

I

Introduction

And as I looked and wept, I saw that there stood on the north side of the starving camp a Sacred man who was painted red all over his body, and he held a spear as he walked into the center of his people, and there he layed down and rolled. And when he got up it was a fat bison standing there, and where the bison stood a Sacred herb sprang up right where the tree

had been in the center of the nation's hoop. The herb grew and bore four blossoms on a single stem while I was looking—a blue, a white, a scarlet and a yellow—and the bright rays of these flashed to the heavens.

—Black Elk

To Black Elk, this vision symbolized the restoration of the nations' hoop—the coming together of all the nations in a harmonious manner. Black Elk believed that the nations' hoop would be restored within seven generations. We are presently in the time of the restoration of the hoop.

The Problem

The student, practitioner, and academician in the psychological arena may ask a very valid and practical question: Why another cross-cultural treatise dealing with Native American psychology? It seems that psychological literature dealing with some of the very complex issues of providing theoretical and practical guidance in this area already abounds. As we see it, the existing literature on the subject is sorely lacking in relevance in the form of theoretical constructions upon which to base a fundamental approach that actually has some efficacy in ameliorating some of the problems facing our community.

After a combined three decades of graduate training, clinical practice, and research, the authors have had some ongoing revelations regarding the use of psychology and the politically correctly phrased cross-cultural approaches. Early on, we began to realize that much of the study of cross-cultural issues and the resultant literature was primarily an exercise that had to be validated by the rules of the academy. It did not take a great revelation to discover that the people who made up the rules of this academy were predominantly white males. In this sense, knowledge from a cross-cultural perspective must become a caricature of the culture in order for it to be validated as science or knowledge. Borrowing from the imagery of Frantz Fanon, the study of colonized peoples must take on a "lactification" or whitening in

order for the produced knowledge to be palatable to the academy. The consequences of such cross-cultural production of knowledge has been ongoing neocolonialism within the discipline of psychology. For example, intelligence testing and sciencing based on eugenics are the root metaphors upon which modern theory and practice are based. From here, we do not need to look far for a critique of psychology—particularly in its cross-cultural formation. Insofar as all the human sciences are founded on the Western philosophical tradition, that tradition itself contains the seeds of psychology's transformation. The "linguistic turn" uncovers our construction based on the binary opposites implicit in Western metaphysics, which in turn constructs all scientific discourse—including psychology. Rather than continuing the "will to power" of control over natural and human processes, new philosophical formulations herald a moral advancement while at the same time negating the teleological progress of history. Feminist studies, cultural studies, and literary criticism are prime examples of the way in which disciplines have been transformed via the incorporation of philosophical insight—much the same way in which Freud reversed the value of the binary opposites of consciousness and unconsciousness. These transformations open the door for different/other models of healing, normalcy, and identity.

The study of cross-cultural thought is a difficult endeavor at best; the outcome of cross-cultural study may be the depreciation of culture rather than its legitimate analysis from another viewpoint. The reality of doing cross-cultural investigation is that most of this analysis is performed through the inoculated gaze of a psychology whose discourse is founded on the premise of the universal subject—the subject of a historical project of emancipation via reason. As long as the language implies that the discourse is cross-cultural, we are perpetuating the notion that other cultures do not have their own valid and legitimate epistemological forms. "Cross-cultural" implies that there is a relative platform from which all observations are to be made, and the platform which remains in place in our neocolonial discipline is that of Western subjectivity. When Western subjectivity is imposed on colonized peoples, not only will the phenomenon

under scrutiny evade the lens of positivism, but further hegemony will be imposed on the community in question.

In order for our discipline to lead the way toward a true integration, sincere work must be completed as we move toward a postcolonial paradigm. Quite simply, a postcolonial paradigm would accept knowledge from differing cosmologies as valid in their own right, without their having to adhere to a separate cultural body for legitimacy. Frantz Fanon felt that the third world should not define itself in the terms of European values. Instead, Fanon thought that everything needs to be reformed and thought anew, and that if colonized peoples aren't willing to do this we should leave the destiny of our communities to the Western European mind-set. The year 1992 marked an important anniversary of the onset of colonialism in the New World. In keeping with the spirit of our brother Fanon, thinkers from the third and fourth worlds must create knowledge that is not only new, but is also liberating and healing.

