clear that the culturally valued trait of memory worked as a tool to preserve cultural ties to Italy and provided an avenue for female agency. By passing on traditions through generations and maintaining connections within and between families women have cultivated the role of what I have labeled as “memory-keepers.” The Italian-American culture remains distinct in large part due to the continued production of regional foods and the maintenance of family ties.

In the case of my two Italian-American great aunts, daughters of early twentieth century immigrants, the traditional Catholic Church-based values of Italy and the pull of economic forces at work during the American Great Depression intersected to form their feminine identities. Both women entered the workplace at an early age to contribute to the support of their family and reentered the workplace once they had families of their own. They passed on to their own daughters a set of regional Italian recipes as well as a strong work ethic, which included the value of both economic and domestic contribution to the home and family. To this day, their English is peppered with Italian words and phrases though they rarely attempt to speak their parents’ native tongue. These lived experiences recall Giunta’s reference to “absorbing but not assimilating; a negation with cultural identities,” a process which creates memory-keepers such as my great aunts.

**Stance: “Native” vs. Outsider Status**

Deciding to study a social scene in which I was already deeply immersed has proven to be both extremely beneficial and problematic. Early on I had come to terms with the fact that my research was going to be defined by my subjective perspective. Being aware of this perspective, however, has given me more insight into my social scene. I feel that this “insider” or “native” angle to my research has added a personal element that I deeply enjoy.

In her article, “How Native is a ‘Native’ Anthropologist”, Kirin Narayan discusses many dilemmas that I have faced in the field. In her piece she works to deconstruct the notion of a native anthropologist and explains, “Calling attention to rather than smoothing over, ‘native’ identity perhaps helped to revise ingrained power imbalances in who was authorized to represent whom” (Narayan 1997:24). Acknowledging my place within my social scene has allowed me to understand my position not only in my work but also in the relationships with the people who are my participants and relatives. Unlike the majority of my participants I did not grow up in a large Italian-American community nor have I ever experienced living in poverty. However, as I conducted interviews with individuals like my great aunts, I began to develop closer relationships based on an exchange of personal stories and mutual understanding. While relatives of my grandfather’s generation will still view me as a child it seems clear that including them in the process of
writing this ethnography has opened up avenues for more mature conversations and perhaps persuaded them to view me with more respect. These elements of cultural identity that define my great aunts and me differently complicate my status as an “insider.” This realization has also allowed me to become more aware of how “factors such as education, gender, sexual orientation, class, race or sheer duration of contact may at different times outweigh the cultural identity we associate with insider or outsider status” (Narayan 1997:31). I can see that while I am a “native” to my social scene that doesn’t mean I am coming from the same frame of reference as my participants. This fact was made more apparent when I began to conduct formal interviews. Hearing participants tell stories from their respective pasts and explain a variety of feelings about their Italian-American culture made me aware of how facets of each of our identities work to construct a wide range of perspectives on this dynamic social scene.

**Memory as a Facet of “Kin Work” and Female Agency**

“You know you should really talk to your aunts about this.” This is the sentiment that in a sense started my entire research project. Once I had decided I wanted to study Italian-American culture I began the rather epic task of choosing a focus for my work. As I told different family members about my research ideas every one of them suggested I talk to my great aunts. I realized early on that I wanted to interview my great aunts to understand their experiences as first generation Italian-Americans. The universal insistence that I do so underscored the value my family placed on their memories and demonstrated what respected positions they held because of their knowledge. It became clear that my Great Aunts Josephine, or Jo, and Celeste are in a sense the memory-keepers of our family. Their ability to remember the past and keep track of the goings-on of the many different branches of our family gives them a great deal of agency.

It seems that this value of memory can be further understood in the context of the private sphere of the home. In her article “The Female World of Cards and Holidays: Women, Families and the work of Kinship”, Italian-American anthropologist Michaela di Leonardo deconstructs the multiple types of work that women do in their homes and communities, all of which rely heavily on personal memory. Within her Italian-American social scene of Northern California, di Leonardo observed that female participants were involved in three different types of work: “housework and childcare, work in the labor market, and the work of kinship” (di Leonardo 1997:341). The author elucidates this dynamic third type of work: “By kin work I refer to the conception, maintenance, and ritual celebration of cross household kin ties, including visits, letter, telephone calls, presents, and cards to kin; the organization of holiday gatherings; the creation and maintenance of quasi-kin relations; decisions to neglect or to intensify particular ties; the mental wok of reflection about all these activities...” (di Leonardo 1997:342). It seems clear that a key element to “kin work” is memory, which thus works to define the lived experiences of women. Since remembering dates and maintaining contact with individuals in and outside of the family falls mostly on women it not only proves
to be a shared experience but one that can create bonds within communities and through generations.

Within my social scene the value of memory has become more pronounced as my Aunt Jo and the people around her cope with her dementia. While Jo is in relatively good health for a 90-year-old woman, her memory loss has proven to shift her role in the family. Di Leonardo explains “Kin work is not just a matter of power among women but also of the mediation of power represented by household units” (di Leonardo 1997:343). It seems that since Jo’s dementia causes that type of forgetfulness that made living in an assisted living facility necessary it has limited the type of kinship work in which she can participate. She is no longer able to cook large meals and keep up with the network of relations and friends she once did. Even though Jo became confused as to who I was during our interview, she was still able to tell me in-depth stories from her youth and could even remember some details that her sister Celeste had forgotten. Since my two great aunts have always been extremely close, it has been rather hard for Celeste to see her older sister age in this way. During our interview as Celeste spoke of Jo’s condition she explained “Seeing her (Jo) the way she is today it breaks my heart because she’s always had good memories and now she feels she’s just wasting time not doing anything...I try and encourage her and tell her ‘we’re all getting old and its something we have to get used to’...there are times that I’m really happy that my sister could recall things, in fact I tell her ‘Jo some of the things you remember I’ve forgotten’...” Within this sentiment Celeste describes both her and Jo’s sadness about Jo’s dementia but also explains how an ability to remember certain things makes them both feel optimistic. In fact, it is the memories of the distant past that are the ones that are so valuable in maintaining a sense of continuity and family identity and these are the memories that Jo can recall. The importance my family places on maintaining a living link to the past is what appears to preserve Jo’s status as memory keeper and protects this element of her female agency. Since the role of memory keeper is constructed in the private sphere of the home but extends into the more public spaces like the neighborhood, an analysis of Italian-American communities would allow for a better understanding of the development of female agency.

“The neighborhood was a very nice family”

While a sense of community is arguably a strong element in all social scenes it has come to my attention that the feeling of community as an extension of the home comprises a key component of an Italian-American construction of cultural identity.

In July of 2008 my parents and I set out on a road trip to New Jersey. This was to be the trip in which I collected formal interviews from both of my great aunts. After hours of mind-numbing highway driving we made it to the Garden State. My first full day in New Jersey was spent at my mom’s cousin Lou’s home. Lou is my Aunt Jo’s oldest son and he graciously arranged to pick his mother up from her assisted living facility and bring her to his house for the afternoon. After lunch I
began my interview with my Great Aunt Jo by asking her to describe the area of Jersey City, New Jersey where she grew up. She answered by simply saying, “The neighborhood was a very nice family.” Sentiments like these can be found in conversations I had with Jo’s childhood friends Rose and John Di Giacinto that same afternoon as well.

Three days into our visit when I sat down to interview my Aunt Celeste in her sunny living room in Tom’s River, N. J. my first questions revolved around her childhood. Right away my aunt explained that “We (she and her family) were very poor but so were all of our friends so we didn’t realize that we were that bad off...the neighborhood was all tenement houses and poor people.” Through this description I was able to see that the lived experience of poverty formed a strong bond of solidarity within her Italian-American community. This strong sense of “taking care of your own” could also be found in comments she made about how her mother treated others. Celeste explained, “Mother was always taking care of people, as little as we had she would always gave ‘em a care package...she shared everything.” It was clear that this was an area that was made stronger by a value of reciprocity. A few days earlier, Rose Di Giacinto expressed similar sentiments when talking about her own mother’s involvement in the raising of her children. Rose explained that her mother was someone she could “always depend on.” While outside sources, like doctors, could sometimes not be consulted due to financial reasons Rose’s mother could always be counted on to “use what she knew” to help. It seems clear that what Rose’s mother “knew” was a product of both what her mother taught her and skills she developed living in the tenement neighborhood where she raised Rose and her older brother. The passing on of this type of knowledge not only aided Rose as a young mother but demonstrated the strong generational ties maintained within families and communities. The ways in which Celeste and Rose described their mothers’ giving natures made it clear that they both admired each of them a great deal and also exemplified how the value of “kin work” was passed on through generations.

