

pertaining to the rocky and forested islands across the mouth of Green Bay, while the second, by Mildred Mott Wedel, provides a detailed and beautifully documented account of Pierre-Charles LeSueur's early contacts with the Dakota Sioux.

The volume is specialized and covers a variety of topics on many different levels, but the serious student of upper Midwest archaeology will find this group of papers to be a valuable source book for years to come. The editor and contributors are to be congratulated for providing a fitting tribute to Lloyd Alden Wilford.

—Duane C. Anderson
The University of Iowa

#

Indians and Bureaucrats: Administering the Reservation Policy during the Civil War, by Edmund Jefferson Danziger, Jr. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1974. pp. ix 240.

Without some understanding of American Indian history, and that from the perspective of the American Indian, there is no understanding American history. Indeed, an understanding of relations between the American Indian and the Europeans who became dominant of the continent reveals as much about the real meaning of American history as the American Revolution or the Civil War. The first Americans were subjected to an invasion from without, and eventually when the Europeans came in such numbers that the Indians could no longer withstand the onslaught, they became a colonial people in their own land. By the time the United States extended its

imperial boundaries to the Pacific Ocean, the American Indian was encompassed in an internal colonialism. The reservation system that developed during the mid-nineteenth century, and, as it still exists today, is a manifestation of this internal colonialism. In fact, the colonization of the American West involved such issues as westward expansion, the growth of the government's Indian bureaucracy and the concomitant conflict between Indian and white man.

Edmund Danziger, Jr., in *Indians and Bureaucrats* describes the government's policy of colonization during the Civil War years. In the imperial push into the trans-Mississippi West, aggressive miners, land-hungry white farmers, and the protective arm of the United States Army served to disrupt and displace the indigenous Indian population. Legal niceties such as "extinguishing" Indian land title, providing compensation to the newly disappropriated tribesmen and colonizing tribesmen on appropriate reserves (land areas not considered valuable in the mid-nineteenth century), all came under the jurisdiction of the Indian bureaucracy. Professor Danziger illustrates the Indian bureaucracy's problems with two different categories of its "charges"—the nomadic people and the reservation people.

The writing and teaching about Indians in American history has always been rife with judgments which denigrate Indian tradition and Indian lifestyles. More recently writers have made conscious efforts to avoid the use of such value laden and prejudiced references, and in the process have contributed a much needed corrective in the writing and teaching about American Indians—a people who have been traditionally treated as a "menace" or an "obstacle" to the advance and progress of American civilization. Not so, however, with much of Edmund Danziger's *Indians and Bureaucrats*. Bernard DeVoto's charge some twenty-five years ago that American history was one-sided and arrogantly told from the white man's view point still rings true today.

Professor Danziger defines Indian tribesmen who are driven from their homes by incoming miners or farmers and

who refuse to abide the government's advice and settle on reservations selected for them as "hostiles" or "renegades" (p. 9). The Navajos, according to the author, subsisted, in part, "by warring against whites. . . . Their treacherous Apache neighbors . . . lived on native products and plunder from nearby farms and ranches. The warlike Utes roamed the central Rockies." The "destitute Diggers of Utah" were "low on the scale of civilization" (p. 13).

When the United States acquired the Mexican Secession as a consequence of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, it "fell heir to the native peoples of the Southwest" (p. 55). The Navajos and Apaches who were included in this imperial bargain are subjected to some of the author's stronger expletives. White encroachment on Apache and Navajo land and the "warlike cultures" of the Indians and their "predatory economies" caused hostilities between whites and Indians (p. 56). The author refers to the "pillaging" of the hostile Navajos, while the whites merely "retaliated" (p. 57). The frequency of such terms in *Indians and Bureaucrats* would incline us to believe that the Navajo and Apache did little else except to wage war.

One is confronted time and again with references to hostile tribes, red belligerence, obstinate hostiles, marauding Indians and intractable tribesmen. Only very brief mention is made as to why the tribes might have reacted in this way. Occasionally Professor Danziger refers to unruly miners or avaricious white farmers, but usually the invading white population is described in terms of enterprising Americans or otherwise sturdy pioneering families, hardy people, struggling against great odds to carve out a civilization and pave the way for progress. During the Civil War years, according to the author, these "pioneers" were left relatively defenseless because of the withdrawal of federal troops from the West to serve in the eastern battlefields.

Perhaps the most striking part of this book is the account of the events in Colorado Territory which led to the massacre of Black Kettle's southern Cheyenne in 1864. Reading Profes-

sor Danziger's account of Sand Creek is like reading Dee Brown's *Bury My Heart At Wounded Knee* through two-way mirrors, or, the story of Wounded Knee from the perspective of the United States Army, vintage 1976. Would-be culprits are well-meaning and concerned citizens. Governor John Evans is described as a man confronted with "problems" when lawless miners and their lackeys flocked into Colorado Territory in the early 1860s. Evans, who evidently feared that the white population would be "left unprotected before a red onslaught" (pp. 34-35), wrote to his superiors in Washington about an Indian conspiracy against white settlers in Colorado. The governor's real concern was how to rid Colorado Territory of its resident Indian tribes.

Colorado Territory's Governor Evans was so fraught with concern for his Indian charges, according to the author, that he pursued every possibility in his efforts to confine the Cheyenne and Arapaho to reservations. Professor Danziger states boldly that the Indian's nomadic nature was partly to blame for the troubles in Colorado in 1863 and 1864, and "[U]ntil the Indians submitted to reservation life, they would continue to clash with whites and be the target of military reprisals" (p. 32). However, the Cheyenne and Arapaho failed to grasp these realities, and by the summer of 1864 Indian raids "so threatened Colorado . . . that Evans too lost whatever sympathy he had for his Indian charges" (p. 38). On August 11th Evans issued a proclamation which authorized each white citizen in Colorado to kill and destroy any hostile Indians in Colorado Territory. Which brings us to Sand Creek.

Professor Danziger dispenses with Colonel John Chivington's attack on Black Kettle's camp at Sand Creek in one paragraph. What most historians of Sand Creek refer to as a "massacre," the author calls "a day of bloody fighting" (p. 44). He partially excuses Governor Evans for his involvement by saying that Evans "had every right to be skeptical of the overtures of Black Kettle and the other chiefs, for theirs was a typical plains Indian tactic: live off the government during the

winter when game was scarce and then resume hostilities in the spring" (p. 43). Danziger's incredible conclusion about the whole affair is that "the puzzle of 'battle' versus 'massacre' still defies solution" (p. 46). Again, this is strikingly similar to the recent United States army historians' revision of the Wounded Knee massacre. Sand Creek was the My Lai of the nineteenth century.

Focusing on the Indian officials' view of the government's Indian policy is similar to following the "official" version of the United States government's Vietnam policy in the 1960s. Both offer only a single-perspective approach and that from the vantage point of the aggressor. Certainly the victims and subjects of that policy deserve fair hearing as well. We should no more believe in the Johnson, Rostow, Rusk version of America's Vietnam policy than we should accept the legitimacy of the government's Indian policy through the tainted glasses of the Indian Office.

—William G. Robbins
Oregon State University

#

Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, edited by Catharine R. Stimpson, Quarterly by The University of Chicago Press. \$12.00 annually.

The inaugural issue of a new journal designed to represent international scholarship about women was published by The University of Chicago Press in late 1975. Titled *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, this quarterly com-

Copyright of Annals of Iowa is the property of State of Iowa, by & through the State Historical Society of Iowa and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.