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“We Are Indians”: Totemic Groups in Modern Europe

One part of the religious superstition of the Savages consists in each of them having his totam, or favourite spirit, which he believes watches over him. This totam they conceive assumes the shape of some beast or other, and therefore they never kill, hunt, or eat the animal whose form they think this totam bears.

J. Long, Voyages and Travels of an Indian Interpreter and Trader, 1791.

Introduction

The present report is the first attempt to situate within anthropological theory the phenomenon of emulation of Native American cultural and religious identities and reenactment of traditional Native American practices by non-Amerindians in Europe and the Americas. Variously called Indianists, Wannabe Indians, Would-Be Indians, Indian hobbyists and Euro-Indians, these people are known to exist in the United States and Canada (Kealiinohomoku, 1986; Powers, 1988b; Green, 1988; Deloria, 1998), Germany, Austria (Bolz, 1989; Turski, 1994), Russia, Ukraine, Belorus, Lithuania (Vaschenko, 1989; Smith, 1994; Rabodzeenko, 1995; Rabodzeenko, 1998: 351-397), Poland (Nowicka, 1989), Belgium (Ceurremans, 1996), United Kingdom, Sweden, Holland, France, Switzerland, Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Bulgaria (Taylor, 1988). Annual Powwows, occasional camps, folklore performances, urban clubs and associations, museums and rural communities alongside with extensive publishing and Internet activity constitute the central terrains of Indianist social visibility. Clubs in both East and West Germany bring together some 15,000 enthusiasts, which is the greatest country-specific Indianist population approximating the size of the largest North American Indian tribes like the Navajo or the Anishinabe.

In many European countries, Indianists coexist and interact with other characters of recent North American history, namely “trappers” and “mountain men”, “cowboys”, “Civil War soldiers”, “settlers” and others. Apparently under the influence of Indianism the reenactment of native African and Australian cultures has lately developed in Germany. Waves of cultural revitalization bring back to life pre-Christian European pagan beliefs epitomized by the “Asatu religion” (Anschütz, n.d.), fragments of Roman, ancient Celtic, Germanic and Slavic legacies, medieval West European guild structures, etc. Alongside with the hotly debated spatial globalization, the Euro-American world generates and experiences the unprecedented temporal globalization marked by the ubiquity of what Jean Baudrillard (1990: 63) called “anachronistic resurrections”. In this regard, Indianism is unique in synthesizing a “here” and a “there”, a “now” and a “then” in a flamboyant version of the Bakhtinian chronotope.

One of the basic issues that looms large in the context of the appropriation of Native American cultures by non-Native Americans is the nature of the relationship that Indianism establishes between European and Amerindian identities. What are the cultural mechanisms that allow some European Indianists to explicitly identify themselves as Indians and others to
implicitly convey this identification through their practices? Drawing on my five-year-long experience as a member of the Russian Indianist community and on a preliminary ethnographic research among Belgian Indianists conducted in the summer of 1998, I will argue that the relationship between Indians “by spirit” and Indians “by blood” is totemic in its essence. Totemism as a long-abandoned anthropological topic needs to be revisited and reclaimed as an enduring mode of social interaction. Contrary to the famous opinion of Claude Lévi-Strauss (1963), totemism represents not an incoherent set of beliefs and practices reflecting the classificatory capacity of the “savage mind” but a systemic, though diverse, component of sociocultural reproduction. A proper interpretation of Indianism necessitates consistent use of the triple distinction elaborated within the paradigm of historical linguistics (Hock, 1991) between borrowing or appropriation of cultural forms, their convergent development and their sharing as a result of common origin.

**Indianism as the Apotheosis of the Noble Savage Tradition**

At the time of Discovery, the European chronotope was paradoxically incomplete: West as the fourth cardinal direction was both cartographically absent and culturally unmarked (Fiedler, 1968; Fogelson, 1987); past inhabited by the images from ancient Greece, Rome and Tacitus’ Germany was crossed out by Christianity. The biblical version of the evolution (or rather decline) of the human species held that, with the expiation of the original sin, future associated with the Second Advent of Christ became the only relevant temporal direction. With respect to Europe, America stood in the position of vivant pastness being viewed by the early explorers (including Columbus) as the Garden of Eden and by philosophes and early anthropologists as populated with evolutionarily primitive and nobly savage groups. It seems useful to distinguish several spatiotemporal developments (paradigms) of the Noble Savage theme: 1) Religio-Apocalyptic paradigm (1492-1700); 2) Politico-Philosophical paradigm (1580-1800); 3) Romantic-Nationalist paradigm (1730-1850); 4) Industrial Fantasy paradigm (end of the XIX century -1950); and 5) Identity Emulation paradigm (1950 – present moment). The temporary boundaries of these stages are flexible and often depend on the country where particular ideas were most widely espoused.

