

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Commissioners of Indian Affairs: The United States Indian Service and the Making of Federal Indian Policy, 1824-2017. By David H. DeJong.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1vg355kc>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 44(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Cook, Samuel R.

Publication Date

2020-03-01

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/>

expansive mix of genres and forms. This collection of opinion editorials and recent essays solidifies Midge's standing as one of the most versatile talents in Native and American writing today.

Samantha Majhor
Marquette University

The Commissioners of Indian Affairs: The United States Indian Service and the Making of Federal Indian Policy, 1824–2017. By David H. DeJong. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2020. 395 pages. \$75.00 cloth; \$40.00 paper.

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution is not only the proverbial “supreme law of the land,” but also has had a profound epistemological bearing on scholars of American Indian law and policy. Much research is so deeply embedded in the understanding that Congress has exclusive authority in Indian affairs that we fail to go beyond our scrutiny of judicial interpretations of the law to consider instead that the executive branch can direct policy in momentous ways. In *The Commissioners of Indian Affairs*, David H. DeJong's painstaking review of the activities and influences of those charged with directing Indian affairs over the years, both challenges and broadens the macro-perspective.

The author's mode of analysis is simple: using annual reports and related documents as his primary sources, he seeks to identify the consistent themes of federal Indian policy over two centuries. As tedious as his task may sound, DeJong identifies numerous “stands” contributing to, or influenced by, two overarching “philosophical braids,” “the social and political integration of American Indians” into American society, and “gaining access to tribal lands” (xi). Rather than becoming mired in theoretical exegeses, DeJong grounds his analysis in an understanding that federal Indian policy is historically and ontologically grounded in Enlightenment-era philosophy, which posited that “the means of securing liberty was individual labor which converted the common estate into private property” (ix).

While DeJong's book provides a comprehensive history of the US Indian Service, his research required a deeper scrutiny of the activities of those who brought the office into existence and determined the breadth of its influence. DeJong notes that the Commerce Clause itself was not an imposition into the affairs of tribal authority and lands, but chapters 2 and 3 provide a cogent analysis of how heads of the Indian Service, in executing and urging elaboration of Indian Trade and Intercourse acts, successfully expanded the authority of the Indian Office and its ability to interlope in the affairs of tribal polities. It was under Superintendent Thomas L. McKenney in 1816 that the Office started systematically combining trade regulation with education as assimilative tools, thus laying the groundwork for the 1819 Indian Civilization Act, which effectively gave the Indian Office legislative sanction to expand its influence. It was not until Andrew Jackson's presidency that the head of the Indian Office was provided with a more secure title of “commission,” when Elbert Herring assumed

the office. The commissioners under Jackson, of course, were vital architects of the Removal policy and often more concerned with land alienation in the East; however, as early as 1838 it was realized that Western tribes required a different approach. Commencing with Commissioner Thomas H. Crawford, the Indian Office advocated a policy of ensuring that treaty annuities were delivered as an incentive to encouraging Indians to pursue Western vocational education and a path to “civilization.”

Indeed, the massive land acquisitions following the Mexican War changed the playing field. While most scholars mark this as the beginning of the Reservation period in Indian policy, DeJong illustrates that however benevolent or indifferent previous Indian commissioners might have been, their policies were not entirely myopic in pursuit of the braids of integration and land alienation. The reservation policy was built on earlier structures for advancing severalty, and commissioners such as Charles Mix, appointed by President Buchanan, envisioned a road to “domestication and civilization” through controlled noncash annuities, effectively foreshadowing some of the social experiments of the Assimilation era. In essence, DeJong illustrates that up until the American Civil War, Indian affairs at the executive level was still an exploratory field, but one very much defined by the Indian Office itself.

