UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
We Are Not a Vanishing People: The Society of American Indians, 1911–1923. By Thomas Constantine Maroukis.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5kw3941r

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 45(2)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Shaw, John M.

Publication Date
2021-06-01

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

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

We Are Not a Vanishing People: The Society of American Indians, 1911–1923. By Thomas Constantine Maroukis. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2021. 296 pages. $100.00 cloth; $35.00 paper; $150.00 electronic.

Founded in 1911, the Society of American Indians (SAI) constituted the first completely Indian-led national advocacy organization demanding justice for Native Americans.

In *We Are Not a Vanishing People: The Society of American Indians, 1911–1923*, author Thomas Constantine Maroukis argues that "modern Indian political activism is part of a continuum" even if "in hindsight, it is difficult to pinpoint the specific accomplishment of the SAI" (13, 79). The Native American leaders of the SAI certainly refuted the lie of the prevalent European American racist perceptions of Indians as intellectually inferior and represented diverse cultural, economic, and political responses to federal "vanishing" policies like assimilation and allotment. The SAI refuted disappearance in spite of demographic decline and the federal government's all-out assault on tribal cultures and land holdings, and represented the resilience and persistence of Native peoples during the second and third decades of the twentieth century.

They objected to the legal status of American Indians in the twentieth century as "wards" of the nation as a result of decades of federal and state laws and policies that resulted in Native marginalization and dependency. SAI leaders such as anthropologist Arthur Parker (Seneca) and Carlos Montezuma (Yavapai) insisted that the federal government had to uphold all treaties, reminding the Office of Indian Affairs that "we are nations" who should have the power to determine their own futures (14). Only by holding on to their tribal roots and identities could Native American self-determination be realized. SAI members like founder Dr. Charles Eastman took every opportunity to publicly express pride in being an Indian: "I am an Indian.... Nevertheless, so long as I live, I am an American" (23).

We Are Not a Vanishing People is the best book on early twentieth-century Indian reform activism since Tom Holm's *The Great Confusion in Indian Affairs: Native Americans & Whites in the Progressive Era* (2005). Maroukis adopts Philip Deloria's categorization of the SAI as "an inter-Indian political and cultural lobbying organization" (14). The impetus for its formation derived from a crucial need to respond to the age-old Indian "question" or "problem" raised by non-Native government policymakers and their private citizen allies. An SAI pamphlet expressed the frustrated Native perspective: "the political status of the Indian varies from state to state and from Indian to Indian in a way most demoralizing to the race and disastrous to the nation" (5). For the SAI, freedom would always be the answer to the Indian "question" or "problem."

Maroukis deploys a chronological narrative of the SAI's origins, goals, growth, problems, internal conflicts, and demise, drawing upon an extensive array of primary sources that clarifies the group's place as a noteworthy Progressive Era reform organization that left a legacy for late-twentieth- and early-twenty-first-century Native Americans to build upon. The only downside with this approach is that some key issues become a bit too repetitive followed year after year. Avoiding a simplistic binary

Downloaded from http://meridian.allenpress.com/aicrj/article-pdf/45/2/155/3049935/i0161-6463-45-2-155.pdf by University of California Los Angeles user on 02 December 2022

breakdown between SAI advocates for assimilation versus resistance proves to be a major strength of the author's analysis. The diversity of the SAI's leadership and membership precludes any simple categorization. Maroukis does not overinflate his thesis or the SAI's achievements, but places them in a nuanced context supported by documentary evidence. It is commendable he avoids the portrayal of Native Americans as victims. The accent on Indian agency and persistence is inspiring. The SAI's leaders possessed clear conceptions of freedom for Native peoples. But the author makes it clear the SAI's inability to connect with and uplift reservation communities constituted one of the organization's biggest failures. A top-down organization with no grassroots could not sustain itself.

By 1916, lingering problems began taking their toll. Insufficient membership, lack of financial resources, more acrimonious debates on the SAI's direction on the citizenship issue, in addition to the peyote controversy, resulted in a period of growing factionalism due both to external forces and internal turmoil. SAI leaders encompassed a diverse, well-educated, articulate, opinionated, and combative cohort with strong egos. They did not hold back on criticizing the OAI or each other. In his famous, "Let My People Go" speech, Carlos Montezuma attacked the SAI as a "do-nothing organization" (117). Both Arthur Parker and Montezuma wanted to abolish the Indian office and attain Indian citizenship, but their approaches varied. Montezuma felt it had to be immediately, while Parker favored a gradualist tactic. Sadly, five years after its inception, the "seeds" of the SAI's "demise were obvious" and the "factionalism had become entrenched" (136).