It appeared that Celeste, Rose and Jo all noticed the work it took to maintain this sense of community they cherished. As a result, they in turn continue to write cards, send gifts and keep in touch just as they had seen their mother do. Di Leonardo calls attention to this type of intergenerational work by explaining, “We tend to think of human social and kin networks as the epiphenomena of production and reproduction; the social traces created by our material lives...But the creation and maintenance of kin and quasi-kin networks in advanced industrial societies is work; and, moreover, it is largely women’s work” (di Leonardo 1997:342). While my great aunts might not refer to the tasks they perform within their homes and communities as “work” because of the joy this effort brings them I am sure they would agree that the maintenance of relationships is not easy and that it is a responsibility left mostly in their hands. It seems clear that along with happiness these responsibilities also give both of my aunts the power to be reference points on nearly all family-related issues ranging from cousins’ birthdays to stories of our heritage.
Looking at the walls of my Aunt Celeste’s wood-paneled living room I was overwhelmed by all of the pictures of family and friends. Against the far wall stood my great aunt’s and uncle’s armchairs, which were distinguishable by the framed Purple Heart above my uncle’s chair and the cluster of her children’s pictures that hung above my aunt’s. It seemed that my great aunt took as much pride in her children as my great uncle did in his Purple Heart. Through this observation I was able to see how the value of family helped define the concept of home just as the concept of home was enlarged to include the larger community. It appeared that my Great Aunt Jo’s description of her childhood neighborhood as a “family” alludes to the dualistic influence the domestic sphere of home has on Italian-American communities and vice versa. It seems clear that neighborhoods made of up of immigrants mostly coming from the same country if not the same region would have similar cultural values that, while cultivated in the home, would also define the larger community.

While similar ethnic backgrounds allowed for the development of tight-knit neighborhoods like the one where my great aunts grew up, economic hardships caused by the Great Depression also worked to strengthen these communities and foster a shared value of “kin work.” Di Leonardo explains how socioeconomic trends can affect work done in the home, “…for visitors and for those who were residentially proximate, the continuing commonalities of women’s domestic labor allowed for kinds of work sharing—nursing, child keeping, cooking, cleaning— that men, with their increasingly differentiated and controlled activities probably could not maintain” (di Leonardo 1997:346). Within this context one can see that the types of “kin work” that were done while these communities worked to survive economic hardships helped to form strong networks of support. My Great Aunt Jo explained this concept when she stated, “(Growing up) we were poor but we were rich in family”. In this response Jo is notably not just referring to the relatives she lived with in her home but the larger network of people within her community. It seems clear that providing neighbors with food, child care and other forms of support not only maintained relationships but also provided women of my great grandmother’s generation with a means of gaining agency during times when most things were out of their control.

“That’s why Pop left Italy!” Food as Cultural Memory and Female Agency

My grandfather was the one who first made me aware of the strong link between food and Italian identity. As I sat across from my grandparents at a restaurant we often frequent when I am back home I scanned the menu, saw the word “polenta” and knew what we were in for. Sure enough, as I looked up I saw my grandfather point at the menu and exclaim, “That’s why Pop left Italy!” While most people would never be offended by this corn meal based patty found in many Italian dishes, the very mention of polenta sends my grandpa into a rant. The story goes that my great grandfather was so poor in Italy that all he and his family could afford to eat was polenta. In my grandpa’s tale this poverty and overexposure to
polenta is what made my great grandfather get on boat to American alone at the age of 17. It seems that food unites the people of my social scene not only around a table but also in giving them a sense of cultural identity and pride. Because of Pop’s disdain for polenta and the poverty it stood for my grandfather still refuses to order it at restaurants. It is clear that this refusal to eat polenta is not only an act of pride but allows my grandfather to feel connected to his father and his Italian heritage.

My grandfather’s disdain for polenta works to illustrate not only a personal connection he makes between food and Italian heritage but also a cultural value that he wishes to maintain and pass on. Throughout my life my grandfather has always praised my cooking abilities. Whether he was eating Italian Wedding cookies I made with my grandmother as a small child or twirling the seafood linguini I made last Christmas, he takes a noticeable amount of pride in my ability to cook. It seems that this culinary related pride is a result of the social structure of “kin work” that he saw in his Italian-American neighborhood growing up and in the home he later created with my grandmother. When I make Italian food and show my enjoyment in doing so my grandfather is able to see my ability to carry on both the culinary and other “kin work” related traditions of his mother and sisters. Here it seems he takes true pride in the fact that I have the potential to be the keeper of his family memories and pass them on to my own family. Through this perspective one can see the value that male family members place upon the domestic roles of women as not only good cooks but also as the passers-on of the varied cultural traditions related to the home.

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the various ways that Italian-American women maintain Italian heritage and demonstrate positions of power within the family through cooking, I consulted works written by contemporary Italian-American authors. The Milk of Almonds: Italian American Women Writers on Food and Culture edited by Louise DeSalvo and Edvige Giunta, allows readers to gain a more vibrant perspective on the cultural link between female agency and food within Italian-American communities. Within this collection of works is a powerful piece by Mary Beth Caschetta, entitled “The Seven Sacraments”. In her short story Caschetta describes how cooking the traditionally Catholic Italian Christmas Eve meal helped her feel more connected to her Italian identity and her spirituality. Caschetta writes:

Last Christmas, after Maria Salerno and I cooked a different fish for each of the seven sacraments, I started believing in God again. Maybe it was my friendship with Maria and her sister, Jannette, their loud conversations, their insistence on tradition, their cheerful faith and careful food preparation. Maybe my past came back to claim me...It’s hard to say for sure. I used to pretend I wasn’t Italian. (Caschetta 2002:67)

Within Caschetta’s narrative she describes the difficulty she faced in understanding her Italian identity. As a young girl she denied her heritage and strived to be like the blonde Protestant girls she grew up around. After meeting the
Italian-American friends, the Salerno sisters, whom she describes in the quotation above, she began to feel comfortable with her Italian roots. Through cooking traditional meals and sharing experiences with similar others, Caschetta was able to take pride in her Italian identity. Toward the end of her piece she writes, “Maria and I cooked for nine hours, using memory and our taste buds to guide us, paying homage to our grandmothers, each of whom had cooked a variation of this meal throughout her life” (Caschetta 2002:75). Within this context it becomes clear that for generations of women that feel detached from their Italian heritage, cooking can work as a tool to regain cultural connections. It seems that the power to create a bond with one’s ancestral background through food allows Italian-American women to have another level of agency within the domestic sphere.

While the act of making Italian meals works to maintain the use of traditional recipes and a rather vibrant link to an ancestral homeland, the gratification of being a skilled cook can also work to give Italian-American women a source of personal pride. An example of this comes in the form of my Great Aunt Jo’s famous carrot cake. Throughout her life my aunt has touched many lives with her baking. From sending Christmas cookies to friends and family to staying up baking banana bread to bring to co-workers for a morning treat, Aunt Jo became known for her culinary gifts. Throughout decades of measuring flour and shaking sprinkles many people told my aunt that she should make a profit on her baking abilities. After years of persuasion she finally listened and opened her own bakery, which sold baked goods at her storefront in New Jersey and delivered items as far as Manhattan. Her favorite cake to make and eat was a rich nutty carrot cake with thick cream cheese icing. Carrot cake also happened to be her best seller and flew off the shelves at prestigious stores like Dean and Deluca. Jo’s tremendous culinary talents granted her the agency to use her skills to build her own business.

Di Leonardo further analyzes this by explaining, “Revealing the actual labor embodied in what we culturally conceive as love and considering the political uses of this labor helps to deconstruct the self-interest/altruism dichotomy and to connect more closely women’s domestic and labor-force lives” (di Leonardo 1997:347). While both of my great aunts worked outside of the home from their early teens to their late 50s, it seemed that all of the jobs they held in the public sphere were always quite distinct from the work they did in the domestic realm. Yet when Jo began producing baked goods for a profit she was able to bring the two worlds together and in the process gain more financial agency.

Even though Jo achieved a great deal of success outside of the domestic sphere with her cooking, she and her younger sister also maintained a fair amount of power within the family because of their cooking abilities. One can easily see the power dynamics that take place during meal times by simply looking at who is serving the food. While other people are permitted to help carry the food out or pass bread around the table, my great aunts are always the ones who take everyone’s plates and dole out their respective culinary masterpieces. It seems clear that this act of feeding others and literally portioning out the food they made works to empower my two aunts. The act of serving a table full of people not only allows my aunts
to take a sense of pride in the meal they cooked but also establishes a sense of agency on a visual level. In observing the distributions of food it is easy to see the matriarchal roles my great aunts play in our family. Michaela di Leonardo explains the ways in which this display of “kin work” can influence family dynamics, “...we see that kin work is not only women’s labor from which men and children benefit but also labor that women undertake in order to create obligations in men and children and to gain power over one another” (di Leonardo 1997:347).

A “Hybrid” Perspective: How Memory Continues Cultural Traditions Across the Atlantic

Reflecting on the value of memory and the ability it gives Italian-Americans to connect with their Italian heritage made me realize I needed to consult someone who, unlike my great aunts, maintained an Italian identity that was not rooted in a past generation. Luckily I knew just the person to talk to.