In his assessment of post-Civil War Indian Service initiatives, DeJong’s tone seems to shift in a way that is both deceptive and directive. The Assimilation era (1865–1930) is often regarded as the most unified epoch in Indian policy, clearly embracing the two braids of integration and land alienation guiding DeJong’s assessment. Yet his layered treatment illustrates that Indian affairs was guided more by a tug-of-war between humanitarian reformists (clearly represented by Commissioners such as Ely S. Parker, the commander of Grant’s Peace policy) and those with more pragmatic, experimental, material interests. Nonetheless, the author treats this as a more nuanced transition period in which Indian commissioners effectively made policies that, in some cases, influenced and surpassed congressional oversight. Ezra Hayt, for instance, actually was far more influential in initiatives that are usually credited to others, including designing the boarding school policy and advancing “divide-and-rule tactics” such as Indian police forces and courts of Indian offenses. Although the book’s ultimate goal is to explicate restrictions to tribal sovereignty, DeJong’s summary of commissioners’ accomplishments and policies during this period seems to take a laudatory tone, yet the policy failures of this period had motivated reforms long before the New Deal.

Indeed, DeJong’s treatment of Indian Office policies from John Collier to the present cannot be separated. While he does not devote as much space as one might expect to the enigmatic commissioner/reformer, he makes it clear that the Indian New Deal, although not divorced from a Western ontological trajectory, made it possible for Indigenous Peoples to seize some control, if limited, over the promulgation of policy. From there on out, policies could not ignore Indigenous agency, even during the Termination era when Commissioner Glenn Emmons sought Indian “consultation but not consent.” His analysis of the Reagan-era “Indian federalism” and the emergent self-governance project, though not as attentive to tribal agency as one might expect, provides a much-needed analysis of executive-level policies that have received very little scholarly attention.

This book deserves a high canonical position in critical Indigenous studies. DeJong's exhaustive research provides solid data with a straightforward explication of the obstacles to tribal sovereignty and Indigenous visibility that drive the field. Together with works that thoughtfully read Marx in assessing the pitfalls of state recognition of Indian nations, such as Coulthard's *Red Skin, White Masks*, DeJong's work illuminates the deep history of colonial manipulations and the boundaries that tribal nations must work within, but ultimately transcend, in bolstering sovereignty.

Samuel R. Cook
Virginia Polytechnic Institute

Incarcerated Stories: Indigenous Women Migrants and Violence in the Settler-Capitalist State. By Shannon Speed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2019. 163 pages. \$90.00 cloth; \$27.95 paper; \$21.99 electronic.

While studies of migrant detention have grown within the last twenty years, much of the literature on migrant detention has remained situated within Latinx studies and theories of neoliberal dispossession, with minimal engagement to the colonial processes that have caused global displacement. In *Incarcerated Stories: Indigenous Women Migrants and Violence in the Settler-Capitalist State*, Shannon Speed provides a critical analysis of the interconnected web of violence that Indigenous migrant women encounter in and across settler-colonial capitalist states. Through the stories of Indigenous women detained in T. Don Hutto ICE Detention Center in Texas, Speed argues that Indigenous women are made vulnerable to myriad forms of violence facilitated through the overlapping structures of gender violence, settler colonialism, and neoliberal regimes. She positions this study through a Native feminist analysis informed by a hemispheric approach to indigeneity and centers Indigenous women from Mexico, Guatemala, and Honduras. Speed presents the testimonies of Indigenous women in Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detention as being part of the larger structure of violence that Indigenous women face, such as those highlighted in the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women (MMIW) movement in the United States and Canada. By mapping these testimonies onto their structural foundations, Speed takes a bold approach to drawing out the resonances between studies of migrant detention and Native American studies, opening the door for a plethora of new directions in both fields.

The oral histories and *testimonios* that make up the chapters of the book are grounded in a "critical engaged activism" that aims to produce critical scholarship on the structures of violence while simultaneously alleviating the material conditions that affect the communities we work with. Each of the book's five chapters begins with the *testimonio* of an Indigenous migrant woman to foreground the chapter's arguments in a real-life narration of those directly impacted by the structures discussed in the proceeding arguments. In place of "vulnerable," Speed applies the word *vulneradas* to emphasize the status that Indigenous migrant women are forced into under settler-capitalist states. Acknowledging the debates around the spectacle of violence and the