The Religio-Apocalyptic paradigm includes the writings of Franciscan and Dominican missionaries in Mexico (Gerónimo de Mendieta, Bartolomé de Las Casas), humanist ministers in Europe (Juan Maldonado) and partially the Jesuits in North America. Christian missionaries and theologians saw in Native Americans an embodiment of angelic virtues and interpreted the discovery of America as a sign of the impending Kingdom of God (Phelan, 1970; Kennedy, 1950).

The initiation of the Politico-Philosophical stage in the development of the Noble Savage image can be attributed to Michel Montaigne who, in the late XVI century, first argued that the cultural experience of the inhabitants of the newly discovered lands is in no way inferior to European civilization. However the main contributions to the Politico-Philosophical paradigm fall into the late XVII – XVIII century and belong to the activists of the French Enlightenment - Lahontan, Rousseau, Diderot, Voltaire and others. They used the information about Native Americans coming from the French colonies in order to criticize European social and political condition.

The Romantic-Nationalist stage can be considered the direct continuation of the previous one. François Auguste René Chateaubriand (1768-1848) in France and James Fenimore Cooper (1789-1851) and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (1807-1882) in the United States are the most vivid representatives of a literary genre that depicted Indians as central and elegantly idealized characters. Travel literature from the late XVIII-first half of the XIX century epitomized by the writings of Jonathan Carver, Louis Cortambert and others contained numerous romantic portrayals of the Indian tribes of Eastern and Central North America. Alternatively the
identification with Indians as exemplified by the participants of the legendary Boston Tea Party (1773), the Saint Tammany Society, the Red Men Order, the Improved Order of Red Men, the New Confederacy of the Iroquois led by the future founder of American anthropology, Lewis H. Morgan, was instrumental in laying down the foundations of American national identity (Deloria, 1998).

The beginning of the Industrial Fantasy paradigm can be traced back to the first Buffalo Bill shows exported from the United States into various countries of Europe, Seton Thompson’s Woodcraft Indians and Campfire Girls – one of the currents that fed the international scout movements - and to the writings of Karl May (1842-1912) that gained fame in Germany in 1893. This stage is characterized by the democratization of the Noble Savage image, its penetration into all spheres of Euro-American public consciousness, commodification, reification, “tobaccofication” and other forms of its commercial exploitation (Green, 1988a). The XX century has witnessed the extensive development of the industry of Indian toys and artifacts, the vogue on Indian mascots, fantasy literature authored by Karl May, Liselotta Welskopf-Heinrich, Sat-Okh and Carlos Castaneda and fancy cinematographic productions such as the East German DEFA series (1966-1983) led by Goiko Mićić and Pierre Brise. Soon after the drastic depopulation and incarceration of real Native Americans, an iron-muscled, befeathered, whooping, pipe-smoking, horse-riding and tomahawk-throwing Noble Savage rose from ashes to become the Nutcracker of America.

Amidst this triumph of simulation, fakeness and kitsch, he was searching for a new incarnation. As early as the late XIX century the first Germans dressed as Indians appeared at the annual Taucha market in a suburb of Leipzig (Taylor, 1988: 567). The first Indianist club opened in Stuttgart in 1902 followed by similar enterprises in Frankfurt, Dresden and Munich. The chief impetus was provided by Original-Indianer-Shows pioneered by the Buffalo Bill Cody troupe and continued by the Serrasani Circus presenting a Sioux dance group “Two-Two” (Turski, 1994: 19). The first Indianist clubs soon ceased to exist but, in 1928, another club called “Manitou” appeared in Radebeul. This East German town hosted the first European museum devoted specifically to American Indians and named after Karl May, whose influence on the development of German and European Indianism can hardly be overestimated.

The Nazi regime did not favor organized Indianist activities in Germany, although Indian images played a conspicuous role in the Hitlerian construction of the Aryan nationalist myth (Feest, 1988: 585; Simmons, 1942: 379-380). In the mid-1930s, the existence of an Indianist group was reported from Belgium (Tassencourt, 1935).