As I drove to the Suman’s house for roughly the four millionth time I began to feel nervous. Since making friends with Francesca Suman our junior year in high school I have always associated her house with uncontrollable laughter and delicious meals. Yet on this rainy afternoon while I sat in front of the wood and brick two-story house I was trying not to think about delicious cups of minestrone and was attempting to prepare for my interview with Francesca’s mother, Anna. After living in the U.S for over half of her life there are still some linguistic elements of English that give Anna trouble. Particular sayings or phrases still confuse her and this confusion usually results in a fair amount of hilarity. Explaining that “man candy” did not necessarily mean that the boy Francesca and I were discussing particularly enjoyed sweets and other similar experiences allowed me to see how language can work to affect cultural identity. Edvige Giunta this link through her personal knowledge of languages.

Language is a manifestation of cultural identity. My languages are diverse and interconnected: English (which I first learned and spoke in its British form), Italian (which evolved from the regional Tuscan dialect)...Brief excursions into other languages did not last: English, so foreign to my immediate cultural experience and origins, would become my language of choice, and as such it would come to permeate my sense of cultural and binational identity (Giunta 2002. xi).

I’m confident that while Anna has not read Giunta’s work that it would resonate with her own lived experiences. It seems that Anna’s bilingual abilities also work to construct the way in which she views her cultural identity and could be part of the reason why she defined herself to me as not an Italian-American but as a “hybrid.” Anna’s memories are constructed through the perspective of an Italian-American “hybrid” whose lived experiences in Italy were defined by her native tongue and whose assimilation to life in America was influenced by the process of learning English. I have come to believe that she makes this distinction because, while she
enjoys living in the United States and considers herself an American, the way she interprets American culture is through an Italian lens.

As I sat across from Anna on the cozy green couch where I have spent endless hours I noticed how different she looked compared to my other participants. Since she is from the Northern city of Verona, Anna has much lighter features than my Southern Italian informants. With blonde hair, fair skin and blue eyes the only thing that gives her Italian ethnicity away is her thick accent. The way Anna speaks English is quite similar to the way she speaks Italian. Fast paced and rhythmic, her way of speaking has caused her quite a few problems over the five years she has lived in the American South. Though Anna’s accent simply places her in the large category of foreigners as far as Americans are concerned, for Anna, her accent is a facet of her Northern Italian identity. After I asked her about the differences she perceived between Italian and American culture she simply stated, “When I first arrived the difference was clear but now things are blended.” It seems that passing years and the assimilation process have deeply affected Anna’s memory. While living in America has constructed a “hybrid” identity for Anna, which in turn has worked to “blend” the cultural differences that were once so distinct, her memories of Italy and Italian traditions have allowed her to keep an active tie to her place of birth. Anna is able to stay close to her Italian roots and keep memories alive through maintaining traditions.

When I asked Anna about her first few years in the U.S she described feeling quite isolated. She explained that since she “came alone” her Italian traditions were “less strong.” She felt that she needed to make more of an effort to assimilate than to continue the customs she knew. However, these feelings did not cause Anna to give up all Italian practices. She was dedicated to maintaining some Italian traditions for herself and for her children. While most of her Italian practices revolved around food, Anna explained that the celebration of Santa Lucia’s Day was always an important event when her children were young. On the feast day of Santa Lucia, December 13th, Anna would give small presents of candy and sweets to her two daughters just as she had received when she was small.

Anna’s face lit up as she explained how much her daughters enjoyed observing Santa Lucia’s Day. Her reaction made it clear that bringing this cultural tradition to her family gave her a sense of agency and demonstrated, as well, the important role that she plays within her family. Within her social scene di Leonardo also found that the maintenance of tradition fell under the umbrella of “kin-work”: “...life histories revealed that often the very existence of kin contact and holiday celebration depended on the presence of an adult woman in the household” (Leonardo 1997, 342). It seems that in addition to maintaining Italian traditions in her American home, Anna works to keep her Italian family a relevant part of her life through yearly visits to Verona and regular phone contact. In terms of this understanding of “kin work” it seems that Anna’s “hybrid” cultural identity has worked to define the home she has made for her family. When asked how she views herself as a mother. She explained, “I raised my children Italian.” Sitting with Anna near the fire, I looked over at a mantel full of family photos above which
hang stylized posters of Venice and Rome. One can easily understand how her home and even her children are defined by her memories of Italy.

“I’ve seen so many changes”

As is the case for all immigrants, first generation Italian-Americans must work to assimilate to life in the U.S. The generations that follow continue the aspiration of creating a better life for their children than the one that they have experienced. While this value of giving your children the things you didn’t have is not unique to Italian-Americans it certainly affects Italian-American communities in a dynamic way. As women of my great aunts generation worked most of their lives to provide more comfortable lifestyles for their children they removed social elements such as poverty that defined their own lived experiences. Generational changes within families and the larger social effects of modernity together have caused a strong shift in perceptions of Italian-American communities and the individual’s involvement in those communities.

Even though my great grandfather passed away about 40 years ago, Celeste still recalls him saying “I’ve seen so many changes” quite often toward the end of his life. It seems that the social shifts my grandfather witnessed during his lifetime were quite extreme. From a poor boy in rural southern Italy to a homeowner in Jersey City my great grandfather likely saw many dramatic changes, including the unique cultural differences between himself and his children. This generational shift that seems engrained in the hyphen between Italian and American is expressed from a mother’s perspective in Janet Zandy’s poem “My Children’s Names.” She writes:

My children have heavy names; Thick sliced, roped and braided names; Old world names; Names reeking of steamer ships; close quarters, and shadows; Names of heavy black cloth; and stiff, sweaty secret.

My children want names that climb; and cling to the sun; Diaphanous names; Clear pool, clubs, and right-school names; Names whose sails billow out; White and clean names; American names; Names that sound like something you buy. (Zandy 2002:64)

Within this quote Zandy works to express the emotions a mother feels as her children begin to adhere to different social values than she has. She sets up a dichotomy between Italian and American cultures through contrasting sentiments like “have heavy names” and “want names that climb.” Through her use of weight-related images Zandy allows the reader to understand the burden Italian identity can carry and the relative ease American identity appears to bestow in contrast.

Sentiments regarding the lives of my great aunt’s children in comparison to their own appear as a testimony to Zandy’s poem. When I asked Celeste what differences she saw between her own childhood and the upbringing her children had her response was peppered with phrases like “(they) didn’t have any hardships” and “it was a big improvement.” Rose mirrored these ideas in her own reaction as she explained the generational differences with sentiments like “they had more
freedom” and “more material things.” While Rose remarked on how different things were for her children she was quick is note that they were raised with the “same values” as she was. She explained that she always “stressed education” to her kids, a value that was no doubt resulted from her parents’ determination to get ahead. It seems that as time goes on the social weight that Italian identity once carried in the U.S has lessened. As a result, it is the work of the memory-keepers to remind each following generations of the work it takes to maintain the lives that previous generations worked for us to have.

In the spring of 2008 I conducted an interview with my only Asheville participant, who for privacy purposes I will be calling “John.” Coming from a later generation than my other participants John was able to provide a different perspective on the Italian-American community. John grew up in Long Island City, New York, an area very similar to the one in which my older informants were raised. During our interview John described his childhood home as an “Italian neighborhood with no outside to it. I had no sense of a world outside of this little bubble where I lived...(the area was) mostly working class Italian migrants who spoke Italian ...a lot of the social habits and traditions were rooted in the Italian household as it was.” It seems that John never questioned these ideas because they were the norm. Only when John moved out of his mostly Italian neighborhood did he begin to see that the way he grew up was not necessarily a common experience. He described the move as a “culture shock” that made him realize that he actually enjoyed living in a community where he could have a little more autonomy. In his late teens John began to feel “claustrophobic” within his close-knit family. He explained “It was hard for me to find my own way, my family tried to keep a tight hold...but it’s not all bad, there is something wonderful about their desire to stay together but it can be very oppressive and that is what made it essential for me to make that break.” For John, and perhaps others of his generation, the value of “staying together” held by those who shared the travails of the Great Depression is no longer such a desirable goal.

While generational changes work to influence different opinions about Italian-American communities and the value systems within them, they also shift the ways in which roles, such as memory-keeper, are maintained. For the women of my great grandmother’s and even great aunts’ generations the role of memory-keeper defined a personal agency that was denied to them in other realms of society. In Ann Cornelissen’s work Women of the Shadows: A Study of the Wives and Mothers of Southern Italy, the author provides an historical perspective of the role of memory-keeper within her rural Southern Italian social scene in the mid to late 1950s. Cornelisen explains,

The women know how to sign their own names, but in any practical sense they are illiterate. Fortunately they have encyclopedic memories. I asked Chichella once how they could remember everything, dates, names, what places looked like and what people said. She gave me a little half-smile, not of self-pity, but of apology and said: ‘That’s all we have.’ They are willing to share it. (Cornelisen 2001: 29)
This quotation emphasizes the fact that in past generations the role of memory-keeper provided one of the only avenues for female agency. Yet even as women of today experience more agency in other realms of their lives the role of memory-keeper is still valued and actively continued. Michaela di Leonardo explains how contemporary Italian-American women carry on “kin work.” “These younger women, though, have added a professional and detailed interest in their jobs to a felt responsibility for the work of kinship...Taking on or ceding tasks was clearly related to acquiring or divesting oneself of power within kin networks, but women varied in their interpretation of the meaning of this power” (di Leonardo 1997:343). Within this sentiment di Leonardo clarifies the process through which “kin work” responsibilities are passed on within “kin networks” and emphasizes that while some women may not perceive the role in terms of gaining agency they still incorporate it into their lives. Through this perspective one can see that while generations of women may perceive the role of memory-keeper differently today, it is still a valued position especially among women who can remember a time when it gave them agency in otherwise disempowering times.

