

Easton Ellis and T.C. Boyle), a city where the search for either identity or safety seems doomed.

Eric Avila's contribution, "Essaying Los Angeles," focusing, as its title indicates, on non-fiction, provides the perfect conclusion to the collection, bringing together many of the themes developed in the previous articles, such as the significance of the climate, topography and architecture of the city, its history of corruption, its paranoia and shallowness, its ethnic diversity, as well as its deepening ethnic and class conflicts. Starting with a discussion of Carey Mc Williams' sympathetic 1946 historical study of L.A. and Adorno's and Horkheimer's more somber analysis of Hollywood as a manufacturer of consent (to use the now well-established metaphor), Avila also provides an insightful analysis of Joan Didion's nightmarish portrayal of the city and Mike Davis' understanding of it as a product of class war. Avila shows that more work still needs to be done in this context to avoid either the simplistic eulogizing or demonization of L.A., and to try to understand instead the city in all its specificity and complexity.

As one would expect of a Cambridge Companion, all of the contributors are seasoned experts on the subject. Although some articles tend to be more descriptive than one would like, the volume is, all in all, highly illuminating, providing both an excellent overview of and insight into the city as it is refracted through its literature. This comprehensive guide to one of the most iconic of American cities should appeal therefore to literary specialists and the general reader alike.

Chloe Avril

University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Fisher, Andrew H. *Shadow Tribe: The Making of Columbia River Indian Identity*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2010. 344 pages. ISBN: 978-0-295-99020-0. \$24.95.

In Native American scholarship, notions of Native, indigenous, or pan-Indian identity have become increasingly fraught under the pressure of critical demands for historical and cultural specificity. The satisfaction of such demands often takes the form of tribal specificity. Yet, as Andrew H. Fisher's work on the Columbia River Indians of the Pacific Northwest reminds us, "tribes" are socially constructed units shaped by complex forces. In the case of the peoples living along the Columbia River, tribal designations

were constructed in the 1800s largely for the convenience of European and American colonizers who sought to appropriate Indian lands, contain Native peoples on tribal reservations, and alter indigenous social and political structures. Those peoples who most successfully resisted these forces developed a distinct sense of non-tribal identity. Based on archival research and interviews, Fisher's history breaks new ground in examining the emergence of the Columbia River Indians.

Not a tribe, nor a faction, not an enclave, nor even a homogeneous linguistic group, "Columbia River Indian" was a term first used by the Office of Indian Affairs in the 1870s to refer to Native peoples who insisted on their independence from reservation life. It evolved over the years into something Fisher calls a "shadow tribe." He uses this metaphor to convey the way this group identity has developed outside of but nevertheless alongside tribal belongings and affiliations. His history of the "renegade" Columbia River Indians makes visible those aspects of Native culture that are often obscured by scholarship organized along the lines of tribal affiliations: off-reservation Indian life, intratribal relationships, links between place and identity, and acts of individual agency and self-determination.

Fisher begins with an account of early contact between Europeans and indigenous populations along the Columbia River, drawing attention to the way that the river connected linguistically diverse groups who nevertheless shared significant storytelling traditions and patterns of seasonal living, with economic and social exchange organized on the basis of independent villages. Marriage and rich kinship ties created security for the peoples of the region. Americans soon sought to reorder these societies, and they did so on the basis of their understanding of "tribe," appointing single head chiefs in order to simplify negotiations and investing them with powers that were not recognized by their social group. Such efforts, writes Fisher, were largely ignored or dismissed by the Columbia River Indians until the 1840s and 50s, when major treaties were negotiated. Fisher describes how the Office of Indian Affairs required clearly defined tribes, territories, and tribal leaders in order to negotiate treaties, land transfers, and reservation boundaries; it imposed distinctions, forced commonalities, and appointed leaders in ways that expedited advantageous treaties, without regard to actual social and political bands among the River Indians. Though the resultant treaties with, for instance, the Yakama Nation, the Umatilla, and the Nez Perce function today as "vital symbols of tribal sovereignty and nationalism," many Columbia River Indians at the time denied the legitimacy of the treaties, and have contin-

ued to do so. Fisher locates in the treaty process the resistance to federal law and distrust of tribal authority that have become “hallmarks of Columbia River Indian identity” (61), which took its shadowy shape between 1860 and 1885 when Columbia River Indians rejected the legitimacy of any authority seeking their removal from traditional settlements and ways of life and their containment in tribal reservations. Fisher draws a nuanced portrait of the interactions between agency and off-reservation Indians, each attempting—in different ways—to ensure cultural survival, at the same time as he outlines conflicts between these groups over issues of authenticity.

*Shadow Tribe* includes an account of the Washani faith (Dreamer or Seven Drums religion) and its complete rejection of white culture and federal power, as well as the later Shaker and Feather religions, which could, in their off-reservation forms, elude suppression. Attuned to historical ironies, Fisher shows how Indian homesteading laws and the Dawes Act of 1887, though rightly cited as one of the single most destructive acts for Native peoples, actually gave the “renegades’ the chance to legitimize their presence off the reservation” (91), and to remain distinct from both federal and tribal governments, neither of which was felt to adequately represent their interests. Using various ways to maintain various distances from assimilative forces in subsistence, religious practices, education policies, and marriage arrangements up through the 1940s, the Columbia River Indians gained and proudly preserved a sense of themselves as “traditional” Indians; “Columbia River Indians,” writes Fisher, “found ways to accommodate modernity without surrendering their core values and customs” (153). By the mid-1940s, however, they had banded together as the confederated Columbia River Tribe—a move engendered in part by conflicts with recognized tribes whose fishing rights were upheld by federal courts that made tribal membership a precondition for recognition. The lifeways of off-reservation Indians continued to be threatened through the 1990s by conflicts over river damming and over regulation of fishing rights. Fisher’s history concludes with the tragic story of David Sohapp, who fought the federal government’s efforts to deny subsistence fishing rights from the 1960s through his death in 1991, and whose defense of a way of life paralleled the resurgence of River Indian identity. Fisher’s balanced but engaged analysis of the shifting manifestations of Columbia River Indian identity performs an important service, bringing this shadowy history into the light.