

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

The War in Words: Reading the Dakota Conflict through the Captivity Literature. By Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/10j1v464>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 34(4)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Gregor, Theresa L.

**Publication Date**

2010-09-01

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Pointing out the aspect character of the Chipewyan verbs in contrast to Indo-European verbs being marked for tense, Scollon underscores how important these are respectively to reckonings of action in time. His comments about Mandeville's goals nevertheless do not engage the issue of language retention and cultural preservation, betraying a conventional, Western, clinical approach to aboriginal linguistics. Today we are more vocal about cultural preservation and look for practical methods that can revitalize a language, record the oral traditions of a culture threatened by modern technology, and have some means to perpetuate cultural attributes. Perhaps because of this, indigenous community people and scholars resort to processes instigated by Euro-Western forms of literacy in order to make practical applications of what languages hold for their people in meaning and spirit. Scholarly decision can otherwise be a disruptive factor. Scollon explains at modest length that Mandeville deferred to a friend, Forcier, to tell the "His Grandmother Raised Him" story to Li because he knew Forcier would give a better telling. But Li and Scollon, wanting *Chipewyan Texts* to be just Mandeville's stories and because Forcier's narration was very succinct and allegedly inferior in quality, omitted it, having then to explain their omission to the people of Fort Chipewyan (237). Still, Scollon was smart enough to realize that Forcier may have been among other reasons intentionally reticent about sharing that story, but he seems to have acquired this revelation much later (258). Scholars and professionals, then, may need to include community input regarding their lexical choices.

The title of this book is taken from a principal structural marker in Mandeville's telling of many stories, and Scollon renders these in separate lines in order to punctuate a narrative at an emphatic point in an episode or to bring closure to a story. Scollon leaves to readers what the phrase signifies, but he or certainly Bringham might have made the phrase usage less opaque for less-experienced readers despite that being somewhat obvious. Scollon includes a modest bibliography, but there is no index. In general, with the narrations in the main body of the collection easy to follow, readers will enjoy the twenty-one stories that make up *This Is What They Say*. Speakers and students of Athabaskan languages will be eager to engage Scollon's technical descriptions of his and Li's respective and collaborative work. Meanwhile, those familiar with the Cree syllabary are sure to have fun with the syllabic symbols for Chipewyan.

*Ron Welburn*

University of Massachusetts–Amherst

**The War in Words: Reading the Dakota Conflict through the Captivity Literature.** By Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2009. 398 pages. \$60.00 cloth.

The American Indian captivity narrative occupies a contested space in Native American and American literature. Many American literature scholars believe that the production of the captivity narrative marked the beginning

of a new original “American” literary tradition. The so-called birth of the American colonial captivity narrative started with the publication of Mary White Rowlandson’s *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* (1682), which features the harrowing experiences of a white captive held hostage by “savage” Wampanoag captors. The genre eventually evolved to encompass a wide range of diverse narrative styles of fiction and (auto)biography, including the slave narrative and the sentimental novel of seduction. In each of these distinct, yet related forms, the captivity plot resolves with the ransom, rescue, escape, or transculturation of the captive. Research in the field by Betty Donahue, Scott Lyons, Yael Ben-zvi, and Stephen Brandon takes into consideration the countercaptivity narratives of Native American experiences at boarding schools, forced removals to reservations, and “confinement,” such as being taken prisoner during US-Indian conflicts.

Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola is one of the leading scholars in the field of captivity literature; she has co-authored and edited anthologies and critical studies that focus on constructions of gender, race relations, and religion. *The War in Words: Reading the Dakota Conflict through the Captivity Literature* is the first monograph in the field to focus entirely upon the captivity literature produced in response to a single American Indian colonial conflict: the six-week Dakota War of 1862 that divided and traumatized the Native American inhabitants of Minnesota (4). *The War in Words* is a well-researched and carefully constructed analysis of the historical and literary records produced following the controversial and chilling conclusion of the Dakota War, a violent and harrowing interracial conflict sparked, according to one account, by “hunger” precipitated by a lack of resources and a delayed delivery of annuity payments and rations mandated by treaty from the US government to the Dakotas (29).

The analysis begins with an overview of the social forces that fomented the violence and a brief introduction to the twenty-four individuals who published captivity narratives following the conclusion of the warfare. Stodola examines accounts written by Native and non-Native participant-captives/captors in the Dakota War that were published between 1863 and 1978. The narratives “signify a series of complex, contesting kaleidoscope of responses” that place in sharp relief the formation and politics of historical memory (3). Her subjects are men and women of Anglo, Franco, German, African, and Dakota descent with varying degrees of racial, economical, social, and political mixing, which produced cultural ambivalence and/or cultural disavowal in some of the narratives. At the conclusion of the war, thirty-eight Dakota men were hanged in the largest mass execution in Minnesota (and US) history, with some of these individuals falsely accused of war crimes. Additionally, 1,316 Dakota men, women, and children caught in the fray were removed from Minnesota and relocated to the Crow Creek Reservation in South Dakota (16). Stodola filters the “war in words” through the contested and passionate individual responses to the conflict without privileging a particular form (history versus auto-ethnography), voice (non-Native and Native), or perspective (past or present), as she reads all the narratives through the lens of captivity and confinement.