**Giving a “Voice” to the “Voiceless”**

As I began to analyze how the act of remembering defined the role my participants played within their families it became clear that this theme was also present in the Italian-American literature I had been reading. Through this deconstruction of the link between memory and agency it becomes clear that modern Italian-American female authors are able to gain personal and social empowerment by explaining their cultural experiences. Edvige Giunta explains the dynamic way this group of authors is able to use memory. “A self-awareness of the ways in which women have not been allowed full use of their voices underscores the memoirs of Italian-American women. What shapes their project of ethnic recovery is a political, feminist consciousness...” (Giunta 2002:125). The author goes on to explain that current Italian-American authors are “a group of writers who have found in the memoir the means by which to re-read and rewrite not only their lives, but also their cultural history” (Giunta 2002:125). Through writing many female Italian-American authors are able to give agency to the generations of women before them. The ability to form a cultural dialog for and about women who in the past were socially disempowered allows for a new conception of feminine identities. It seems clear that this process can be extremely empowering for authors. Giunta uses a quote from author Edward Said’s work *Representations of the Intellectual* to explain the personal agency that modern Italian-American authors gain through deconstructing cultural memories. “Looking back to the past, then, while ‘beset with half-involvement and half-detachments, nostalgic and sentimental on one level, and adept mimic or secret outcast on another’” (Said, in Giunta 2002:137). Giunta goes on to explain how this “paves the way for a future in which the voiceless can learn to transform their own silence into language and action” (Giunta 2002:137). Through this conceptualization one can see that contemporary Italian-American female scholars are able to continue the traditions of memory-keeping and spread cultural narratives to wider audiences.
Conclusion: “What was important was that we were all paisan”

As the narratives of my participants show, the language and values of the old country are extremely important to those new to this country because they contribute so significantly to an immigrant’s sense of identity. It is clear, in turn, that the values of the new country also shape the way in which many of these recent arrivals create homes and communities for themselves. As they cultivate these new spaces and identities, first- and even second-generation Italians tend to put regional differences aside and come together under a unified ethnic status. My grandpa describes this value of solidarity by simply stating “what was important was that we were all paisan (countrymen).”

However, as time passes and new generations are born in America it stands to reason that this Italian identity will shift to an Italian-American identity. It is this cultural shift that makes the value of memory so vital. Memory of traditions is what keeps the identity distinct and ensures that the “Italian” piece of “Italian-American” won’t disappear. It seems clear that as time goes on Italian-American communities will continue to influence American society and in turn will be influenced by the culture around them. The persistence of this dynamic process of “splitting and joining, blending but not melting, absorbing but not assimilating” will make continued study of these communities all the more fascinating. The Italian-American memory-keeping women can take a large amount of credit for the prominent place that their community plays in the consciousness of broader American culture.

References Cited

Caschetta, Mary Beth

Cornelisen, Ann

Di Leonardo, Michaela

Narayan, Karin

Giunta, Edvige

Zandy, Janet
How Memory Affects Sense of Self: Stories of Traumatic Brain Injury

Leah Smith
University of North Carolina at Asheville

How does memory affect sense of self? For traumatic brain injury (TBI) survivors, memory has a large impact on sense of self. Some cannot remember who they were before the injury and have to rely on others’ memories or photographs to reinvent their sense of self. Others can remember who they were before the accident, but feel they are vastly different than their old self. How do TBI survivors negotiate reconstructing identities and sense of self when memories play a disconnecting role? Through this process, storytelling can help survivors recreate a sense of self that is more continuous and also empower them in educating others about their experience and decreasing stigma.

Introduction

When you think about who you are, do you think about all the things you do? Do you think about the people that you love, or the feelings you have experienced in your life? For most of us, these ideas guide us in thinking about our sense of self. For many traumatic brain injury (TBI) survivors, thinking about who they are may be more of a comparative question. They compare who they used to be before injury, what they used to do, or how they used to feel, with their lives now, life after their “second birthday,” as one survivor I interviewed called the day of her injury. Many survivors don’t know whether to think of themselves in terms of before or after injury, when many times these two time frames seem very incongruent. Loss of self is commonly described “in relation to pre- to post-injury comparison, loss of self in the eyes of others, and discontinuity of identity through lost or disrupted memories” (Dewar and Fergus 2007:603).

Many survivors wonder if they will ever make their way back to their “old self” or if they are going to be forever different. Jennings explains this journey as an act of “reminding.” He explains this concept,

First, I mean reminding in the ordinary sense of recalling to mind something that has been forgotten. In TBI rehabilitation, the person’s memory of past
activities is (to some extent) restored. But it is also ‘re-minding’ in the more radical sense of reconstructing the subject, the person. Is this the reconstruction of the person who was, or the fashioning of a new person who has never been? A false dichotomy surely, but how are we to describe what lies between? (Jennings 2006:30)

Medical ethicist William May (1991) asserts that memory both creates continuity with the past while distancing the present from the past. When survivors have memories of the past, the juxtaposition of old memories and current life situation creates uncertainty in self. Through forming and telling their own stories, survivors can explore how they can recreate sense of self in the midst of memories of contrasting life experiences before and after injury.

Doing fieldwork among the Asheville TBI community

To get to know the local TBI community in Asheville, I started attending a monthly support group meeting of the Brian Injury Association of North Carolina (BIANC) as well as weekly visiting Hinds Feet Farm, a new brain injury day program. I learned about TBI through neuropsychology and anthropology classes, and had met a few survivors at a summer camp, but didn’t know any local survivors, so I was really excited to meet with the local group.

Driving over to my first brain injury support group meeting, I was nervous about how the night would turn out and if people would think it was weird that I was coming even though I didn’t have a TBI. But right when I walked in the door, I felt so welcomed. Everyone was so real, honest, funny, and relaxed; you couldn’t help but feel at home. There were five TBI survivors there, along with four of their moms. Everyone had so much to share. People would ask each other, “with your injury, did taste change? And smell?” They were so curious about the subtleties of the differences in their injuries. Karen, an outreach coordinator with BIANC, says that a lot of people with TBI miss the social interaction they used to have. Chances to get together might be limited for some of these people, but the support group seems to be providing a great way to interact with others and also a way to find empathy in shared experiences.

My experience at the Hinds’ Feet Farms day program was a little different. When I came during some free time in the afternoon hours, people were finishing up lunch and playing cards or doing artwork. Unlike the support group meeting, there were no moms there and the people “in charge” (as in the director or physical therapist) were in and out of the room, which might lead the participants to feel more free in their conversations with me. They asked me why I was there, and I told them I was a student studying sociology who was interested in TBI. They all responded pretty much the same way, “Oh, you are here to see if TBI people are retarded or crazy,” something I did not hear at all at the support group meeting. I thought this was an interesting response. Of course, I didn’t really know what to say, except “no... you know that is not why I am here.” They seemed like they were kidding, but I had to wonder if they really were.
I wonder if these responses are pointing to an underlying notion, that these brain injury survivors at the day program think people really do see them as crazy now. Some of the people there couldn't walk very well, talked really slow, needed help playing simple card games, and had trouble finding words they wanted to say. Maybe they, the people who answered in this way, feel self conscious about how other people see them now, after their brain injury. Would frequent interactions with people who are uncomfortable talking to you because you talk really slow finally influence you to think of yourself as slow and “retarded”? The stigma with which others view them would certainly have an effect. One survivor I interviewed talked about how people are scared of what they don’t know, afraid of what’s different, and spoke of how this affected how she interacted with people and how she came to view herself through the eyes of others. Charles Horton Cooley, a symbolic interactionist sociologist, describes this phenomenon of seeing yourself reflected through the judgments of others in social interactions (in Wallace and Wolf 1995).

When I met Drew at Hinds’ Feet Farm, he came up to me and introduced himself; he said he hadn’t seen me before. At one point in our conversation, Drew said, “Disabled? Look at me, I am not disabled,” as he did a rap dance move. He said that he has a lot of skill in social interaction. He questioned what “disabled” even really means, which is a question many disability scholars ask. Robert Murphy, a quadriplegic professor, tells a story about receiving the census and encountering a question asking how many disabled people were living in his household. He answered “none,” as he is a professor and earns a living, something that seems to be things that “abled” people do (Murphy 1990).

