

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Perimeters of Democracy: Inverse Utopias and the Wartime Social Landscape in the American West. By Heather Fryer.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8zn015ph>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 36(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Russell, Stevel

Publication Date

2012

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/>

Dunbar, Allis, and their associates seemingly did not file regular reports about the mission or letters suitable for printing in the religious presses. Such sources generally provide richer ethnographic materials for reconstructing the lives and spiritual beliefs of those involved with the missions than those letters found here. As such, those seeking information on specific Pawnee people, their beliefs and opinions, and the daily activities of their lives will likely be left unsatisfied.

Overall, *The Pawnee Mission Letters* stands as a very welcome addition to the growing body of edited missionary writings that have found their way into press in the past several years. Although not fully satisfying as a source of information about the Pawnees, this book certainly provides valuable insight into the missionary and his world at an early stage of Protestant missionary activity in the trans-Mississippi west.

Michael L. Cox

University of California–Riverside

Perimeters of Democracy: Inverse Utopias and the Wartime Social Landscape in the American West. By Heather Fryer. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010. 432 pages. \$50.00 cloth.

What is a reservation? It depends upon whom you ask and when you ask. Colonists claim they magnanimously set aside tracts of “their” land as homes for the surviving indigenes. From the other side of the transaction, the Indian landlords ceded land to buy peace but “reserved” some for their own use.

Some resemblance to the Jewish ghettos of Europe existed, with isolation standing in for physical walls, much like the red lines on a banker’s map that functioned as walls around African American neighborhoods in northern cities. Passing the reservation boundaries often required documents, and escape from the reservation meant exclusion from the constitutional category “Indians not taxed” but subjection to the vicissitudes of color prejudice common to the times by law and by custom.

Reservations continue to be established in contemporary times, but most date from the winding down of the shooting phase of the Indian wars. This history will come to mind for Indian readers when thinking about Heather Fryer’s decision to include the Klamath Reservation in her analysis of World War II–era “inverse utopias,” government-established communities containing people whose difference from the surrounding cultures were thought to make segregation a wise policy for the duration of hostilities.

At first blush, it is not apparent what the Klamath residents have in common with the “interned” Japanese Americans at the Topaz Relocation Center in Utah, the mostly African American war-industry workers in Vanport, Oregon, and least of all the hypersecret community of atomic scientists at Los Alamos, New Mexico. Fryer’s straightforward research brings it all together such that the primary difference in the reservation is that it was connected to an overall federal policy familiar to the readers of this journal rather than commanded by the exigencies of war.

Fryer argues that the four communities have in common a thin veneer of democratic utopia (after all, immediate needs are supposed to be provided) over a hard reality of dependence and powerlessness, a reality only politically salable during wartime. World War II was the US iteration of a “great patriotic war.” The Civil War took more lives, but it was a war of division. World War II was a crusade opposed by few outside of principled pacifists. All of Fryer’s “inverse utopias” were styled as necessary for the greater good, as temporary measures to keep unreliable populations under surveillance. Even so, the total responsibility of the federal government for the immediate welfare of these populations caused some critics to complain of “socialism,” a complaint directed at Indian reservations by the uninformed to this day.

Fryer’s narrative of the Klamath Reservation contains many other familiar themes: tribes with little in common treated as one—a difficulty that continues to play out recently as some Modocs try to secede from the Klamath Reservation government, imposition of unfamiliar forms of government on peoples with long political traditions of their own, colonial exploiters named as Indian agents, and assimilated mixed bloods set to rule over traditionalists, with the resulting controversies ending in termination and the loss of collectively held property. For many Indian peoples, this is a common narrative.

However, Topaz was not the only internment center/concentration camp for Japanese Americans, and the experience of the southern expatriate African Americans at Vanport is also part of a larger narrative involving many thousands of families. In the end, it is more the well-educated “longhairs” of Los Alamos who stand out for having more freedom to lose and being not only indisposed to lose it but also schooled in how to push back. Even the Los Alamosans, however, found themselves at the mercy of government procurement officers for the most basic necessities and unable to vote in state or even national elections. The disenfranchisement was not because of racial discrimination, however, but rather because the community at Los Alamos did not officially exist. The residents all shared a post office box in Santa Fe for their censored mail, which could only be written in English, French, German, Italian, or Spanish.

