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tioned 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
to emphasize the impact of ecological and demographic change, as well as political and cultural contact, in the transformation of tribal cultures. Thematically, they stress the relative flexibility and adaptability of those cultures; the significance of reciprocity in Native American thought and social relations; and the erosion of reciprocal relations and development of dependency consequent upon long-term absorption of native economies into the international market.

Anderson's treatment of the complex variables involved in intercultural relations is outstandingly subtle and sophisticated. Like Salisbury, he focuses on the importance of reciprocity—especially the reciprocal relations arising from affinal and fictive kinship bonds—in cementing native societies. Unlike Salisbury's New England tribesmen, however, the Eastern Sioux proved able for many generations to incorporate white traders and government officials into their kinship networks, and to impose Sioux definitions of responsibility on their adopted kinsmen. Successively, French, English, and American traders accepted a definition of "trade" as the exchange of gifts among relatives. French and English soldiers and officials similarly exchanged "gifts" of arms and ammunition in return for brotherly promises of friendship and military alliance. Though epidemics of the 1780s and 1790s substantially reduced their population and increased their dependence on white kinsmen, the Eastern Sioux nonetheless continued to regard those kinsmen as friendly supporters. They welcomed the American soldiers who established a fort in their midst, the emissaries of the American Fur Company, and their resident U.S. agent—all alike were friends and brothers. These new kinsmen provided not only goods and services, but profitable employment for a rising class of mixed-blood tribal leaders.

In the 1820s, the system of mutually profitable gift giving began to disintegrate. Beaver became scarce, and businesslike agents of the American Fur Company substituted whiskey and double-entry bookkeeping for generosity as a means of encouraging more energetic trapping. Sioux hunters went after muskrats, intensified their exploitation of dwindling buffalo herds, and appealed to their U.S. agent for help in dealing with their suddenly businesslike brothers. Their agent proposed land sales, and the Mdewakanton band enthusiastically bargained away their territory east of the Mississippi for annuities that settled their debts. In the 1830s, other bands attempted to negotiate equally profitable exchanges. By the end of that decade, we face the anomalous historical scene of an Indian tribe anxious to sell valuable timber land and a penurious Senate unwilling to incur deficits by ratifying the purchase. Economic revival, and the organization of Minnesota Territory, changed the senators' outlook. By
1851, the Sioux had sold nearly all of their territory in exchange for annuities and small reservations whose negotiated boundaries the Senate failed to ratify.

Well aware that neither hunting nor annuities would support the tribe in its diminished territories, government agents and missionaries intensified their efforts to train tribesmen in the techniques of plow agriculture and to teach them English, arithmetic, and Christian habits. Many Sioux men and women perceived the gifts of plows, schoolhouses, books, and prayers as yet another brand of brotherly generosity. But not all did. By the 1850s, traditionalists were organizing dancing societies of warriors in revolt against schools, Bibles, square houses, male agriculture, pantaloons, thieving agents, grasping traders, and carping missionaries. Dependent for profit and patronage not on friendly relations with their Indian hosts but on politicians in Minneapolis and Washington, traders and government employees no longer acted the part of friends and brothers. Even the more acculturated Sioux abandoned their participation in village life, hunting, and ceremonial dancing, and obeyed their white mentors’ advice to keep their surpluses locked in their own square cellars. Meanwhile “bad-speaking” German farmers overran the new land cessions. Few of them were friendly at all.

In 1862, surrounded by enemies of varying complexion, traditional Sioux warriors attempted to restore tribal unity by forcing their modernizing red kinsmen to join them in an uprising against white intruders. They chose their targets with care as well as ferocity. Trespassers, thieves, and scoffers at shamans paid with their lives. Proper kinsmen, friends and helpers of whatever complexion, received care and protection. Predictably, the rebels’ reluctant allies fled, the rebellion disintegrated, and Lincoln’s government executed those who had committed atrocities against civilians and imprisoned other warriors unfortunate enough to have been around at the time. The Eastern Sioux ended up on reservations in Nebraska and the Dakotas.

Military defeat simply accelerated an on-going process of disintegration in Sioux society and politics. The transformation of traders—mixed-bloods and U.S. agents who were long-valued counselors within the tribal political system—into self-interested factionalists, together with the polarization of the society over questions of acculturation, destroyed the consensual governance that had served the tribe through generations of adaptation to the multiple challenges of diplomatic, economic, and cultural change.

Anderson’s systematic, nuanced analysis of Sioux history revises several “traditional” interpretations, and ranges chronologically from the Chippewas’ responsibility for early Sioux migrations to the Sioux’s
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selection of victims in the 1862 "massacre." More important, his treatment of fictive kinship as an adaptive strategy, and of the reasons for the ultimate breakdown of that strategy, suggests an interpretive framework that should be useful to ethnohistorians who deal with a variety of contact situations. His work makes clear both the complexity of cultural interactions on the frontier and the flexibility of tribal people in coping with novel challenges and opportunities.

University of Rochester Mary Young


The authors of tribal histories are generally non-Indians who spend most of their time combing archives and special collections for documentary evidence about particular tribes. Historians usually come to know their subjects only through written records, the vast majority of which non-Indians compiled. Too often historians do not interact with their human subjects; they neglect the rich oral traditions of Native Americans. The major focus of Gerald Vizenor's volume is the oral histories of the Anishinaabeg, people commonly called the Chippewa. Interspersed with analysis of the written literature associated with the Chippewa, Vizenor has woven numerous oral traditions, ranging from the creation story of his people to narratives about Dennis Banks. Thus Vizenor has based an American Indian history on the documentary evidence which the Indians themselves present.

Vizenor, a professor of Native American literature at the University of California, Berkeley, is a member of the Minnesota Chippewa tribe and the author of several books, articles, and plays. The People Named the Chippewa is in no sense a "traditional" academic history, but is nonetheless a scholarly work of considerable value. Vizenor deals with a variety of topics, including Chippewa origins, the importance of medicine people, and the significance of dreams. Many of his oral histories also discuss issues of Indian education in Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and Catholic schools. The author uses the reminiscences of selected individuals to illustrate aspects of Chippewa life. For example, he uses the words of Rose Shingobe Barstow to examine the feelings of Indians attending school for the first time. Barstow remembered that when she attended a BIA boarding school ridicule frightened her into silence. In third grade she decided not to say anything at school ever again because she feared students and