

REVIEWS



American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment. By Jason Edward Black. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2015. 214 pages. \$65.00 cloth; \$65.00 electronic.

Well worth the read, the premise of *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment* is not as new as it is nuanced and enhanced. Although more than two sides were always in play, Black argues that the Native-US relationship developed out of the nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Native and non-Native discourses offered up from each side, and that thus the relationship owes its outlines not only to the colonizing tactics of the United States, but also to indigenous resistance. Often referring to both discourses as “the government” rhetoric, the author writes that as a result of discursive interaction, this rhetoric “constructed the silhouette of both . . . communities” (13).

Like Peter Nabokov’s now-classic *Native American Testimony: A Chronicle of Indian-White Relations from Prophecy to the Present, 1492–2000*, or C. Joseph Genetin-Pilawa’s more recent *Crooked Paths to Allotment: The Fight over Federal Indian Policy after the Civil War*, one of the strengths of this book is its inclusion of Native voices that might otherwise remain relegated to the archives. Black’s rhetorical analyses explore the effects and functions not only of what people said, but also how they said it, when, where, and to whom. Underlying this approach is a welcome and thickly described recognition of Native agency. That is, in order to effect change, Native speakers are shown deftly choosing their venues, words, and actions. Sometimes they succeeded, at least to some extent. And if to a much greater extent they did not succeed in altering what now appears to be (perhaps inaccurately) “the course of history,” yet Native speakers were often able to complicate how and when new laws were implemented. More importantly, they were able to leave a public record, if little explored, of their resistance that would influence federal Indian policy makers long into the future. Black’s work contributes significantly to the exploration of that record.

For example, the author points out that during the Removal Era, Native “decolonial” resistance occurred most often in public speeches, but also in editorials in the *Cherokee Phoenix* and other newspapers, petitions to Congress, and, in the instance of Sauk Nation leader Black Hawk, a published autobiography. Describing the latter text as a comingling of Native and non-Native voices, Black argues that regardless of its perceived authorial “impurity,” its effect was to express moral certitude and to expose the hypocrisies inherent in federal Indian policies (80). The author asserts that Native actors complicated Indian removal by means of these modes of communication, not only by using “U.S. governmental language, but also its channels, as a platform for resistance,” and thus extended the time needed to implement the Removal Act from the single year President Jackson had expected to nearly ten (60).

Drawing on the work of Frederick E. Hoxie's book *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880–1920*, among others, as well as primary documents from the periods under study, the author demonstrates repeatedly how Native expressions of reproach and rebuke worked to motivate reform in federal policies. In the Allotment Era, individuals as well as pan-Indian groups are shown to use “petitions, memorials, biographies, literatures, and performances” to influence public sentiment in ways not possible during the Removal Era (106). By challenging the “identity duality” imposed upon them through inconsistent federal policies of inclusion (a diminished form of citizenship) on the one hand, and exclusion (a diminished form of sovereignty) on the other, the Five Civilized Tribes are seen arguing strenuously against forced allotment (14). In one telling instance, among the many illustrated in this book, Choctaw leaders explain in an 1894 memorial to Congress that their people are doing well and “following in the way of progress.” And they ask: ““Why not just let us alone?”” (111). Black remarks that, though allotment was eventually imposed even on the southeastern tribes, their protests did delay its implementation there. Throughout, the author identifies the rhetorical ways in which Natives “talk back” (following Hoxie) as one of the distinguishing characteristics of decolonization. Further, he points to the “decolonial mechanism of *détournement*” to illustrate Native actors subverting the tools of public discourse again and again in order to undermine dominant power structures (104).

