seemed to lead as active an outdoor life as the author. It is clear, however, that like farm women in other decades Low felt restricted by the economic opportunities available to her. Marriage was an acceptable, though not always preferred, solution. Dust Bowl Diary is also timely in its account of one family’s struggle to retain its land, a situation relevant to present-day farmers seeking to preserve family farms. Then, as now, the government’s proper role in the affairs of agriculture was controversial.

Ann Marie Low’s diary is a sensitive, well-written account of farm life during the Depression in North Dakota. It is a rich resource for scholars studying this region and era, and for those examining farm women’s lives. Men and women who remember the dust bowl, as well as those too young to do so, will enjoy reading this informative and entertaining book.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EAU CLAIRE SARA BROOKS SUNDBERG


Glenda Riley needs little introduction to Annals of Iowa readers. A professor of history at the University of Northern Iowa, she has taught in the areas of women’s, public, and Iowa history. She has played an important role in encouraging research on women and the frontier. Women and Indians on the Frontier, 1825-1915 is her second major book. The first, Frontierswomen: The Iowa Experience, (1981) concluded with a discussion of Iowa women’s varying attitudes toward Indians. Surely not all frontier women, she observed, were completely negative in their perceptions.

Riley’s new study thus begins where her last ended. She argues that while white women on the frontier may have initially shared images and preconceptions of Indians, their frontier experiences often permitted them to revise their first impressions, as they may also have discovered new roles for themselves. In six main chapters, Riley traces American and European influences upon frontierswomen’s ideas; rumors and alarms on the trail and in early settlements; contact and cultural clash with Indians; development of relations with Indians; and attitudes of women toward Indians and other groups on the frontier, including the Mormons.

Riley has published four articles on these topics. There are other discussions in print as well, including Sandra L. Myres’ chapter on women’s views of Indians in her recent book Westering Women and
the Frontier Experience, 1800-1915 (1982). Elizabeth Hampsten, in Read This Only to Yourself: The Private Writings of Midwestern Women, 1880-1910 (1982) reaches conclusions similar to Myres' in regard to how white women saw Indians. Other scholars, notably John D. Unruh in The Plains Across, (1981) have deemphasized the actual degree of danger which Indians posed to non-Indian pioneers. Robert Berkhofer and other historians have probed white images of Indians and how such images influenced white actions. Riley's analysis is thus not pathbreaking for the most part, although it is the most extended commentary we have had to date.

Riley's Frontierswomen and Women and Indians clearly are similar in approach, style, and substance. In each, Riley has gone to women's writings as the heart of her research and has based her main conclusions upon those writings. She has quoted generously from diaries and other sources. She has introduced myths and stereotypes and then attempted to puncture them. Above all, she has wished to have women included as integral participants in the frontier experience; she has advocated a chronic that is neither romantic nor incomplete. To this end she has done exhaustive archival research. Together with the efforts of other historians, her work is contributing to a more thorough and more complicated picture of women on the frontier. We can no longer be satisfied with simplistic portraits of gentle takers.

At the same time, however, there are important limitations to this book. Riley acknowledges a couple of them in her introduction. She uses "West" and "frontier" interchangeable and she does not investigate in any detail the "Indian side" of this particular story. These are significant shortcomings. Riley's study is more about the frontier than about the West. It is considerably stronger in its treatment of the earlier portion of the ninety-year time span than in its coverage of the later section. Such emphases indeed are not surprising, given Rileys' previous teaching responsibilities and research. But for specialists in the history of the West (as opposed to the frontier) and in Indian history, they will be disappointing.

Even ten years ago, scholars in Indian history could focus almost exclusively on federal policy, for example, while ostensibly addressing Indian-white relations. Within the past decade, however, studies have become more two-sided. The internal dynamics of Indian history now command a far more central area of the stage. This process has enhanced our sense of Indian-white relations immeasurably. Even given difficulties with sources, any historian who currently works in Indian history must attempt to bring forth Indian views and actions. Therefore Women and Indians appears curiously old-fash-
ioned in its approach. In presenting white women's views and actions, of course, Riley is on much firmer ground. Yet we still need a broader context for western continuity and change. We need to know more fully how the West differed in 1915 from the West of 1825. We need to understand more clearly how a West Coast perspective might differ from that of Dubois, Wyoming. And we need to draw a sharper distinction between the view from a reservation bordertown community and that from a community more removed from Indian life.

Riley appears to want the women of her pages to speak for themselves. That is a laudable goal, but too often the chorus is unrestrained. There is a definite tendency to provide too many direct quotations. Pages often include as much quoted material as analysis; chapters average six or seven footnotes a page. A tighter rein on this material would have strengthened Riley's analysis. *Women and Indians on the Frontier, 1825-1915,* in sum, tells us more about white women than it does about Indians or the West. Still, even if it is a partial view, it is also a conscientious beginning. One may learn much from this thoughtful foray into a complex and worthwhile set of issues. One may also hope that Glenda Riley will continue to expand and deepen her inquiry from the foundations she has now established.

*University of Wyoming*  
PETER IVERSON


In the preface of his ethnohistorical analysis of the Eastern Dakota, or Sioux, Gary Clayton Anderson acknowledges his intellectual debts to a collection of visiting and resident scholars at the Newberry Library Center for the History of the American Indian. Taken together with the work of other “graduates” of the Newberry fellowship program—notable examples include Calvin Martin’s *Keepers of the Game: Indian-Animal Relationships and the Fur Trade* (1978), Neal Salisbury’s *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England* (1982), and Richard White’s *The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos* (1983)—Anderson’s study might represent an emerging “Newberry school” of interpretation in the field of Native American history. Exploitation of information and concepts from archaeology, demography, ecology, and ethnography characterize this “school’s” disciplinary approach. Substantively, these historians tend