In addition to attending the support group and day program, I interviewed many people whom I met through these activities, and a few more with other survivors who interviewees connected me with. I interviewed ten people, including eight TBI survivors and two moms, four females and six males. These people were of various ages and had their injuries in various ways, such as car wrecks, bike accidents, and falls. It will be important to remember that I interviewed survivors who are members of social networks1 and will have very different experiences and perspectives than survivors who are isolated in their homes. This might skew these survivors’ stories and views to be more optimistic and hopeful than those who are isolated practical means of socializing with people.

During my conversation with Angela, a TBI survivor who I’ll introduce later, she noted that she was saying “survivor” and not “victim.” I want to follow her lead by using “survivor,” which is more empowering and positive than “victim” which sounds like something to be pitied. We see this when advertisements and fundraising campaigns use words like “killer disease, life ebbing away, before it’s too late” describing the need to help people with different forms of disability (Johnson 2005). These words imply that disability is bad, disgusting, and

1 I met these survivors precisely because of the social networks they were a part of, such as the support group, day program, or other more informal personal connections with the brain injury community.
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something with which you could never have a fulfilling life. Phrases like “confined” to a wheelchair or “save” the people “stricken” with this form of disability perform the same function.

I began my research with the intention of studying people with TBI, as I had heard of groups which are organized around this group specifically. The medical field categorizes brain injuries into either Traumatic Brain Injury, meaning an external force caused the injury, or Acquired Brain Injury (ABI), which involves something internal, such as stroke or brain tumor. As I got deeper into my research, I found there was no fundamental difference between the experiences of TBI and ABI. Michael Paul Mason, a brain injury case manager and author explains it best,

Every brain injury involves trauma, and every brain injury is by some means acquired, but the terms are disparate in medicine... Outside of hospital walls, however, an injured brain is always traumatic, always a TBI. (Mason 2008:70)

Brain injuries are often recorded in medical records as an insult to the brain, insult meaning assault, but implying that the survivor has been “wronged, offended, somehow made less as a result of his injury” (Mason 2008:71). Many survivors may experience these feelings that “insult” implies, feeling degraded or reduced, but at the same time they have the ability to be free of the negative thoughts, thinking instead, “they are not insulted; they are transformed. They are not disabled, but challenged” (Mason 2008:72) In this opposite, positive way of viewing TBI, survivors can lead a life full of love, joy, and variety.

I have come to value storytelling and the empowerment that comes with telling your story and having it heard. Throughout this process of interviewing, I have been excited about giving these survivors space in which to tell their stories. They all seemed eager for this opportunity, for many of the people I interviewed find importance in brain injury advocacy. They feel that with the understanding that comes with advocacy, perceived stigmas are lessened and change can be made.

Barbara A. Hogan, a professor of Sociology, Criminology, and Human Services at Chestnut Hill College, writes about how narrative therapy can help TBI survivors. She says,

In narrative therapies, people are encouraged to name their own problems and to participate in therapy as authors who write/ tell stories rather than solely as “patients” about whom reports are written. They engage with therapists in a process of co-authoring new narratives characterized by themes of their capacities for agency (power, achievement) and communion (interdependence, care) (Hogan 1999:22).

Hogan shares one story about co-authoring a book with a TBI survivor Jeff. While Hogan can’t answer Jeff’s questions about why he is alive, she can validate the questioner. She can be a witness to Jeff’s journey, legitimating, validating, and understanding his experience. She says Jeff “has the potential to claim an identity
as an author not just of a book but an author of his own life from which he has felt quite alienated” (Hogan 1999:24) He wants the people who he shares his story with to be a part of a “mutual process” of education about health, identity, and rehabilitation can mean for TBI survivors.

Psychologists McAdams, Josselson, and Lieblich, in their book “Identity and Story: Creating Self in Narrative,” explore how the construction of a self-defining life story can be a critical part of exploring identity questions such as “who am I?” and “How do I fit into the world?” They continue,

> Internalized and evolving life stories—what we call narrative identities—function to organize and make more or less coherent a whole life, a life that otherwise might feel fragmented and diffuse” (McAdams, Josselson, and Lieblich 2006:5)

When TBI survivors feel like their identity is disconnected between life before and life after injury, stories may not only help educate others about their experiences, but help themselves construct a more continuous image of identity throughout their lives. Psychology professors and writers of “Storied Lives: The Cultural Politics of Self-Understanding” believe that the stories people tell of themselves are remarkable for the explicit scenes and stories that are shared, but also for the production of the stories themselves.

> How individuals recount their histories—what they emphasize and omit, their stance as protagonists or victims, the relationship the story establishes between teller and audience—all shape what individuals can claim of their own lives. Personal stories are not merely a way of telling someone (or oneself) about one’s life; they are the means by which identities may be fashioned. It is this formative—and sometimes deformative—power of stories that makes them important. (Ochberg and Rosenwald 1992:1)

Through stories, survivors can defeat negative perceptions of the “insult” to their brain and create empowering, hopeful, and fulfilling life narratives.

I have the chance to put these many stories together into a more powerful unified story, which is a great advocacy opportunity. I am nervous though about how I have represented these people and their experiences. Images I paint, words I choose to include or leave out, and how I analyze these words will affect how readers see these people and think about brain injury. I want to try to use the voices of survivors as much as possible to really make it their stories.

**Trying to Remember**

For some survivors, their brain injuries were not immediately obvious. Some may have had a car wreck and walked away from it thinking they just had a few bruises, though a few weeks later they may notice symptoms, like a numb arm, memory issues, or differences in emotions. At this point, they may go to the doctor
and find out they had a TBI. But many of the survivors I interviewed were in a coma for some period of time after their injury, from a few weeks to many months. Waking up from a coma is not a sudden occurrence, but a long process of slowly making sense of your environment, of where you are, why you are there. This is when survivors slowly begin to look around, try to move their body parts, start rehabilitation therapies which involve learning how to swallow, talk, walk, and think. This is also when survivors try to remember their lives and figure out who they are.

“remembering my life by how other people remember me:” on not remembering. Angela was the vice president of a big PR firm in New York City. She had recently married Rich, the love of her life, who was also a vice president of another company. She was in the middle of planning a $200,000 event and didn’t feel like going to a Yankees game, but her friends convinced her to go. She was driving home from the game with her husband when their car was hit by a USPS truck. Rich died instantly. Angela was left with many injuries, including a left frontal hemorrhage, a right parietal contusion, many fractures including ribs and her C1 vertebrae, the most serious of the injuries. She told me if C1 fracture isn’t stabilized within five minutes, you die or become completely paralyzed. But because she was in New York City, she was air lifted to the hospital and stabilized within five minutes, something Angela refers to as the first of many miracles.

When Angela woke from her coma, she didn’t know what had happened. After a few months she started to piece things together and started asking about her husband. Her family had to tell her that her husband had died instantly in the car wreck. She couldn’t remember who she was before the accident. She didn’t know how far she would recover. She didn’t know if she would be able to walk or have a job again.

I first heard Angela speak about her experience at a TBI panel at UNC Asheville. I recently reconnected with her at a brain injury support group meeting, where we decided to meet again for an interview. The following week, Angela and I walked into a beautiful coffee shop in downtown Hendersonville full of wonderful fragrances of coffee and scones. We sat sipping our hot teas and continued the energetic conversation we were having ever since we met up an hour earlier at her home. Looking around at the antique furniture and fancy mirrors that filled the café, Angela describes remembering who she was through other people’s memories,

I don’t know how accurate that is. It’s really scary to think about. But I’m remembering my life by how other people remember me. But fortunately it’s pretty good memories. Apparently I was very nice, I was a good mentor. I mean when I first came to NC, I was being reminded ‘oh you mentored kids you volunteered all the time.’ I was like ‘really? Golly, I was a pretty good person, am a pretty good person. That’s a terrible. I quickly broke that habit of referring to myself in the past tense because I am a good person. I am a volunteer. It was a bad habit that I got into, but I broke that habit (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).
Angela acknowledges the strange experience of relying on others to create a sense of self. She doesn’t know if this is a reliable way to find out about herself, but apart from reading her old journals and looking at old pictures, she doesn’t have many other options. She jokes about telling one of her friends that this would be a good time to tell her she did some extraordinary thing, like climb Mt. Everest, because Angela would have to believe it. She also talks about herself in past tense then immediately corrects herself to use present tense. She has a disconnected sense of self which she is slowly but very intentionally trying to make continuous.

Just as she doesn’t remember herself, Angela doesn’t remember her husband Rich. She remembers how they met through how it’s been recounted to her, though she says she does remember pieces of it. She stumbled upon an online photo journal of their life together, which she has carefully poured over, trying with all her might to remember him. She has viewed Rich as her guardian angel throughout her recovery process, even though she doesn’t remember him. She talks to him all the time, praying to him, talking to God through him. She remembers him through photographs but doesn’t remember

Things like what side of the bed did he sleep on, what was his favorite meal, what did he love most about me. I actually don’t remember much about when we met, how did we meet, where was our first date. That’s the stuff that I’m praying that will come back when he thinks I’m ready, when Rich thinks that my recovery is coming far enough, because I think Rich knows that a recovery would be harder and slower if I had a broken heart, and so when he thinks I’m ready, I’ll remember(Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

Angela is grateful for the ways she has of remembering him, but mourns the loss of the personal information she alone used to know about Rich. Angela refers to her guardian angel Rich’s keeping these memories away from her as the “brain’s unique and powerful ability to protect itself and to heal (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009)” When Rich thinks she is ready, she will remember.