The end of the World War II opened gates for the resurgence of Indianist clubs in Germany and Belgium and the crystallization of Indianist activities in other parts of Europe. In 1951, the first “Indian council” in Karlsruhe brought together some 300 German Indianists (Taylor, 1988: 567). In 1956, Kulturgruppe für Indianistik “Old Manitou” revived the pre-war Indianist traditions of Radebeul. Since then hundreds of clubs mushroomed all over Germany making this country the most representative in terms of Indianist activities.

In 1954, the English Westerners Society emerged in Great Britain. In 1959, Indianklubben was formed in Sweden. In 1964, an Indianist club De Kiva was organized in Holland (Taylor, 1988). Late 1960s-early 1970s mark the beginnings of Indianist activities in the former Soviet Union that led to the first Bolshoi Sovet (Grand Council) in 1980 near St. Petersburg, the first national Powwow in 1981, the first club “Alkatraz”, or the Indianist Club of Leningrad in 1982 and the first rural Indianist community in Verh-Kukujá, Altai Mountains, in
In Poland, the popular interest in Indians gave rise in 1981 to Polski Ruch Przyjaciół Indian (Polish Movement of Friends of the American Indians) (Nowicka, 1989). These events paralleled by similar forms of Indianist activities in other European countries circumscribe the current Identity Emulation paradigm in the history of the Noble Savage image. Interestingly enough, all country-specific Indianist communities emerged independently from one another.

The Identity Emulation paradigm is characterized by deep emotional involvement and oftentimes life-long commitment to Indian life-ways (Taylor, 1988: 562; Turski, 1994: 8). Authenticity in the reconstructions of Native American cultural forms, emulation of Native American social, spiritual and personal values, identification with Native Americans, contacts with actual Native American tribes, pilgrimages to Native American reservations, the propaganda of Native American history and culture and political support of Native American struggle constitute the most salient trends in contemporary Indianist movement in Europe. In some cases (Russia, Poland), the birth of the American Indian Movement in 1968 and its political actions in Alcatraz in 1969-1971 and Wounded-Knee in 1973 are immediately responsible for the formation of Indianist groups (Ishtha Shicha, 1994b; Nowicka, 1989: 65). In other cases (United States), the Indian cultural Renaissance of the 1960s has contributed enormously to the spread of “traditional” Indian spiritual knowledge among Indian hobbyists, hippies and New Agers (Brand, 1988; Niman, 1997).

The ultimate aim of Indianist activities is the attainment of a state of profound sameness with Indians and the elaboration of conditions under which this transformation becomes possible. In the United States, the same tendency is observed in the wide interest on the part of non-Native American people in constructing their “real” Indian genealogies and discovering their Indian ancestors that would make legitimate their claims for tribal membership. These efforts of American “wannabes” in the past 40 years have resulted in a dramatic increase in Native American population figures, with 524,000 citizens identifying themselves as Indians in 1960 vs. 2,212,000 citizens claiming Indian identity in 1994 (Wannabes…, 1993).

Indianism strongly affects individual social choices in terms of friendship and marital ties, intergenerational relations, jobs, political and religious preferences. It nurtures critical attitudes towards dominant patterns of social interactions, public education and environmental policies. Indianism’s critical stance echoes the XVIII century Politico-Philosophical paradigm in the development of the Noble Savage image within which Native American examples were used to undermine the prevalent notions of the relationship between individual freedom, on the one hand, and the state and the Church, on the other. Consequently Indianism can justly be classified among the so-called “new social movements” usually epitomized by the Greens, feminism, anti-war groups and youth counterculture movements that "try to realize the new way of living not via the state, but via the individual and society through personal transformation, new forms of relationships, a new culture…. " (Scott, 1990: 157).

The persistence of the Noble Savage image in Euro-American cultures is astonishing. Astonishing is also the tight bundle that unites recurrent archetypes and the noticeable directionality of the transformation of the earliest Religio-Apocalyptic paradigm into the current Identity Emulation paradigm. The whole paradox is therefore that, while the setting changes, the actors remain the same. It is not a static reproduction of images – it is a true Time Travel.

**Indianism as Totemism**

What is then the nature of the startling gravitation of Euro-American public consciousness towards the American Indian? One is struck by the similarities in statements...
produced by Indianists from different places, times and milieus concerning their experience of Indianness. One of the hundreds of *sauvages volontaires* of the XVIII century, Philippe Le Cocq, a French soldier, who after the surrender of Quebec in 1754 fled to the Iroquois, married an Iroquois woman and changed into Indian clothes, explained his behavior as driven by “instinct” (Chinard, 1915: 282). In the early XIX century, a French traveler in southern Plains, Louis Cortambert (1837: 42-43), wrote,

> “I am an Osage. When I hear the chant of war of the Osages, I break the little bands by which civilization envelopes me like a mummy, and I range the prairie on a wild horse”.