The past five hundred years have been devastating to our communities; the effects of this systematic genocide are currently being felt by our people. The effects of the genocide are quickly personalized and pathologized by our profession via the diagnosing and labeling tools designed for this purpose. If the labeling and diagnosing process is to have any historical truth, it should incorporate a diagnostic category that reflects the effects of genocide. Such a diagnosis would be "acute and/or chronic reaction to colonialism." In this sense, diagnostic policy imposes a structure of normality based in part on the belief in the moral legitimacy and universality of state institutions.

The generation of healing knowledge from the land of the colonist—as has been the history of cross-cultural work—will no longer suffice. Our communities' indigenous forms of knowledge were and continue to be relevant as we face the task of overcoming the colonial mind-set that so many of us have internalized. For this reason, as responsible cross-cultural social scientists, we must address the colonial attitude of our discipline. We cannot continue to reward knowledge that reifies the thought of western Europeans above all others.

We realize that colonization has had an influence on much of the current state of knowledge. In order to have a true integration of thought we must make room for nonlinear thinking, which will yield a true hybrid postcolonial way of expressing subjectivity. As we move into the next millennium, we should not be tolerant of the neocolonialism that runs unchecked through our knowledge-generating systems. We must ensure that the dissemination of thought through journals, media, and other avenues have "gatekeepers" who understand the effects of colonialism and are committed to fighting any perceived act of hegemony on our communities. Postcolonial thinkers should be placed in the positions that act as gatekeepers of knowledge in order to insure that western European thought be kept in its appropriate place.

If psychology continues on its present course, the judgment of history will continue to be unkind—as already described by Michel Foucault in *Madness and Civilization* (1967). It is no longer acceptable for psychology to continue to be the enforcement branch of the secularized Judeo-Christian myth. Through the worshipping of logical positivism, our discipline has been a coconspirator in the devastation and control of those peoples who are not subsumed under a white, male, heterosexual, Christian subjectivity.

The Newtonian and Cartesian fundamentalists who continue to entrench themselves in kneeling at the altar of science must analyze and deconstruct their actions anew. A very simplistic analysis will illustrate that their so-called objectification of science is nothing but ongoing social control and hegemony. Our discipline prefers to think that psychological thought exists in an acontextual form, emerging as the immaculate conception of the past century. In reality, psychological thought as an offshoot of medicine has been gestating since the Middle Ages and continues to be implicated in an ongoing system of social control as it was during the heyday of the papacy. These notions are sure to disrupt the linear thinking of most of our objective scientific brothers and sisters in the profession. A postcolonial diagnosis for such objective scientists would perhaps be, "chronic and/or acute Cartesian anxiety disorder." Fortunately, this is a disorder

that has a good prognosis when treated with some of the new postcolonial therapeutic interventions. Postcolonial psychology will not operate on the basis of a logic of equivalence—A:non-A—but rather on a logic of difference—A:B. Postcolonial psychology will celebrate all diverse ways of life rather than comparing others to what they are not.

The current literature illustrates how contemporary service delivery is still failing not only Native Americans but other ethnic groups as well. Stanley Sue has found that “regardless of utilization rates, all of the ethnic-minority groups had significantly higher dropout rates than whites” (1987, p. 37). One of the most important factors in the failure of the mental health delivery system is an inability of therapists to provide relevant forms of treatment to ethnic populations.

Most of the attempts at providing services to Native American people have ended in failure. For the most part, the blame for this failure has been placed on the patient instead of on a delivery system that is still brazen with overtones of the 1800s Department of War policy: assimilation and/or termination of Native American people. Most providers are trained only in delivering services to the majority/dominant population. Usually, therapists are completely unaware of the life experiences of the ethnic minority patient. In earlier works—*Archetypal Consultation* (1984) and *Transforming the Soul Wound* (1990)—a theoretical construct was initiated (though never fully developed). This construct was the result of the integration of Jungian psychology and community consultation concepts. The resulting mental health model was implemented in a Native American community in central and northern California and, when measured by some standard evaluation methods, was assessed as having some success.