How do you create a new sense of self if you don’t remember who you used to be, or roles you used to play, such as wife and lover? Michael Paul Mason says “Most of what we consider essential depends on memory. We carry a host of suppositions about what it means to be human, but without access to our memories, our notions surrounding identity begin to crumble”(Mason 2008:47). How does Angela begin to put together an integrated picture of who she is? She would wonder “if you asked my friends ‘how am I the same or different?’ what they’d say, I really don’t know. Am I more short tempered, more irrational? These are things that cross my mind all the time” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009). She clearly thinks about how she might have changed since the accident, but to be optimistic and hopeful, she doesn’t want to think about it too much.

“How did I wake up in bed?” the process of remembering. Drew and I had been talking about doing an interview for a few weeks. Finally we decided to meet up at a Jamaican place downtown for dinner. I had picked it because I thought it
would be a quiet place to have an interview, my first formal recorded interview this semester. We get there, and we are the only people in the entire restaurant. Our waiter’s only customers, we are getting his full undivided attention. And in between our interactions with the waiter, it is just too quiet for an interview. So I eat my calooloo as Drew eats his ribs, jerk sauce everywhere. We decide to have the interview after dinner.

We walk around downtown looking for a quiet place and we just can’t find one that suits us. I suggest driving to UNC Asheville and finding a quiet room in the student union. Of course when we get there, the whole place is packed, students everywhere, not a single free room. Living off campus, I forget that other people still do live on campus, and actually hang out at the student union. Yet we roam around the building and finally decide to sit on some couches in the open and have the interview. I am wondering if I have been stalling this whole time. But here we sit.

I start off very vague and general, “tell me about your injury, this is your space, to say whatever it is you need to say” and after a bit of back and forth, the ball finally starts rolling. Drew described his injury, falling off a fifteen foot retaining wall, being in a coma for two months, and finally waking up. He just “kind of woke up in bed and it’s not like I didn’t really have any questions because, I mean, I was like an infant so you don’t really have a question, like ‘why am I here?’ because I was kind of born again and what not” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009). He says you’re not going to say anything about it because you don’t know anything else. Only with time was he able to form questions to make sense of his being in the hospital.

Angela’s doctor told her many survivors might not remember events that happened in what is called an amnesiac window, a period one year before the accident and one year after. Diane Chamberlain, a nurse and critical care studies lecturer, led a study which found that survivors “relied heavily on their carers for recovery narrative expression. The carer was used to transform and reflect narratives in a sometimes desperate relationship bound by complex trust and interdependence” (Chamberlain 2006:413-414) Drew depended on his family to tell him what happened during the period he couldn’t, and still can’t, remember. I asked him about how he was treated in the hospitals and rehabs, and he can just tell me what has been told to him.

**Remembering and Negotiating the Differences**

As we have seen, recovering memories from the past can be a process. For some TBI survivors, certain, or even all, long term memories don’t come back. But for most, long term memory stays intact while short term memory is weakened. Feminist philosopher and brain injury survivor Kate Lindemann says that for these survivors with good long term memory, “Childhood holiday celebrations, teenage adventures, and former professional triumphs can still be recalled as vividly as ever, and they often present a stark contrast to one’s present situation” (Lindemann 2001:110) Having memories of the past and realizing how different these memories
are from the current moment can be very troubling to a TBI survivor. Who are you, if you used to define yourself by something that you no longer have, something you’ve lost, or something you have now rejected? How do you negotiate sense of self with such critical differences in identity?

“you were always such a happy little boy:” memories of moods and personality. While at work on June 28, 2006, Frank was walking down the halls of the television news broadcasting studio, lost consciousness, and fell. He has no recollection of the event. Seven days later he was able to listen and digest what happened and why he was in the hospital. He learned he had a subdural hematoma, meaning a piece of bone inside his skull, above his left ear, splintered out and clipped an artery inside his head, causing extensive internal bleeding. He says he is literally lucky to be alive, thanks to the speed at which he was taken to a hospital and operated on.

Like Angela, I first heard Frank speak at the TBI panel at UNC Asheville, and it was through Angela that I connected with him again. Frank and I decided to meet to have an interview. Frank enters the library, tall in his Grateful Dead sweatshirt and coordinating Grateful Dead T-shirt underneath. We walk downstairs to have our interview.

Frank tells me he hasn’t had any physical impairments from his injury, but has had experienced immense emotional changes. After his injury, Frank was diagnosed with bipolar disorder. With this, he is now either really manic or depressed, never in the middle. When he is manic, he is “sometimes way too energetic and chatty” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009). On this day at the library, he tells me he was probably on the manic side, because he was pretty chatty, and brought water with him because he thought he would be chatty and knew his throat would get dry. This was good on this day, since we were having a conversation about TBI, though other times, his mania can be way too much. In reflecting about his depressive times, he says,

I’m really not happy anymore. Like I said, at the depressive times, nothing is funny. I don’t want to watch any kind of movie. I don’t want to read anything. Nothing is funny. And what I’ve noticed is that I can be amused now, when I’m not depressed, I can be amused. So I can read a joke or look at a cartoon in the New Yorker and start to laugh. Or I can watch a comedy on TV or movie and laugh at moments, but I’m not happy, I’m humored. Happiness went away, and what I need to try to do at some point, or I’m hoping it just does itself, is for happiness to come back. Because like Jean [his sister] says, ‘you were always such a happy little boy.’ And I turned into being a happy adult. And this thing that happened in June of ‘06 has taken the happiness away (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

Frank shows real remorse in this loss of happiness in his life, something that used to define who he was.

Ten years ago, Dora was a college student at home on break when she got into a car wreck. She doesn’t know what happened. She was going through a curve near
her house, something happened, and her car did a 180. The side of her car hit a tree, and the car “crumpled in around it” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009). She was airlifted to the hospital and was in a coma for fifteen days. She stayed at the hospital for four weeks and then spent another five weeks in a different hospital for in patient therapy. She learned that in the wreck, she had gotten brain shears. The doctors explained to her that brains are like jello, and skulls are like bowls. So when you knock a bowl of jello into a wall, it jiggles and slits are created throughout the jello. Her skull didn’t break but her brain was agitated and sheared, bruised in a couple different areas. All the slits had to reroute and the doctors told her parents that Dora would never be the same person from then on, that things might be similar, but that she would need 50% help with everything forever.

I first met Dora at the brain injury support group meeting. We met the next week at Earthfare and sat at a small table in the café. To start off our conversation, I asked Dora, a beautiful, soft spoken, Southern woman in her thirties, to tell me about herself. The very first thing she tells me is:

Before the accident, I was very outgoing. I was very. . . I was a happy person. I had problems just like anybody else, I was generally happy and I was fun. I was really fun to be around. I was jokin’, I mean I was shy to a degree but I was really a lot funner I think (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

This reflection must hold such significant weight for Dora since this was the very first thing she tells me and also a theme she keeps referring to throughout the interview. She could have started off by telling me about who she is now or by describing her accident, but no, she tells me about who she was before. Later, she says, “I didn’t have a personality, it was gone. I remember I was this fun person, I don’t know what to do to get that back” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009). Another phrase she uses a lot was “it’s tough.” It’s tough trying to get your personality back. It’s tough not knowing how far to expect to recover. It’s tough to have people be afraid to interact with you because they don’t understand TBI. Dora says, “it bothers you, here you are a different person, but you’re the same person, you look the same...” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

Dora says it is “hard to get back in the swing of things, back socially where you were, it’s just tough, because you’re trying to figure out who you are now” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009). After her injury, she didn’t have much to say to her friends. When her friends would call her on the phone, they “wouldn’t get very far,” Dora would just “sit there.” She said this is when her friends began the three way calls. This way, “at least they could talk to each other when I was on

2 Many of my participants have mentioned doctors telling them or their families that they would not get much better or that they wouldn’t be themselves ever again. Dora thinks doctors might do this because they don’t want to give false hope, since every brain injury survivor is different and recovers differently and to different functioning levels. However, some participants feel that doctors should do a better job of encouraging and fostering hope.
the phone. Because I wouldn’t talk much. And I still don’t talk much” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009). Dora clearly had many friends who knew her as this fun person, and she has had to recreate her sense of self, through the looking glass. Her friends put her on three way because she does not talk, and that is reflected back to her, and she uses the information to change the way she sees herself, as a less talkative, less fun person.

In remembering their former selves as happy or fun people, there is a sense of regret or sorrow at the loss of these pieces of themselves. Both Frank and Dora seem desperate to find their ways back to being fun or being happy.