Black concludes his book with rhetorical analyses of the Native and non-Native discourses surrounding American Indian involvement as “citizen-dependents” in World War I (140), and of the 1924 Indian Citizenship Act, the 1928 Merriam Report, and the 1934 Indian New Deal. Harking back to seminal works such as Edward W. Said's *Culture and Imperialism* and Homi K. Bhabha's “Signs Taken for Wonders,” he rightly argues against the tendency to view marginalized peoples simply as victims, or as weak in the face of a monolithically constituted colonizer. Instead, he creates a rich tapestry of voices to show how Native discourses were able to “defy and *détourn*” governmental discourses, and to “flip the master narrative on Native-US relations” (137).

Referring to the Indian Citizenship Act and the Indian Reorganization Act as the “symbolic bookends of Native empowerment,” the author highlights the vigor and reverberations of Native agencies as they engaged in countercultural and “cultuaretypal” discourses around the “empowering and decolonizing ruptures” contained in those acts (155). Readers will have to decide for themselves to what extent the various terms of art employed, such as “cultuaretypal,” produce a deeper understanding of how colonization and decolonization proceed. “*Détournement*,” in particular, requires an accompanying critique along the lines of Audre Lord's “The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House.”

In another, more minor issue, the author seems to conflate the two Cherokee cases, stating on page 54 that “Marshall ruled in favor of the Cherokee” during his discussion of *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*. In fact, the Marshall Court did not rule in favor of the Cherokee until the later *Worcester v. Georgia* brought the question of Georgia's crimes back before the Court in 1832. The “decision” that Black refers to in his discussions was actually not a decision, at least not on the merits; rather, in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, the Court refused to hear the case on its merits, saying that it had no original

jurisdiction over what it called, in *dicta*, “domestic dependent nations”—a form of rhetoric if ever there was one (30 U.S. 2). Marshall coined the term to distinguish “tribes” both from “foreign nations,” on the one hand, and “states,” on the other—even though in a preceding paragraph the Court states, in no uncertain terms, “The Cherokee are a State” (30 U.S. 1)!

Overall, the foregoing aside, Black’s study is meticulous. Significantly, the author opens up an opportunity to explore the ways in which American indigenous nations would engage in a process of *détourning* the Court’s *dicta*—its non-binding, but persuasive opinion—in an ongoing and evolving strategy of speaking truth to power—and perhaps, as Black writes, for Native and non-Native actors to make “sense of their public lives together” (156).

Kristin Ruppel
Montana State University

Brethren by Nature: New England Indians, Colonists, and the Origins of American Slavery. By Margaret Ellen Newell. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015. 316 pages. \$45.00 cloth.

New England and its history, a region and subject overwrought by national mythology and Puritan studies, will be indelibly transformed by historian Margaret Newell’s *Brethren by Nature*. Newell places the enslavement of indigenous peoples at the center of staple topics of New England history, shedding new light on the household economy, the development of a legalistic society, and conflict with Natives. She contends that New England colonists made conscious decisions to exploit indigenous labor, using a variety of legal, military, and cultural mechanisms. In doing so, Natives and Europeans became part of a “hybrid society” in which indigenous people in varying states of bondage comingled with free colonists on a daily basis (6). Focusing on the complex matrix of legal statutes and customary practices that buttressed indigenous slavery in the region, Newell builds on her earlier scholarship to recast the relationship between colonists and the indigenous nations of southern New England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *Brethren by Nature* relies on an impressive research base of county court records, statutes, diaries, and published accounts to expose how deeply enmeshed colonists were in acquiring and deploying bonded indigenous labor.

For the thousands of Natives that New England slavery ensnared, its very opacity made escaping it difficult; similarly, the system’s ad hoc nature masked its pervasive role in the regional political economy and allowed it to evade scholarly attention. Many of the leading slavers will be familiar to students of the region: Roger Williams, Benjamin Church, Daniel Gookin, and John Winthrop and his sons, among other New England luminaries. Given their roles in organizing slaving campaigns and holding large numbers of Natives in household or plantation bondage, one is left wondering how such activities have avoided scholarly attention. In recovering the history of New England slavery, apparently hidden in plain sight, Newell joins a cohort of historians