Since the initial success of this program, there have been further developments in the way psychology has been delivered to the aforementioned group of people. The program has expanded into a prevention and treatment model that has yielded a successful history of Native American people seeking relevant treatment for some of the problems they encounter as part of living in a colonialistic setting. The purpose here is not to

suggest that these paradigms are the final answer to the mental health problems in Native American country. Instead, we would like to point out some possible weaknesses that may be inherent in the models that were developed and offer some new solutions that have emerged after decades of clinical practice and research with Native American people.

In the past few years, much literature has emerged dealing with the issue of cross-cultural approaches. Although as yet no one has proposed a model that actually has had a significant level of success, some articles on Native American psychology have been written. Most of the literature having to do with Native Americans continues to focus on the lack of relevant approaches to psychological treatment as well as to paint a very grim picture of the extent of the problems afflicting the native American community. Most approaches implemented on Native peoples are ongoing attempts at further colonization of their lifeworld. Alcoholism, chemical dependency, and high rates of suicide continue to plague these communities. Programs that have the responsibility for addressing these problems appear impotent in the face of such a herculean task, although there are some isolated instances of success in treatment.

There continues to be discussion about integrating Western and traditional approaches in order to offer a solution to the problem; for the most part, however, the effort has remained in the realm of academic discussion. The problem is not so much with traditional practitioners in the Native American community as with the Western practitioners. Western practitioners approach traditional healing methods with skepticism while expecting absolute faith from the traditionals in orthodox Western-oriented therapeutic strategies. A bridge between these two camps must be built. The bridging task is more difficult than it might appear, since most Western practitioners are deeply entrenched in a worldview that will not allow for openness outside of rational empirical thought processes. In spite of the problems of bridging the worlds there are many non-Native American people who are embracing traditional concepts and actually portraying themselves as traditional medicine people or shamans. When Westerners portray themselves in this manner, they only

increase the existing gap, since the Native American community perceives these impostors as exploitative and disrespectful.

Purpose and Approach

The purpose of this book is to shed some light on how to approach these differing worldviews and the lack of understanding that exists between them; in so doing, we may begin to integrate these worldviews. By elaborating on models previously espoused in *Archetypal Consultation* and *Transforming the Soul Wound*, we offer some new ideas as to how issues of psyche can best be understood using the analytic methods of Archetypal psychology combined with Native American cosmology.

In this book, the problems of living a healthy and balanced life in the Native American community are honestly dealt with from the perspective of the community. The term *soul wound* is delineated and placed into the perspective of practical clinical intervention. The uses of Jungian typology are explored as they provide a construct that catapults this treatise into a new perspective. The authors demonstrate how the knowledge that has existed in the native community for hundreds of years directly addresses many problems faced by the community today. In so doing we feel that we are offering a long overdue legitimization of epistemological forms.

In the Clinical Praxis part of the book, the first area of discussion is alcoholism. We offer a review of the literature in this area, as well as some views of alcoholism from the perspective of oral tradition. The literature review is presented in academic fashion as is customary, and the traditional component is offered in a manner that reflects Traditional discussion. We then follow the alcohol section with some case examples illustrating the actual provision of treatment.

A brief discussion on working with Native American families is then offered. The sandtray is discussed as it is used in the assessment and treatment of children and families. The family discussion is followed by a chapter on suicide and, finally, by a chapter on community approaches to delivering services to Native American people.

In this book, we also include some discussion of how some of this work has been implemented in the treatment of a range of psychological diagnostic categories. We offer strategies that have emerged during the process of working therapeutically with individual clients and with communities. Some of these strategies have emerged from the despair of not having anything to offer to the client who is suffering greatly. The strategies that have emerged in this work are seen within the context of transforming a trauma that has been a painful part of the Native American community for many decades. As part of the honest “seeing” of things, we also discuss some of the parallels between shamanism and psychotherapy.

The epilogue of the book reflects on some sociopolitical issues that are inherent in working with Native American people. The fact that the Native American community has such a great number of problems is addressed from a sociohistorical perspective.

This book describes some of the notions needed in order to understand the worldview of Native American people. The purpose is not to encapsulate the experience of being a Native American so as to give the reader a blueprint of this perspective. Instead, the intent is to give the reader the necessary tools required to understand the theoretical discussion as well as the specific treatment strategies in this book. It is our hope that this discussion will be useful to therapists, counselors, paraprofessionals, academics, students, and community activists, advocates, and consultants.