The side-by-side presentation of the Dakota conflict narratives written by the non-Native and Native captives/captors resituates and deconstructs the canonical focus of the American Indian captivity genre, which historically privileged the subject-position of the white captive. Stodola charts the rise, role, and function of the American Indian captivity narrative in the national culture and explains the way in which the Dakota War narratives adhere to, diverge from, and transform prior generic categorizations of disruption, trauma, stress, and violence. In addition, the subheadings to each chapter provide further thematic classification of the accounts: "Captivity & Protest," "Captivity & German Americans," "Captivity & Bicultural Women's Identity," and "Captivity & Oral History." The common thread to all the narratives, however, involves the individual descriptions of captivity and confinement during and after the war, and the way in which those experiences "destabilized and blurred identity in the eyes of both writer and reader" (50).

Not surprisingly, the individuals most divided and affected by the Dakota War and its legacy are the Dakotas, particularly those of mixed racial backgrounds. In this regard, the narratives presented in part 2, "Native Americans Narrating Captivity," provide the most compelling and unique examples of the stress, anxiety, and cultural conflict caused by the war. The accumulation of the diverse set of narratives reveals a second common thread: the suspicion of the bicultural or racially mixed individual's allegiance to a particular cultural, religious, or political group during the war. The issue of racial or cultural authenticity in Indian country is fraught and polemical. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (Crow/Creek/Sioux) is vociferous in her defense of tribal kinship ties, the efficacy to practice Native American studies for the sake of Native American tribal communities, and her belief that anything less than a tribally centric worldview and theoretical lens is a capitulation to American imperialism and hegemony. Stodola points out that Cook-Lynn argues that the Dakota conflict and American Indian colonization were part of a larger "anti-Indianism" sentiment in America that forced Natives to "relinquish [the] faith and identity" that the dominant culture believed were inextricably tied to tribal racial identifications. In this way, Cook-Lynn draws uncomfortable parallels between Natives and Jews as targets of systematic racial oppression and genocide (20).

However, none of the racially mixed Dakotas in the monograph articulate a cultural defense about the war as forcefully and compelling as Cook-Lynn does. One reason for the bicultural ambivalence in the Native captivity narratives is the conflation of the myriad levels of confinement, capture, and betrayal operating simultaneously for some of the participants during the conflict. For instance, the stories of Samuel J. Brown and Joseph Godfrey are presented as original Native texts about "conflicting cultural identities and agendas that affected the presentation of captivity and confinement" (169). To varying degrees each man seemed to renounce, or at least minimize, his role in the war through traditional Dakota kinship ties that helped him evade life-threatening capture and simultaneously assist non-Native captives during the warfare. "Both Brown and Godfrey used their stories to credit or validate their own actions and attitudes. In this way, they adapted a standard use of the captivity narrative: helping to authorize a captive's behavior during and after captivity" (169).

Brown's racially mixed status in the Dakota conflict accounts is elevated through his upwardly mobile social-class status; however, Godfrey's status is dubiously mixed by his Franco-African-Native heritage, which provides him with an ambiguous, almost chameleon-like identity that resists easy classification for the military courts. Godfrey testifies that his participation in the Dakota violence was coerced. His testimony, single-handedly, according to many of the accounts, signs the death warrant for execution of several Dakota men hanged at Mankato. "He supplied evidence—much of it amazingly detailed—of fifty-five of the cases, and he testified in the trials of eleven of the thirty-eight Dakotas hung" (181–82). In the end, Godfrey's narrative seems to divide further and provide an historical foundation for racial separation not only between Natives and whites but also more insidiously between Natives and African Americans that mixed with Natives: "Like some other part-black, part-Native people, his status as an Indian was better than his status as African slave" (179). Yet this racial restructuring did little to preserve, protect, or include him in either community. Stodola reveals that he died an antihero in the Dakota community, a social outcast with threats made against his life continuously since the trials, and that he was forced to live in hiding as "a captive of his conscience" (185).

Literary analysis of the canonical captivity narrative shows that the plot resolution typically leads to a consciousness-raising of the former captive. In essence, the traumatic experience transforms the captive, turning him or her into a double agent: at once the representation of civilization restored and the new "native" informant inside and outside the text. The captive's newfound duality, Christopher Castiglia argues in *Bound and Determined* (1998), affects the captive's ability to contrast cultural, racial, and/or gender differences in the world. This line of inquiry overwhelmingly privileges the experience of whiteness as the most desirable subject-position of the narrative; however, the examples of Godfrey and the other bicultural narratives of the Dakota War challenge this position. Thus, Stodola's work "reveals the heterogeneity and volatility of Minnesota's many frontiers" during the war (26).

Her reading of the Dakota War's captivity literature, the historical forces that produced the narratives, and the legacy with which contemporary Minnesotans and Dakotas must reckon encourage contemporary readers of captivity literature to investigate the deep fissures of cultural and historical memory that continue to haunt American Indian stories of capture and erasure, place and displacement, settler and Native, memorial and massacre. Her work reminds us that the individual experience witnesses, resists, participates, and narrates history, sometimes holding it rhetorically or ideologically captive while offering "hope for liberation and renewal" through literary reproduction (276). In the end, we can only do as Joy Harjo once instructed me, to "carefully walk the razor's edge" and "tell the story."

*Theresa L. Gregor* (Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel)  
University of San Diego