A German adoptee into the Blackfoot tribe and the author of several books on Blackfoot culture and indigenous spirituality, Adolf Gütohrlein, confessed,

> “As a child I lived far from the lands of the Blackfoot people. Yet my dreams often took me among these people. As I grew older I went to schools, studied American history, and became a schoolteacher. I wanted to relate to this land and its People, both past and present. So I finally traveled to the lands of the Blackfoot People to see if there was any truth to my childhood dreams. I met an old Blackfoot man who told me there was” (Hungry Wolf, 1977: XIII).

A leader of the Polish Movement of Friends of the American Indians recalled

> “In fact my interest in the American Indians awoke at the same time that the American Indian movement came into being. But spiritually, I’ve always lived according to Indian values, ever since my childhood. Indian values are dear to me: these were the earth, the plants, the animals, and the stars” (Nowicka, 1989: 605).

She used to say: “When they had taken the Black Hills from us….” (Nowicka, 1989: 604, italics in original).

Members of the Verh-Kukujá Indianist commune in Russia expressed their feelings in the following way,

> “I am close to Indians by spirit…. Since early age I have considered myself an Indian…. [In the commune], I could touch the shadow of my dream…. And if one paraphrase Black Elk, “for me my dream did not die there in Altai, in Kukujá. A dream can’t die at all…. The very fact that we feel ourselves “Indians by way of life” – it is already kinship and brotherhood” (Crazy Wolf, 1998: 103, emphasis in original).

> “I am an Indian by way of life…. [Indians] believe that there is a spiritual connection between man and the cosmos. But in order to understand all the secrets of Indian culture and religion, one has to make it the essence and meaning of his or her life” (Shestakov, 1991: 2).

Many Russian Indianists deplore the appellation “Indianist” and prefer to refer to themselves as “Indians” or “Russian Indians”. The Indianist vocation is usually described as an irresistible passion that comes over people in childhood, gradually swells to reach its climax and focuses invariably and exclusively on Indians. Some Russian Indianists refer to this passion as the “Red Power” (Crazy Wolf, 1998: 104).

One of the oldest Indianists in Holland, Red Spirit, repeatedly told me
“I was not born Indian. I am Dutch. I can’t become an Indian, no European can become an Indian, but, in my dream, I am a Lakota. That’s why my name is Wanagi Luta, Red Spirit. I have a beautiful dream”.

Some of the recent Internet exchanges about the implications of the Lakota Declaration of War against the Exploiters of Indian Spirituality (1993) for Indianists in the United States and Europe contain similar statements.

“All my life I have felt a kinship. May be it stems from my admiration of my father, who looked quite Native with his black hair, dark eyes, dark skin and facial features that were clearly descended, and my grandfather whose features were even more pronounced. And, they both retained some part of personality that seemed inherited, and from their distant past” (February 6, 1996).

A passage from the writings of John Joseph Mathews, a one-quarter Osage and a historian of the tribe who grew up on reservation but was brought up and educated according to the “white man’s way”, is perfectly at home with the previous testimonies; it demonstrates that the blood quantum plays no decisive role in the character of statements concerning one’s relationship to Native Americans.

“I was a very small boy when the seed which was to disturb me all of my life was planted…. There floated up to my room through the open window which overlooked the valley, a long drawn-out chant broken by weeping…. It seemed to me later, after I had begun to reason, that this prayer-song, this chant, this soul-stirring petition, always ended up before it was finished, in a sob of frustration.

It was Neolithic man talking to God.

Later, when I became a man, quite unconsciously I searched for the continuation of that which had ended before it was finished” (Mathews, 1961: XI).

Except for Mathews, who undoubtedly was familiar with Cortambert’s diary, no influence of the informants on each other can possibly be imagined. One has to admit a remarkable situation of transhistorical and transnational convergence. This convergence however, while ruling out direct borrowing and mutual influence, occurs in the same Noble Savage context. It leads us to a puzzling conclusion that Indianism does in fact point to an actual kinship relationship between Indianists and Indians, a relationship of which genetic connection is just a specific case. It is a kinship not through *genotype* but through *phenotype*, i.e. it operates as a complex set of temporal associations between physical and behavioral features interpreted by the subjects as visceral experience of a power. It is this understanding of kinship that appears to be in the ascendant in the late XX century anthropological theory (Peletz, 1995; Wilder, 1998; Dziebel, 1998).