“because I was very tied to what I did:” memories of activities of daily living. One day while he was mountain biking, Joe, a very enthusiastic, optimistic, engaging man, flipped over his handlebars and had a mild traumatic brain injury. Luckily, he was wearing a helmet, so his injury wasn’t worse. He found a brain injury day program to attend in New England, and finally got to go back to school for therapeutic recreation. He has recently moved to Asheville to work part time at the new day program for brain injury survivors called Hinds Feet Farms. We met at the library to talk about his experience with brain injury.

Joe used to train with other cyclists on the coasts of New Hampshire. The cyclist in front, the leader, has to put the most energy in, and the rest in back work off the leaders’ energy and don’t have to work as hard. Leaders rotate so everyone shares the energy load. The first time he practiced with this group again after his injury, he describes being the leader as they crossed over a bridge. He looked down from the bridge and saw a seal, which amazed him, and caused him to lose his speed. When the group stopped for a rest, all the guys asked him what happened on the bridge, implicitly referring to the time in which he lost speed. With excitement, Joe told his friends, “I saw a seal and it was the neatest thing!” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009). They immediately started “whopping” him with their hats and scolding him for slowing down. He realized,

Oh my God, racing is more important than the seal. Ha, and honestly before my injury I would have never noticed the seal there. But I started to realize, okay, I’m viewing the world differently and so I would like to be appreciated for the way I view the world instead of stomped on because I saw something that I felt good about. (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009)

So Joe stepped down from the competitive activities that used to be so central to his life before. With this decision, “a lot of old friends became old gone friends” since they no longer had mutual interests.

After his injury, he feels that he has become not only less competitive, but more understanding, compassionate, and patient. He says that “most of us men” don’t get it, but that women have more of “a flexibility, an understanding, a way of listening,” all of which are benefits in his opinion. He feels that male TBI survivors have more of these listening, compassionate qualities, qualities that he truly values. These traits produce a community of acceptance, support, and cooperation instead
of individualized competition. He says, “For the most part in our country, you’re number one, stand alone. Do it yourself. That’s our culture although that becomes a very difficult scenario to play out successfully with the brain injury population.” He thinks that a healthier society would be one with a more “collective consciousness” idea, a phrase he emphasized throughout our conversation.

Frank has also experienced dramatic changes in his daily activities since his injury. Frank spent his entire career in broadcast television. He started in 1979 and says he knows nothing else. Most of his passion and energy was focused at work, where he has played many roles over the years, including reporter, anchor, and news director. He thrived in that fast paced, short deadline, high pressure workplace, the same factors that can challenge a TBI survivor. He says these factors can bring “a certain craziness, if you will, to what I did for a living, but there was no depression in my life. To a certain extent, I wouldn’t call it mania, but it’s a manic job anyway.” For Frank, his job was

This thing that I had that drove the financial part of my life, as well as, you know, what you referred to as identity. That’s a good way to put it, because I was very tied to what I did. I had a family and friends and a social life which I liked but that was really just Saturday and Sunday. Monday through Friday it was just go, go, go, this is what I do, this is how I live (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

Like Joe, Frank expressed struggle in identity due to difference of daily life and activities. For Joe, we see this with athletic activities; for Frank, it is his work. Now with his TBI and bipolar diagnosis, Frank does not consider himself a reliable employee. He says, “with the mania and the depression, I’m pretty unpredictable, its not like I have any choice really. And when you’re like that, I have serious doubts about what I’d be able to offer to an employer.” On days when he is depressed, he does not want to talk to anyone or do anything. He struggles about what he would do on these days if he were employed, knowing he shouldn’t call in sick because he isn’t physically ill, but wonders about what an alternative would be. To be fair to potential employers, Frank says he has to understand that he really can’t make that kind of commitment. Even in a more manic mood, he might be flying all over the place, like a whirlwind, or have filtering issues, something common to many TBI survivors, which could cause confrontational problems in the workplace.

Frank has tried to go back to work twice since his injury. The first time everyone around him (family, friends, coworkers) did not think it was a good idea. But he insisted, so they let him try, and he quickly realized that they were right, he was not ready for work. He said he was “trying and trying and it just got to be too much” and so he had to ask for more time. When he came back for a second try, he was again unsuccessful. On top of this, he thinks news stations don’t want fifty three year olds, but the “completely inverse reality”—they’re looking for thirty five year old people. Frank also thinks and that it would be “difficult, perhaps unattainable, perhaps impossible” to retrain now. He isn’t trying to “wah wah wah, cry or anything” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009) but really questions his
ability to work, either in his own field or another.

For Joe and Frank, these activities were crucial to their identities. Being outdoors, physically active, and competitive were a large part of Joe’s life. Frank’s work was the master status of his life before his injury, something that defined him and energized him. In Chamberlain’s study, “Men frequently commented about employment and how their identity was well-established in what they did for work. Employment difficulties seemed to affect their self-esteem and hinder their ability to recover” (Chamberlain 2006:413). With Joe’s change in priorities and activities, and Frank’s loss of being able to work, how can these individuals reconstruct or re-imagine their sense of selves to include these differences?

Reconstructing a Sense of Self

“my brain is that impaired:” cognitive differences. Kate Lindemann illustrates the struggle to find a sense of self with a changing way of thinking and processing information about the world. She describes a fifty year old woman who used to be a highly verbal thinker, but who, now after a stroke, cannot think in words anymore. How does she find a sense of self now? Lindemann elaborates,

The person with adult-onset brain injury, however, has had an identity that included certain styles of thought, certain ways of processing information that are now flawed or missing. She may learn coping skills for these deficits or she may abandon tasks that are no longer possible, but she also deals with the fact that her ‘own mind is now like a stranger’ (Lindemann 2001:110).

Angela, like most TBI survivors, went to many kinds of therapy as a part of her rehabilitation program. She went to a physical therapist, occupational therapist, and speech therapist. She really admires her speech therapist, who Angela thinks had the hardest job, basically to help Angela “use her brain again.” The therapist helped Angela with her attention, focus, and cognition. Angela told me, “you can’t imagine what it’s like to not be able to use your brain. When you use it your whole life. I couldn’t use it” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

Angela illustrates her issues with short term memory with an example. One day she called someone and was put on hold, so while she waited she checked a few emails on her laptop. While reading an email, Angela realized,

Oh my God, I’m on the phone! I couldn’t remember who I was on the phone with, what we were talking about, I had no idea. And that was when I realized, this is terrifying. My brain is that impaired. I have that much work ahead of me (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

Unlike most survivors, Angela also went to a developmental psychologist as a part of her therapies. Most survivors don’t get much official help in learning how to navigate social situations, they have to find ways to practice social skills on their
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own, like through support groups. After her injury, Angela says she was being treated like a child because she was "very much behaving like one." She used to be a very social person, as any VP of a PR firm would be. But now she had trouble walking into a room full of people and knowing what to do. She didn’t know how to turn the focus away from her in a conversation. So her developmental psychologist would help her come up with strategies for these situations and help her start to think like she used to.

Bryce, a passionate brain injury survivor and advocate, also speaks about differences in cognition. He views his pre-injury self and his post-injury self as very different people. Since his injury, he has experienced drastic differences in his decision making, having to negotiate between the two selves, asking each what they want to do. Bryce shared the story of his experience with the Story Corps project, explaining it as:

Every time I approach a decision to make, I have before-car-wreck-adrenaline-junkie-Bryce and then I have the more reasonable, let’s-figure-it-out-Bryce. And every time I make a decision I have to have a committee hearing. My favorite analogy is: I’m out at a swimming hole and I ask myself, ‘What do you want to do, pre-car-wreck-Bryce?’ ‘Well I want to go to the top of that waterfall and dive from the top of that rock.’ ‘What do you wanna do post-car-wreck Bryce?’ ‘I’m happy sunbathing on the beach.’ ‘And I have to mediate between the two sides of myself, so I go halfway up the rock and jump in feet first. It’s not that this isn’t something that everyone goes through. It just seems that much more dramatic to me. On top of the patience that I have with myself, I accrue the debt of patience or lack of patience from society (Story Corps 2009).

Bryce also now has issues with short term memory and sequential thinking. Kate Lindemann speaks to the troubles survivors have with storing new memories. She asks how someone can create “a new sense of when new experiences are not codified and stored?” She continues, “If I can only remember myself pre-trauma and have little memory of what I have done post-trauma, how do I reconstruct an identity?”(Lindemann 2001:110).

Short term memory issues are common to many TBI survivors. After I met Drew, we decided that we would go contra dancing together. A carload of my friends and I picked him up and we drove to Warren Wilson College for the dance. In the car, everyone introduced themselves to Drew, and within minutes, he kept having trouble remembering names. Everyone laughed like it was funny, but fifteen minutes later, as we were parking, after a whole car ride of name games, he still could not remember any of the names. During the dance, he asked me my name again. He had called me for a ride, so I had assumed he would remember my name, but this made me realize the full extent of his short term memory problems.