By 1917 and the United States' entry into World War I, intense debates over patriotism arose and raised questions about the civic status of Indians. The participation of 12,000–16,000 Native Americans in the war became the ultimate proof that the American Indian had not "vanished." Having fought alongside non-Native soldiers against a common enemy, citizenship for veterans extended to all American Indians in 1924, although an estimated two-thirds had already become citizens. From the OAI's perspective, the granting of citizenship in 1924 to all American Indians was the final phase of their assimilation efforts. Yet even as citizens Native Americans faced forms of "Jim Crow" racism, while those on reservations still languished as wards of the federal government—to the dismay of the SAI. Maroukis concludes "unfortunately, citizenship did not solve the basic problem: a lack of self-determination for Indian people," but that negative outcome cannot be blamed on the SAI (214).

From 1919–1923, the final years of the SAI's existence, conferences became sporadic, and membership and funds dwindled. After a twelve-year run, the SAI became defunct. But its brief existence does not minimize its importance for Native Americans and all Americans. By 1923, the vanishing Indian myth had itself vanished. European Americans became increasingly interested in Native American cultures, especially their environmental consciousness. Despite a five-year gap, the SAI's critiques of the Office of Indian Affairs led to the government-sponsored *Meriam Report* (1928). It conceded the failures of assimilation policy to solve the "Indian problem," and called for an end to colonization and wardship, and a transition towards self-determination.

Downloaded from http://meridian.allenpress.com/aicrj/article-pdf/45/2/155/3049935/i0161-6463-45-2-155.pdf by University of California Los Angeles user on 02 December 2022

Federal Indian policy continued to undermine the legal status and self-government of tribes by institutionalizing the doctrines of wardship and plenary power until 1934. Nevertheless, the positive political and cultural legacy of the SAI inspired some of the late-twentieth-century Native American activism and protest that lives today. Changing public perception of American Indians, they laid the groundwork for today's National Native American Heritage month and Indigenous People's Day. Hence, Maroukis concludes, the refrain "We Are Still Here" "is louder than ever" (219). The SAI's activism ensured that Native peoples' voices would be heard in the American cultural mainstream.

John M. Shaw
Portland Community College

What God Is Honored Here? Writings on Miscarriage and Infant Loss by and for Native Women and Women of Color. Edited by Shannon Gibney and Kao Kaliai Yang. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019. 256 pages. $19.95 paper; $19.95 electronic.

The individual and family pain that so frequently comes with miscarriage and infant loss is often compounded for Native women and women of color in the United States. The loss occurs in the context of genocide and ongoing colonialism perpetuated against Indigenous bodies; it occurs within the context of ongoing, deeply structural racism. And the loss occurs within a dominant culture that continues to devalue women's reproductive lives—especially the lives of women of color and Indigenous women. Legacies and ongoing impacts of colonialism and white supremacist policies compound the grief felt by those living through loss: this is simply true, and, for many of us, rather easy to comprehend, intellectually.

That something is true and easy to comprehend intellectually does not make grappling with it any less difficult. And that something is true and easy to comprehend intellectually does not mean that one's belief and understanding can grasp the tenor, the temperature, or the emotional resonance of the narratives provided by writers who have experienced such losses. The stunningly good pieces in *What God Is Honored Here? Writings on Miscarriage and Infant Loss by and for Native Women and Women of Color* generously, righteously offer access to those greater depths. Some scholars become used to approaching our areas of study through data and analysis, even those of us who study the messy moments of life captured here: birth, and death. I appreciate the shift of perspective enabled by encountering a poetics of birth and death, a series of visual representations of loss, a personal story told intimately on six slim pages.

In *What God Is Honored Here?* editors Shannon Gibney and Kao Kalia Yang have collected twenty-seven poems, essays, stories, and works of visual art into a coherent and well-balanced whole. While the Supreme Court has approached pregnancy through a trimester system of biological time—such as in the cases of *Geduldig v Aiello* and the entire *Roe* progeny—the editors' arrangement of the pieces defies the

Downloaded from http://meridian.allenpress.com/aicrj/article-pdf/45/2/155/3049935/i0161-6463-45-2-155.pdf by University of California Los Angeles user on 02 December 2022