Besides generic identification with Indians, European Indianists have clear-cut “tribal” identities. Plains tribes (Sioux, Cheyenne, Blackfoot, Arapaho) appear to be the most frequent Indianist “clans”. Symptomatically enough, the key Pan-Indian symbols in North America also go back to the Plains area (Lerch and Bullers, 1996: 390). In Germany, every “tribe” tends to have a separate club; for instance, “Lakota” in Bautzen, *Indianistikgruppe* “Onondaga” in Birkenwerder, *Interessengemeinschaft* “Ponca” in Greifswald, *Indianistikgruppe* “Hidatsa” in Leipzig, etc. In Belgium, while the overwhelming majority of Indianists consider themselves Lakota, they are subdivided into warrior societies. The Kit Fox or Tokala Society (*Société du Renard*) that until recently published a special magazine and included members not only from Belgium but also from France appears to be the most influential. A small group of outliers identify themselves as Southwest Indians and subdivide into Apaches, Navajo and Pueblo.
The Russian Indianist community is very diverse as far as “tribal” affiliations are concerned. People identify themselves not only with the four aforementioned Plains groups but also with Iroquois, Cree, Anishinabe, Ottawa, Kiowa, Shoshone, Modoc, Tlingit, Comanche, Apache, Pueblo, Crow, Pawnee, Shawnee, Delaware.

Each member of the community must belong to a ‘tribe’, or ‘band’. This condition is indispensable and a person chooses membership either during the period of his independent involvement with Indians or on entering the community. From the very beginning, older members start to coax a newcomer to make his decision about the “tribe”. The choice of a “tribe” is critical first of all for the purpose of the visual presentation of the person. Indianists make Indian costumes and other elements of Indian culture, which they wear during Powwows and, to a lesser extent, on other occasions. Much attention is paid to their accurate conformity to the traditions of the particular Indian tribe. Finally, “tribal” membership is the only possibility to plough one’s way through the abundance of information, which gradually has become available to Indianists. These objective imperatives contribute to the creation of an Indianist’ “tribal” identification but they do not act as the ultimate cause of the choice.

Dancing Fox: “People make their choices about a tribe proceeding from the details and nuances which, only to them, are visible”.

Spider once objectified his adherence to the Anishinabe saying that geographically the Anishinabe live in woodlands on the same latitude as St. Petersburg, the climate, flora and fauna are similar in both places and hence it is easier to feel yourself an Anishinabe than, for instance, a member of a desert tribe in the American Southwest. The same logic belonged to Wandering Spirit’s decision to move to the Crimean Peninsula since the local plains were most likely to shore up his interest in the Lakota.

“Tribal” divisions are socially productive: they strengthen personal relations, inspire “tribesmen” to share tipis or territories during the Powwows, enforce relations of reciprocity and mutual help, create joking relations between “tribes” in the manner known from Native American cultures, increase competitiveness in terms of the command of Indian crafts and ethnographic information.

“Indian” names are an equally necessary condition for participation in Indianist communities throughout Europe. Early Indianists used to refer to these names as “totems”.


Following the Indian custom, Indianists derive their nicknames from the names of animals, birds, plants, celestial bodies, from the memorable events of their lives, or from the peculiarities of their appearance and behavior. Sometimes a person is addressed by the name of his or her tribe, e.g. The Modoc, The Iroquois, The Algonquin, The Dakota, The Apache, The Crow in Russia, The Crow Man in Belgium.

Evidence from Russia shows that there are various ways of acquiring a nickname. A person can choose the nickname by himself, though it is not widely spread or highly welcomed, unless he gets to know it from his/her dream. On the other hand, the dreams, even if they are evocative, are not always used for the aim of obtaining or changing the name. Strong Voice once dreamt of himself turning into a bear, but this occasion, however appropriate for getting the name it might have considered by others, did not seem to him important enough to change his name.

Ideally, a person was nicknamed by the others.

Squirrel: “When I had just entered the community, the older girls decided to give me a name. We came together to Sea Gull’s place and they deliberated on my name for a short while. All of
them said in one voice that I was Squirrel. That’s because my hair is red. Since then nobody has ever called me Olya”.

