

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

This Indian Country: American Indian Activists and the Place They Made.
By Frederick Hoxie.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5vf7z328>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 38(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Lee, Leece M.

Publication Date

2014

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/>

This Indian Country: American Indian Activists and the Place They Made. By Frederick Hoxie. New York: Penguin Group Incorporated, 2013. 496 pages. \$32.95 cloth; \$20.00 paper.

Frederick Hoxie's *This Indian Country* engages a "new Native American history" as an approach to historical writing that is aimed at illustrating the vibrant political endeavors of Native Americans in the postcolonial context and shifting the reader away from the stereotypical accounts of Native American life in remarkable ways. In the book's broadest appeal, Hoxie engages a set of intellectually astute and politically savvy Native American political figures whose lives were shaped by the changes brought on by American national formation and who attempted to negotiate and guide the legal developments that would come to structure the sovereign rights of both Native American tribes and the United States. To do so, Hoxie identifies Native American peoples whose lives were thrust into the public spotlight as they worked to garner footholds in the new and unfolding political terrain affecting Indian country. Hoxie deftly outlines the "yield or perish" approach to territorial expansion by illustrating the personal strife of those whose lives became inextricably linked to the political upheaval caused by treaty-making, removal, and the advent of federal Indian law. The legacies of these figures, moreover, expose the enduring political traditions of Native American peoples, the tenuous political atmosphere that saw their individual accomplishments, and early formations of pan-Indian political groups that worked against the grain of federal agents who worked to devise a system that would, if physical and cultural eradication proved unsuccessful, transform Native American tribes into quasi-sovereigns.

The text's ability to disfigure the western imaginary's stereotypical historicization of politically unsophisticated "Indians" who are either hostile or passive is one of its most pointed critiques, a sum of all of its parts. Moreover, the text supports a number of opportunities for comparative analysis. Despite the national, cultural, temporal, and geographical differences between these Native American figures, a certain ethic and assumption of indigenous autonomy and political responsibility emerges as they work between two epistemologies, that of their Native American communities and the West. Each of them was well educated in western cosmopolitan ideals of freedom and exhibited a willingness to adapt to the challenges of their time. In the formation of this double-consciousness they speak from the ethos of these epistemologies and make use of the West's claims of moral exceptionalism to call for the preservation of Native American spatial and cultural rights. Each recommended the following cornerstones: guaranteed educational access for Native Americans, the employment of Native Americans in positions within the so-called "Indian Offices," the creation of political posts within the United States government, and the

designation of geopolitical spaces for Native Americans to live unrestricted by Western political, economic, or cultural intrusion. These, they contended, would serve not only tribal communities, but also aid the United States in creating a multifaceted and diverse, but interconnected national community.

Each appeared to believe that “good faith” would govern the processes of negotiation, but grew disillusioned by the malleable nature of western political promises to Indians. As Hoxie points out, treaty and other legal negotiations were likely conducted as political maneuvers that counted on the spread of “false consciousness” among Native Americans. It is in moments of realization and disillusionment, Hoxie demonstrates, that each figure emerged renewed as a vibrant orator of Indian rights.

As a teaching text, it serves well for a secondary study. There is much that is better absorbed with some knowledge of federal Indian law and history, as well as other matters that require knowledge for an informed contemplation of Hoxie’s analyses. Whether intentional or not, *This Indian Country* reads at times like an ode to mixed-blood Native Americans. In highlighting bureaucratic rather than militaristic approaches to fending off the perpetration of Indian eradication, Hoxie dispels questions of mixed-blood political integrity and commitment to the survival of Native American epistemologies and communities. Notably, the brief mentions of Tecumseh and others whose diplomacy is overshadowed by admonitions of violence nullify their efforts to unite Native American peoples, and are simply too thin to afford real consideration. Still, what Hoxie offers by creating a constellation of these particular Native American political figures stands well enough alone, though again, the work will be best served by an informed reading.

Two chapters stand out in their opportunities for comparative work. The analysis of Choctaw political figure and US attorney James McDonald reads as an example of the “talented tenth” approach to ameliorating the suffering of Native American peoples. Educated in a boarding school and then sponsored by non-Native political and legal figures, who privately denigrated him as “our little Indian,” McDonald not only survived, but also embraced the opportunities that a western education gave him to fight for the Choctaw tribe. After a lofty career as the first Native American lawyer in the United States and a dramatic professional turn to advance a career in the state legislature, McDonald suddenly died, apparently by suicide. In a somewhat rare moment of under-investigation, Hoxie simply notes, absent any critique, that rumors surfaced speculating that political disillusionment, alcoholism, and the scorn of a white woman led the lawyer to end his life. As a counterpoint, Hoxie highlights one friend of McDonald’s who declared the lawyer too deeply committed and focused to “deliberately abandon the stage of human action” (95). As well, Hoxie questions some of McDonald’s acquiescence as naïve.