Indian policy entered the Los Alamos story in a more direct way in necessary relations with the pueblos near the secret city. The Indians provided necessary labor while maintaining the obsession with secrecy, which in hindsight was probably excessive but certainly appeared necessary at the time. They were also unceremoniously moved off their croplands as needed for the bomb project. The needs of Los Alamos trumped any other considerations. Fryer writes, "The sacrifices of the San Ildefonso and Santa Clara people were enormous: the short-term economic gains could never compensate for the profound disruption of the traditional web of social and economic relationships that had sustained the pueblos for generations" (166).

Fryer takes the narrative to the end of all the temporary inverse utopias, relating the destruction of Vanport in a flood and the subsequent futile fight for compensation, clumsy attempts to move Japanese Americans from Topaz to anywhere but California, difficulties of merging a revealed Los Alamos into the preexisting political structure of New Mexico, and termination of the Klamaths. The residents of Vanport, Topaz, and Los Alamos left their inverse utopias, for better or worse. The Klamath and Modoc peoples faced a future for which the reservation had ill-prepared them with nothing more than a per capita payment from the sale of tribal assets and the leaky social safety net available to all poor people in the United States.

American Indian studies can always benefit from more comparisons among similarly situated peoples. Such a tiny minority always needs coalition politics and other peoples disfavored by the government are likely allies. Looked at from this perspective, Los Alamos stands out again in the problem of finding a convincing voice to complain in a time of worse relative evils. The residents of the Klamath Reservation were mistreated but not as badly as many other tribes. Their timber resources gave them "walking money" even when they had nowhere to go. The Vanporters faced racial discrimination in Oregon, but had they stayed in the South they would have faced lynchings and lesser forms of routine violence. The Topaz residents were in a concentration camp under constant threat of deadly force, but there were no gas chambers or starvation like in the concentration camps of other belligerent powers. Had the Los Alamos residents not been locked up in New Mexico, most of them would have been teaching at the universities of Chicago or California—hardly a difficult situation, even in wartime.

The trials of the Klamath people did not end with World War II. Termination was, as for most terminated tribes, the beginning of a political struggle for renewed federal recognition. More exhaustive studies of termination policies from both ends of the process exist. More complete narratives of the Japanese American internment from the perspective of the interned as well as from the rationalizations of policy makers are available. Histories of

the great migration of African Americans from the agricultural south to the industrial north are common, and there are now less classified if not totally declassified tales of the several secret federal enclaves built for atomic research.

What Fryer has contributed is the juxtaposition of these narratives in a manner accurate enough for those new to the issues but not too detailed to allow the conclusions to stand out. The primary conclusion seems obvious only from the safe vantage of hindsight. The failures documented here should persuade any remaining doubters that a condition of dependency is no preparation for self-government and trying to incubate democracy behind barbed wire is as futile as it is hypocritical.

Steve Russell

Indiana University–Bloomington

Sequoyah Rising: Problems in Post-Colonial Tribal Governance. By Steve Russell. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, 2010. 194 pages. \$25.00 paper.

Sequoyah Rising is an engaging, intriguing book, perhaps even an influential one once it builds an audience. Author Steve Russell, a citizen of the Cherokee Nation and associate professor of criminal justice at Indiana University in Bloomington, asks some tough questions about dysfunctional reservation governance and aims them directly at the Native people who are doing the governing, while making it clear that he does not mean to offer accommodation to “new termination” advocates who would use such criticism to attack these governments, swarming, as he writes, “like buzzards to carrion” (3). “Since we plainly had governments before Europeans came,” Russell writes, “it is fair to ask: why can’t we seem to govern ourselves now?” (72). Russell goes on to say, “It is sad and ironic that we are quick to claim a major theoretical role in the creation of the American Constitution, but yet we imagine contemporary political communities only in visions derived from the colonial relation. Can we restore our vision?” (47).

The situation is not always as bleak as this. Many Native governments are in a state of transition. Witness, for example, the Muckleshoots, numbering about three thousand people near Tacoma, Washington, who used the legal recognition of fishing rights during the 1970s to build businesses and a sense of collective energy—and in just the nick of time, as their commonly held property had shrunk to one acre while the suburbs of the Seattle-Tacoma urban area advanced upon them. They capitalized on the urban area to open a casino, expanded the casino several times, and refused to make per-capita