

surveillance, harassment by community members, and indirectly, due to bullying and pressure from the Caledonia community, the suicide of Jameson's daughter. McCarthy's writing drives home the reality that indigenous resistance does not always have a storybook ending; while it is easy for settler narratives to dismiss indigenous activists as lawless rabble and scholars of indigenous studies to focus on indigenous activism's unmitigated successes, the actual result is often more complex and touches the lives of the indigenous people in ways both good and bad.

Scholars will appreciate that McCarthy also strikes a mighty blow against more than a century of public discourse against Six Nations and the Haudenosaunee as well as sexist, racist scholarship. This makes the book both accessible and almost indispensable to all readers, whether affiliated with American Indian and indigenous studies, anthropology, history, geography, or other areas of academia engaging with indigenous peoples. Some background reading in settler-colonial studies would be helpful in order to fully grasp and engage with some of the concepts McCarthy explores, such as the works of Patrick Wolfe or the aforementioned *Mohawk Interruptus* by Audra Simpson, but this is not a requirement since McCarthy gives the reader an ample amount of the background information needed to understand the concepts and ideas that factor into her narrative. The result is a deeply moving and thought-provoking work that portends well for the future of indigenous political activism and direct resistance, not only in our communities, but in the academy. In this, there is encouragement. As long as indigenous people keep their traditional ways alive, they can continue to push against the settler-colonial project.

Deondre Smiles (Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe)
The Ohio State University

Indians in the Family: Adoption and the Politics of Antebellum Expansion. By Dawn Peterson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017. 432 pages. \$39.95 cloth; \$37.95 electronic.

I am left with a question after reading this book: how did “adoptions” take place when adoption was not legally formalized until 1851 in Massachusetts? Under current law, adoption requires that birth-parent rights be terminated, but as Dawn Peterson's accounts in *Indians in the Family: Adoption and the Politics of Antebellum Expansion* demonstrate, in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century America such formal terminations of rights did not occur. Indeed, none of the terms now encountered in regard to adoption were then used: birth parents, parental rights, adoptee, or adoptive parents.

I question whether adoption is the correct term for what Peterson is describing; rather, it seems that the experiences of many Native youth “wards” resembled today's temporary foster placements, although the term *foster families* had not yet appeared. I doubt if these informal practices generally afforded Native youth inheritance rights similar to those of the birth children of their placement parents, even if they took on

other families' last names. Nevertheless, the author's research reveals a practice of child placement or form of adoption between white settler families and Indian nations. While both sides had their own reasons for this transfer of children, this work reveals that often Indian children were trophies used by white settlers to impress others and, perhaps, fulfill their romanticized idea of saving Indian people.

Peterson has unearthed the history of keenly instinctive Indian families placing their children in white settler families with the goal of having their children gather vital information they could use later to increase economic and territorial development. Choctaw, Creek, Chickasaw, and Seneca children were willingly sent by their families to live with Quakers and other prominent white families. Hoping that their intelligent children would become equipped to navigate white government and return able to help their communities, Indian mothers selflessly relinquished their children. I don't think that white settlers expected the young Indian children to grow into articulate young men and women who could negotiate treaties. Some didn't view Indians as equal human beings, referred to Native Americans as savages who were not entirely educable, and held strong beliefs that Indian women needed to learn to weave and Indian men needed to become farmers.

The text contains a haunting premonition of what would happen to the thousands of adoptees removed before the passage of the Indian Child Welfare Act in 1978: "Stuck in between two cultures, this youth was declared to be 'neither a white man nor an Indian; as he had no character with us, he has none with them'" (77). Such are the results of being removed from culture and losing years of language and cultural nuances; many contemporary adoptees express a feeling of not fitting into white society and a lack of understanding the culture into which they had been born.

Thank you, Dawn Peterson, for your meticulous research that reveals the resiliency of the early Indian families as they grappled in desperation with how they would survive encroaching white settlers and government. This rich history brings more pride in our ancestors who sacrificed years away from their children knowing in the end that this act would benefit their Indian nations.

Sandy White Hawk

First Nations Repatriation Institute

Indigenous Cities: Urban Indian Fiction and the Histories of Relocation. By Laura M. Furlan. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2017. 354 pages. \$60.00 cloth and electronic.

Laura Furlan's book on urban Indian fiction examines selected case-study texts by Native authors Janet Hale Campbell, Sherman Alexie, Louise Erdrich, and Susan Power, all written between 1985 and 2003. Employing what Furlan identifies as a spatiohistorical methodology, she focuses on the "place histories" of particular urban areas (San Francisco, Seattle, Minneapolis, and Chicago) and links together precontact- and contact-era zones with centers of Indian migration that were enforced by