Drew says forgetfulness is his biggest downfall. Memory loss inflicts a devastating blow to a survivor’s “sense of continuous identity, severely limiting his ability to articulate a stable narrative account of himself”(Eakin 2001:120). People
have expectations of you remembering names after a certain point, and if you don’t remember, you must be lazy or not interested in the person enough to remember a name. For a social person like Drew, how does this affect sense of self?

the “sticky situation:” the (in)visibility of TBI. For some survivors, TBI is a noticeable disability. Survivors may walk slowly, talk slowly, have scars from their surgeries, or have double vision which might cause their eyes to go in different directions. For some, these features stay with the survivor for long periods of time, maybe for the rest of their lives. For other survivors, with time and therapies, these features slowly disappear, and their TBI becomes an invisible disability. Chamberlain describes this invisibility of TBI and how it affects survivors’ sense of self,

TBI disability was integral to their being (and self). One of the difficulties encountered with constructing reality was the invisible nature of TBI disability. The construction of the recovering self required reflection and comparison with what resembled being normal, yet subsisting with an invisible disability made that process exigent (Chamberlain 2006:414).

Dora struggles with the invisibility of her disability. Most of Dora’s friends say that she is the same person from before her car wreck. She looks the same, which made it hard for them to fully understand how she had changed. Only Dora and her mom, who has been with her truly throughout the entire process, really understand the change. When she got back to college, she would try to hang out with her friends just like she used to, and she would notice how different she was. She says,

My friends had a hard time. Still my friends will say, there’s nothing wrong with you, you’re exactly the same, there’s nothing wrong with you, you might’ve had a brain injury but you are the exact same person. Well, no I’m not. And it is so hard. Some of my friends still don’t get that, some of my friends still think I am the same person (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

Frank’s disability is also invisible and like Dora, his friends don’t see any difference after his injury. The people he is closest to, his wife, sister, and daughter, see the differences clearly, subtle differences that sometimes Frank himself doesn’t necessarily notice. But in general, Frank is very aware of the striking differences he experiences every day. He says,

Traumatic brain injury is a really sticky situation, especially my situation. Because, once again, you know, people look at me, and it’s like ‘wow, he’s in good shape. Physically, he looks terrific, and he can talk, and you know all that other stuff (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).
Not only do friends, coworkers, and other acquaintances not notice his disability, insurance companies don’t recognize it either. He says if he was in a wheelchair or had fallen off a ladder and hurt his back, his disability would be more definable.

Frank says that insurance companies in general don’t like to pay on those disabilities that aren’t obvious. Because of this, he has had to fight to prove his disability by having interviews and tests from doctors and hiring an attorney to put together case law appeals. He is happy he isn’t in a wheelchair, but he does have a disability. And at a time when he is trying to figure out who he is and how he has changed, he has to battle this system of bureaucracy that doesn’t help with his stress, anxiety, and general well being.

The effect of the apparent invisibility of both Frank and Dora’s disability make it hard for others to understand the full affects of their experiences with TBI. Frank has had a lot of problems fighting insurance companies due to this very reason.

“I’m gonna be fun again:” reimagining self. In Chamberlain’s study, “Twenty six of the fifty nine informants presented themselves as being on their way back to their old selves ‘before injury’”(Chamberlain 2006:413). Many survivors are told they will never get back to where they used to be, they’ll never be their old selves again. Many crave to be back to their old selves though they don’t know how reasonable it is to hope for it. Many have to reconstruct a new identity, one that combines aspects of their self, old and new.

Being a TBI survivor has become a critical part of Frank’s identity. He describes how he is reminded of this every morning when he wakes up,

Every day since that day in June when I got my where-with-all back I have woken up in the morning and the first thing I think is ‘I’m a TBI survivor.’ Every morning that’s the first thing you think and it bugs the hell out of you. I want to wake up one morning and think of something else. But I can’t. My guess at this point, more than three years later, is that I never will. And that might not sound like a big deal to some people but it bugs the hell out of you. It’s not where you want to start the day. Where I would start the day before, like normal people, with hope, with excitement, ‘hey it’s Saturday!’ Everyday’s the same to me. Seven days a week. A week. A month. Everyday’s the same (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

He wishes this wasn’t so, but this is clearly a critical part of his identity. Before his injury, he took his moments of waking up for granted. Now with his TBI, that is all he can think of. Work must have been something he thought about upon waking most days of the week. Now he doesn’t know whether he will be able to go back to work, and it is frustrating. He is going to have to reframe his identity around something new if his life continues not to include work and this is going to be something he will have trouble with since his previous self revolved around what he did for a living.

Drew says that after his injury, he is probably 75% a different person, “I’ve changed a great deal but I still have some of the characteristics, I am still me! I am still Drew!” (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009). He explains,
I got like four heads running around. Four Drew’s. I believe that I am very variable in a lot of ways but this head, maybe a couple of these heads, sort of feel like I want to get up and do something in this world... (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

Drew feels inconsistent, sometimes optimistic about making a name for himself and changing the world, and sometimes not. He describes being diagnosed with bipolar disorder, going on different medications which cause him not feeling in control of himself, jumpy, and unsure about everything. How can he reconstruct his sense of self when he feels so variable? He is trying to get off meds which he attributes many of these feelings of inconsistency and variability, but he will still have to negotiate the question of “who am I?”

Dora feels the same inconsistencies that Drew talks about. She expresses this struggle with self well,

I still can’t figure out how to get to be the same way as I was, or the same kind of personality, or the same, I can’t figure it out, but I’m gonna get there someday. I’ll never be the same person again, but I’m gonna be fun again! I’m gonna, I don’t know. I’m still there, I’m just trying to figure it out (Interviews with TBI survivors, 2009).

Dora’s hesitations and uncertainties highlight her journey, a journey so many survivors travel, to figure out how to move on from here, how to move towards her old self, even though that might not mean returning to her old self completely.

**Conclusion**

Traumatic Brain Injury Survivors have to reimagine sense of self. After their injury, they may not have memory of their earlier lives, who they were, or events in the amnesiac window. Some will never recover these memories, but most survivors will, and they have to manage incorporating memories which emphasize the sometimes extreme differences in self before and after injury. These memories may include activities they have lost or rejected. They may include traits and moods that are missing or changed now, or different ways of thinking. People in the survivors’ lives may or may not see any difference in the survivor before and after injury, which may cause lack of understanding of survivors’ full experience and journey of self.

Through narrative and the story telling process, survivors experience a form of therapy, a way of reforming and reimagining their identities. As the narrative psychologists say, “We are all storytellers, and we are the stories we tell” (McAdams, Josselson, and Lieblich 2006:3). Survivors take the old memories and new experiences and form them into a cohesive life story which they can claim. Their sense of self can begin to feel connected, not disjointed, and with it, survivors can create a fulfilling life.
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Book Review: Tacos and Tacquerias in North Cackalacky


In her book, Gill addresses the various issues that pertain to Latino immigration in the state of North Carolina, and she dispels the vast assumptions and stereotypes that usually cling to immigration debates such as taxes and employment opportunities. Gill takes a holistic approach by referencing multiple hot spots for Latino immigration, including the Raleigh-Durham area and other more rural counties in North Carolina. She makes clear links between the local and global forces that continue to dominate immigration politics in both North Carolina as well as the South in general; all of this is accomplished without alienating the voices of many different native North Carolinians about Latino immigration, including the racial mixture of whites, blacks, and Native Americans.

Gill points out in the preface that this book was written in order to reach those who would not normally pick up a book about immigration, and this includes college students, educators, policy makers, law enforcement officials as well as anyone in the faith communities. Clearly, this is a scholarly work aimed at mainstream audiences who might have ill-informed opinions on immigration. I personally enjoyed reading this book because the writing style is accessible and not overloaded with academic jargon; it is informative without being overwhelming. The book is well laid out and follows the path set out in the table of contents, covering the history of immigration to North Carolina, the economic and social realities of Latino immigration, community building, and lastly, how Latino immigrant youth view their experiences and opportunities in the State as well as the future of immigrant families.

Gill combines her skills as an anthropologist as well as an educator in Latin American immigration studies to produce an ethnography that reaches a wider audience, not the usual suspects for such ethnographies. She incorporates participant observation both in North Carolina and various towns in Mexico. Gill relies heavily upon interviews, primarily with a small group of Latino immigrants themselves, in order to produce a more personal dimension to this ethnography. Also important, her research is backed up by an extensive bibliography of pertinent literature which gives this book a solid framework of evidence.
What I found to be the strongest points of this book are Gill’s capacity to rebuff the various myths associated with Latino immigration and to advocate for comprehensive immigration reform. She addresses the controversial issues at the center of current debates and ties them to North Carolinian immigration policies.

If readers take nothing else away from this book, it should be that the children of undocumented immigrants bear the brunt of the lack of sound immigration policy. Inevitably, these kids are hindered from pursuing higher education and are forced to follow employment paths similar to their parents’. Gill uses interviews with several Latino youth to illuminate this desperate and unforgiving situation. If we have learned anything from history, it is that education is key to social mobility as well as to becoming active agents and citizens in communities around the United States.

Gill promotes better understanding of immigration and the factors fueling it. By using the voices of immigrants themselves, she provides personal insight into the lives and experiences of Latino immigrants in North Carolina. Only by understanding immigration on this level will acceptance and tolerance be fully realized.

Katie Case, Georgia State University