

Power and Progress on the Prairie: Governing People on Rosebud Reservation

Harvey Markowitz

Washington and Lee University

ISSN 0003-4827

Copyright © 2019 State Historical Society of Iowa. This article is posted here for personal use, not for redistribution.

Recommended Citation

Markowitz, Harvey. "Power and Progress on the Prairie: Governing People on Rosebud Reservation." *The Annals of Iowa* 78 (2019), 97-98.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17077/0003-4827.12555>

Hosted by [Iowa Research Online](#)

to raid other tribes. In response, Tatum sometimes withheld rations, including sugar. In a letter to his Quaker superiors in 1870, he declared, "I did it to punish them and . . . I believe it had a very salutary effect upon them. They have not appeared to be nearer conquered since I have been here than they did on that day" (89).

Graber skillfully uses a variety of sources, including Kiowa calendar drawings and shield art, enabling her to reveal Kiowa hopes and fears. Those sources also reveal the process of assimilation and cultural survival. For example, toward the end of her story, Graber analyzes a fascinating letter written to a Kiowa student at the Carlisle Indian School from his family on the reservation. The letter used a combination of symbols and drawings to deliver news of Christianity's presence on the reservation, the local peyote society, and pieces of family news (199–200).

Overall, *The Gods of Indian Country* is a welcome addition to the scholarship on American Indian spirituality as well the history of nineteenth-century U.S. Indian policy on the southern plains.

Power and Progress on the Prairie: Governing People on Rosebud Reservation, by Thomas Biolsi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018. xxii, 340 pp. Maps, graphs, tables, illustrations, notes, index. \$30.00 paperback.

Reviewer Harvey Markowitz is associate professor of anthropology at Washington and Lee University. He is the author of *Converting the Rosebud: Catholic Mission and the Lakotas, 1886–1916* (2018).

During the past three decades, a sizeable portion of anthropologist-ethnohistorian Thomas Biolsi's scholarship has focused on political, economic, and jurisdictional issues affecting the Pine Ridge and Rosebud Lakota Reservations of South Dakota. In *Organizing the Lakota* (1993), Biolsi analyzed why the Oglala and Sicangu Lakotas of those reservations ultimately voted to formalize their political life under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 and how that decision further politically factionalized their populations and diminished their tribes' power over reservation affairs. In *Deadliest Enemies* (2001), he demonstrated the various ways federal courts have systematically posed the interests of Rosebud Indian against those of non-Indians in neighboring counties, thus exacerbating racial tensions between the two groups.

In his latest effort, *Power and Progress on the Prairie*, Biolsi again returns to the Rosebud Reservation and its surrounding South Dakota counties to explore how federal officials, local bureaucrats, and social experts collaborated on programs of directed change that they believed would improve the lives of the state's Indians and non-Indians and the often destructive consequences of those initiatives. As he explains in his

introduction, his object is not to describe the formal policies or congressional laws that went into the construction of the programs but to examine their origins and agendas as examples of “governmentality,” a neologism coined by the late French philosopher and political historian Michel Foucault that refers to the often subtle and unobtrusive ways those in power attempt to mold the consciousness and actions of people to solve problems that the leaders deem of local or national concern.

Biolsi has organized his book as a series of case studies. In chapter one he discusses the way the government reduced the Rosebud Lakotas’ lands in order to make them available to non-Indian settlers. He places both processes within the contexts of the democratic values of white homesteading and Indian allotment. In chapter two he examines the strategies of governmentality that were deployed in order to re-engineer Indians into modern citizens and transform white farmers into good businessmen. The next case study illustrates how the governmental processes associated with the New Deal in South Dakota illustrate that “liberalism with its impulse not to govern too much has been historically accompanied by a process of reform guarding against governing too little” (129). The following chapter contrasts New Deal reformers’ views of policies needed to confront the Great Depression and drought with those of white and Indian South Dakotans they sought to convert into “New Deal subjects.” Chapter five details how, during the Cold War, the relatively sparsely inhabited region of western South Dakota was economically and socially devalued in order to make it a suitable site for ICBM silos, thus drawing potential Soviet nuclear attacks away from the country’s more densely populated and valued areas. In his final chapter, Biolsi discusses the legal-political apparatuses designed to protect the voting rights of racial minorities and the recognition of treaty rights and tribal sovereignty and how they came into conflict during the process of organizing Todd County on the Rosebud Reservation.

The essays in *Power and Progress on the Prairie* are not easy reading. Each is densely packed with historical details that the author employs to meticulously build his case. Although the cases are specific to South Dakota, the book’s theoretical framework and its lessons make it important reading for Iowans and all citizens of the nation’s heartland who will be able to discern the workings of governmentality in their own states and lives.

Congress and the King of Frauds: Corruption and the Credit Mobilier Scandal at the Dawn of the Gilded Age, by Robert B. Mitchell. Roseville, MN: Edinborough Press, 2018. xi, 214 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography. \$22.95 paperback.