However, current decolonial scholarship characterizes a variety of survival techniques, including assuaging the ego of colonial figures as a surer method of survival than clear and unapologetic voices of indigenous political resistance. At textual moments such as this the reader wishes for deeper investigation. Often a later chapter will advance a useful critique that speaks to that wish. Only one hundred pages later, for example, Hoxie reveals that like McDonald, when their levels of open resistance made waves, Sarah Winnemucca and Alice Jemison were both criticized for lacking moral and intellectual integrity and engaging in radical lifestyles not supported by their tribal members. Read alone and left unquestioned, such commentaries could perpetuate negative race and gender ideologies where deeper investigation might produce something better. However, these moments also can be taken as opportunities for new points of departure.

Hoxie's history of Sarah Winnemucca also fosters great comparative work. Winnemucca's life illustrates the greatest ironies that surrounded those who attempted to work within the western system. Winnemucca's experiences suggest that she had learned her political approach from her family and community and hence at first assumed that all parties entered into negotiations in "good faith." After she experienced and witnessed abject violence such as rape that seemed to be part-and-parcel of expansion and settlement, Winnemucca refocused on the gap between the West's protestations of morality and its violence. Hoxie contends that as the first Native American woman to publish a book in the United States Winnemucca produced an enduring critique in her book *Life Among the Paiutes*. After the publication of the book, the Indian Rights Association denounced Winnemucca simply as self-serving. Together with Vine Deloria Jr., Hoxie argues that such attempts to politically ostracize a "friend" appear to indicate the political adeptness and powerful threat that such critiques extend. Moreover, Winnemucca's critique of the sexual violence that accompanied expansion and settlement is a chilling reminder of the early formations of anti-Indian race ideology, its misogyny, and the low value placed on Native American females. With the passage of the Tribal Law and Order Act in 2010 and the barrage of criticism that followed, Winnemucca's testimonial speaks to the current criticism of the act, which claims that anti-Indian misogyny is clearly present in the legal structures of federal Indian law today. Winnemucca's history lends itself to comparative work within the fields of indigenous human rights, legal scholarship, and Red feminism.

Hoxie's declaration of "this Indian country" is a spatial argument that converses with Patricia Penn Hilden's 2006 premise of the "Red zone," which signifies a spatial political consciousness located wherever Native American political activity is engaged. *This Indian Country* speaks well to the growing transdisciplinary approach in Native American and transnational historical

studies. Hoxie's reading of these histories blurs the distinctions between those forging the American nation and Native Americans who, rather than swim against the stream, intended to forge political identities and relationships that would strengthen their efforts to shape both their new tribal political realities and those of the United States. Whether examining the history of James McDonald, Sarah Winnemucca or Vine Deloria, Hoxie's notable Indian country is a vibrant space of indigenous political strategy, uplift, and ingenuity and demonstrates the enduring commitment to Native American cultural-political autonomy that is still present today.

Leece M. Lee

University of California, Berkeley

Tohopeka: Rethinking the Creek War and the War of 1812. Edited by Kathryn E. Holland Braund. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2012. 336 pages. \$34.95 paper.

Tohopeka: Rethinking the Creek War and the War of 1812 is the product of a 2009 Auburn University symposium that brought together academic historians, public historians, and archaeologists to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Horseshoe Bend National Military Park. Horseshoe Bend was the site of a decisive battle, and Tohopeka ("fortification") is its Creek-language toponym. The book is an important resource for anyone interested in the Creek War and the War of 1812 in the South.

For readers unfamiliar with these overlapping conflicts, the editor's introduction and Robert Thrower's "Causalities and Consequences of the Creek War: A Modern Creek Perspective" both lay out their origins, progress, and results. However, as the "rethinking" in the book's subtitle indicates, this book is not intended to serve as a primer on the wars, but engage existing interpretations and guide future exploration. For example, John Grenier argues vehemently against seeing the Creek War and the War of 1812 as separate. Encompassing both conflicts, his bracing essay makes no bones about the principal reason Americans went to war in the years after 1809: to conquer Indian territory as well as evict—and often exterminate—its inhabitants.

With the exception of Grenier's essay, this is a book that dwells on the details. The chapters by Gregory Dowd, Robert Collins, and Kathryn Holland Braund perform some necessary myth-busting. Dowd rebuts the notion that Tecumseh or the Shawnees were unique exponents of the idea that Native Americans must unite to resist expanding white settlement. Dowd also demolishes the canard that earthquakes and comets contributed to the popularity of