Among the older Indianists in Russia a custom existed to obtain one’s name from Red Wolf, a person who was considered a shaman. They used to visit him in his hometown, Velikie Luki, or his tipi during Powwows. At first, Red Wolf would conduct a pipe smoking ceremony and then the company would deliberate on the name of the newcomer. After the name had finally been announced to him, he had to perform a dance imitating the habits of the bird or animal whose name he was taking on.

**Raven:** “I was trying my best but I knew I could not dance well. But I was impressed by the fact that nobody was laughing at me, not any sign of smile appeared on their faces. The atmosphere was solemn and august”.

When the contacts with Indians were established, some of the Indianists started to obtain names from them. These names were the only names recognized by Indians. As Evil Eye recalls, when he met with the famous Indian singer and movie star, Floyd Westerman, the latter carefully questioned him about his Indian name and the way he had received it. He was finally satisfied when he learnt that it was one of the leaders of the Native American environmentalist action called the Indian Run who had bestowed the name on him and signed greetings on one of his music cassettes (Ishta Shicha, 1994a: 77). During his visit to Russia in 1991, the Pogasset chief, Big Eagle, used to bestow names upon the Indianists (Smith, 1994).

Discursively expressed identification with the generic Indian, “tribal” membership together with the appropriate clothing and an “Indian” name constitute perhaps the universal set of formal characteristics that distinguish a Euro-Indian. If the custom of naming, the symbols used in names, the manners in which a name is obtained as well as the tradition of membership in warrior societies are simply appropriated or borrowed from “traditional” Native American cultures, the situation with the “tribes” and the generic “Indian” identity is more complicated. Although the tribal names and associated garments are certainly borrowed from Native Americans, the principle of “tribal” affiliation among Indianists is different from the principle of tribal affiliation among Indians. While an Indian belongs to a tribe through his or her “blood”, an Indianist is Russian, German or Belgian “by blood” and Lakota, Apache or Iroquois “by spirit”.

The closest analogue to the Indianist “tribal” membership is provided by totemic clans found historically in many Native American tribes. From the subjects of totemic associations, Native Americans have turned into the objects of those associations. Where Indians found animal species as a distant other, Europeans found Indians. If Indians used to imitate buffaloes, wolves and other animals by putting on their hides, Indianists imitate Indians by manufacturing exact replicas of their traditional garments. If Indians danced “buffalo dances” to magically replenish the herds of buffaloes, Indianists “play Indian” and thereby increase Native American population figures. Ironically Indians, who had used to hunt the wild game and subsequently appropriate its “culture” in the form of hides, feathers, meat or even dances themselves (as far as myths go), suddenly became the objects of the same practice.

Following Ralph Linton’s definition of totemism (1924: 299) as involving mainly (1) segmentation into groups conscious of their identity; (2) the bearing by each group of the name of an animal, thing, or natural phenomenon; (3) the use of this name as term of address; (4) the use of an emblem or a personal ornament with a corresponding taboo on the use of the emblem by other groups; and (5) respect for the “patron” and design representing it, it seems absolutely correct to consider Indianism a variety of totemism. The very Anishinabe word *ototeman* “he is a relative of mine” from which the term “totemism” is derived (Lévi-Strauss, 1963: 18) is a precise indication of the nature of the relationship between Europeans and Indians, on the one hand, and Indians and animals, on the other. Unlike the uses of insignia and name-group designations in the
American army (Linton, 1924) and the uses of animal or other (including Indian) mascots in sports, which represent cases of convergence and borrowing and are rightly classified as pseudo-totemic (Green, 1988a: 604), Indianism shares with totemism substantial features. This is another indication of common origins with Native Americans (and not of convergence or simply borrowing) that figures as the underlying theme in Indianism.

Indianism challenges the Lévi-Straussian paradigm of interpretation of totemism as a “contingent arrangements of nonspecific elements” (Lévi-Strauss, 1963: 5), as an artificial anthropological construct (Lévi-Strauss, 1963: 10) and as a product of thinking in binary oppositions (Lévi-Strauss, 1963: 88-89). Instead this kind of phenomena should be viewed as an overlap of two modes of social interaction: the one situated within a local (culture-specific) time-space framework and the one situated within a global (species) time-space framework. Indianism can also be seen as emerging at the intersection of two forms of collective memory: historical memory spanning from 1492 to the present moment and evolutionary memory spanning from a certain crucial point in the evolution of the human species to the present moment. Still another dimension involves the interaction between punctuated or genetic kinship and continuous or phenotypic kinship.
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