

# UCLA

## American Indian Culture and Research Journal

### Title

The Indian on Capitol Hill: Indian Legislation and the United States Congress, 1862-1907. By Markku Henriksson.

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1vs5s6fp>

### Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 14(1)

### ISSN

0161-6463

### Author

Snamenski, Andrei A.

### Publication Date

1990

### 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/>

history in the months between July 1861 and August 1862, and many ethnohistorians will be disappointed with the author's neglect of social or ethnographic materials. Gaines does not analyze these events from a tribal perspective; although his appendices contain the muster rolls of those men who served in Drew's regiment, his narrative contains little information regarding the enlisted men's viewpoint. Indeed, this is traditional military history, but for historians interested in the difficulties encountered by those Cherokee soldiers loyal to John Ross, yet temporarily forced to serve the Confederacy during this brief period, *The Confederate Cherokees* provides a good, concise summary.

R. David Edmunds  
Indiana University

**The Indian on Capitol Hill: Indian Legislation and the United States Congress, 1862–1907.** By Markku Henriksson. Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society, 1988. 325 pages.

It is usually a difficult thing for a foreign scholar to say anything new in a history of another nation. That is particularly true with subjects that have already been studied intensively. Markku Henriksson, however, has refuted this common conviction.

Henriksson's book, dealing with the heroic period of Native American history (1862–1907), seems at first to cover facts that have been widely analyzed before. Nonetheless, the author has formulated an original viewpoint. He shows the native history of the period through the activities of the United States Congress, describing the very mechanism of legislation in the Congress and its influence upon Indian destinies. The fact that these years witnessed more than one thousand laws concerning the Indians (page 252) proves the necessity of researching the matter.

The book, which derives from the author's doctoral thesis, has a clear task—to show the place that United States Indian policy occupied in the whole congressional bulk of actions, the motives that led senators and congressmen to this or that action. The primary sources for Henriksson's work, according to the author himself, were *Congressional Records*, *Statutes at Large*, documents from many American libraries and archives (the National Ar-

chives, in particular), and materials from the National Archives microfilm collection at the Kennedy Center of the Free University of West Berlin. (The author was one of the initiators in the creation of this collection.)

Henriksson came to the conclusion that it was useless to look for consistency in the philosophical and political doctrine of United States Indian policy. Policy was based mainly on pragmatic principles—to secure further expansion onto Native American lands, and to find the cheapest ways to solve the so-called Indian problem. The author believes, however, that there was a second motive for congressional actions—a general paternalistic approach founded on the so-called “theory of linear development” (page 254). Legislators had been partially influenced by the evolutionary doctrine of the nineteenth century. Worked carefully by Lewis Henry Morgan, Frederick Engels, and Charles Darwin, it considered, as applied to human society, all the cultures related to each other hierarchically (page 5). According to these ideas, modeled in Eurocentric ways, human progress was a ladder-like ascension from savagism through barbarism to civilization. It was a common belief among humanistically oriented intellectuals and legislators that they knew the needs of Native Americans better than the Indians themselves did, and tried to speed up their ascension on the “ladder” (page 5). Henriksson uses the example of the struggle between Indian and white conceptions of land ownership as good evidence of the ethnocentric character of the “linear development” approach. For lawmakers, collective ownership of land was another example of “Indian backwardness” (page 8).

In the author’s opinion, all congressional measures can be divided into two categories (according to the different motives behind the legislators’ actions): confrontation laws and civilization laws. In addition, the author specifies that one can hardly draw any strict lines between them. “And yet, when confrontation arose, civilization measures always yielded to economic or political interests” (page 254). Examples of confrontation laws are various kinds of land withdrawals under homestead acts, railroad legislation, partitioning of the Great Sioux Reservation, and the end of Indian home rule in Oklahoma. Education laws, for example, can be included in “clear” civilization laws, although there were pragmatical reasons for the laws, too. Wide criticism

of boarding schools after 1890 and attempts to establish day schools created harsh tension between the Indians and the federal government. Western congressmen had finally realized that the "educated" Indian would occupy less land than his "wild" brother (page 102). The Indians, however, were angry about the government's sending Indian children far from home (page 113). Henriksson concluded that the desire to take Indian lands was not necessarily behind all proposals for Indian education, but the goal of destroying native culture was (pages 115-16).

A considerable part of legislation consists of the measures fashioned as compromises between proponents of civilization and those of confrontation. That applies in the first place to the Dawes Act. The author dedicates much space to the debates on the bill and tells about three groups of opponents to the measure. The first group was afraid that the Indians might get citizenship after allotment; the others considered that the "savages" would not go the road to civilization during such a short period. The third group of legislators thought that the Indians would soon lose their holdings, and the government would have a quarter of a million Indian beggars (page 169). The greater part of allotments, according to Henriksson, were made between 1900 and 1910 (page 178).

Many laws connected with Indian matters scarcely touched Native Americans at first; legislation related to the Indians generally was a product of the power struggle among different congressional groups. For example, Southern congressmen voted against raising military appropriations for the army fighting with Indians, because the same army occupied the Southern states until 1871 (page 280). A similar example is the decision to end treaty-making in 1871. The House of Representatives, striving for more power in Indian affairs, refused to appropriate any money for Indians unless it was given more control in native affairs. The result was the compromise between the Senate and the House; for the Indians that meant the end of treaty-making (page 71).

Henriksson also divides all the laws passed by Congress according to the following principle (which is the base for his table of contents): military laws, judicial status laws, education laws, Indian Territory laws, allotment laws, railroad legislation, financial legislation. In my opinion, the reader's attention should be drawn to the characteristics of three leading figures in the United States Indian policy of those years; the picture given by the

author can be summarized roughly as follows: James Rood Doolittle (helped the BIA to stay in the Department of the Interior, responsible in a greater part for the peace policy); Henry L. Dawes (Dawes Act, Curtis Act, allotments of the Five Civilized Nations' lands); Henry Teller (opponent of the allotments, champion of boarding school education) (page 279). The author argues convincingly against the view that members of Congress were frequently misinformed in Indian matters: "the documents have clear evidence that they were not always as ignorant about Indians as one has been led to believe" (page 13). Henriksson also disputes the contention that lawmakers often did not know of settlers' advancement onto native lands, and had to legislate those occupations *post factum*. In reality, excluding Kansas and the Black Hills cases, "Congress and its laws were supporting expansion onto Indian lands" (page 14).

In my opinion, the book's excursions into the terms of the important laws (Dawes Act, Burke Act, Oklahoma allotment acts), are very useful not only for a European reader, but for an American student of Indian affairs as well, because Henriksson gives us many new details about discussions of the measures in Congress. In general, I believe this is a valuable study that will be read with interest on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

*Andrei A. Snamenski*  
Kuibyshev Teachers' Training College, USSR

**Public Policy Impacts on American Indian Economic Development.** Edited by C. Matthew Snipp. Albuquerque: Native American Studies, Institute for Native American Development, University of New Mexico, 1988. 179 pages. \$9.95 Paper.

This is the fourth publication in the Development Series undertaken by the Native American Studies program at the University of New Mexico. It contains six papers on various aspects of Indian economic development. Like many such collections, the papers are diverse in theme, approach, and quality, but the collection is a valuable one and contributes much to the growing and important discussion of development issues in Indian country.

Those issues now occupy center stage. With recent federal cutbacks in funding and the decline of social programs, many tribes