his argument about the importance of Fort Nogales in an elegant, eminently readable style. Whether this work would fit the needs of a particular class or add to a scholar’s resources is something each reader must decide, but scholars of Southeastern Indian history or comparative Native history should definitely examine this book. The reader will never look at the history of the Yazoo Valley or the Nogales region the same way again.

J. Daniel d’Oney
Albany College of Pharmacy


As the title clearly indicates, this book is a history of the interaction between the Lakota people and the United States from the beginning of the 1800s to approximately the end of that same century. Because so much ink has already been spilled on this topic, it may be legitimate to wonder what Ostler could possibly add to this story. This book, however, will probably surprise those who are expecting little more than a repetition of what has been presented in other texts. Ostler brings a new approach to an old topic.

One aspect that separates Ostler’s account from the overabundant existing literature about Lakota history in the 1800s is his emphasis on Lakota agency in resisting American colonial policies. Whereas many authors have portrayed the Lakota as doomed victims of American expansion, Ostler focuses his attention on the ways in which the Lakota worked to create their own destinies within the confines of a progressively shrinking political autonomy. In this regard, Ostler seems to be inspired by the work of James Scott, the author of Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts (1992) and Weapons of the Weak (1987).

Ostler gives less weight to the theme of Lakota factionalism than other historians (for example, Joseph M. Marshall’s The Journey of Crazy Horse: A Lakota History [2005] considers factionalism as a major theme). According to Ostler, both overt resistance and limited accommodation were strategies used to limit the impact of colonization: “Indeed, by focusing too much on factionalism it is possible to fail to appreciate the extent to which Sioux leaders’ strategies had a common goal” (7). Ostler is certainly right that factionalism has been overplayed as a cause of all Lakota problems. Overemphasizing factionalism allows some revisionist historians who act as apologists of American colonization to diminish the importance and the horror of US government policies toward the Lakota by shifting the attention to the Lakota’s own inner rivalries. Ostler’s choice to avoid this mistake is laudable but is both a weakness and a strength of this text. On one hand he tells us of little-known examples showing the unyielding spirit of resistance that continued to animate the Lakota throughout the 1800s, and it refuses to divide the Lakota people in simplistic portrayals of sellout collaborators
of American policies and heroic but ultimately defeated resisters. In doing this, Ostler paints a much more complex picture that seems to do justice to Lakota history. On the other hand, however, Ostler tends to sweep under the rug all instances of Lakota factionalism as relatively minor aspects of Lakota history, a conclusion that the evidence does not always support. An excellent quality that characterizes the book is that Ostler does not hide those facts that do not seem to fit with his conclusions. Rather, he presents them as part of the record, thereby allowing his readers to make up their minds about the evidence and evaluate his interpretations.

One of the great strengths of the book is the incredibly thorough job that Ostler did in researching the topic. Many primary sources about little-known events that are rarely, if ever, found in other books about Lakota history are presented in this volume. The research work is so extensive that some pages contain more footnotes than text.

One of the few ways in which the book is fairly typical and similar to the already existing scholarship is the structure of the text, which follows chronologically the history of Lakota-US contacts throughout the 1800s. Ending the book with the 1890 Wounded Knee Massacre is also very common, because Lakota history in the 1800s has received much more attention than Lakota history afterward. After the introduction, the book begins with the Lewis and Clark expedition paving the way for the colonization of the Lakota with a first meeting in 1804. Here, Ostler presents some material about earlier Lakota history, something that Western historians cannot trace before the late 1600s, and explores several themes in Lakota culture and religion. Ostler then goes on to analyze the early treaties signed between the United States and the Lakota and the beginning of open hostilities between the two nations starting in 1854 with the first episode of a warfare that lasted intermittently until 1877 and resurfaced with the Wounded Knee Massacre. Among the many other topics Ostler explores are the colonial policies designed to destroy Lakota culture such as boarding schools, the repression of Lakota religious practices, and the 1887 Dawes Act. The political assassinations of Lakota leaders Crazy Horse and Sitting Bull are also explored at length. The feud between Crow Dog and Spotted Tail is carefully presented. The Wild West shows, the Ghost Dance, and the events leading up to the Wounded Knee massacre make up the last portion of the book.

In his treatment of these key events in Lakota history, Ostler ends up taking issue with the conclusions reached by other historians. In the beginning of the book, for example, Ostler disagrees with the argument advanced by Richard White that the Lakota were an imperial power just like the United States. On a different topic, Ostler acknowledges that Indian peoples contributed to the decline of the bison population, but sharply criticizes those historians who argue that Indian peoples were the main culprits for this decline. In several instances, Ostler clearly implies that Robert Utley’s work is biased by his desire to justify American policies. According to Ostler, not only is Utley excessively critical of Sitting Bull’s strategy, but also he relies on biased evidence to conclude that troops were needed to repress the Ghost Dance and that Sitting Bull and his supporters were partially to blame for his death.
One quality that accords credibility to Ostler’s conclusions is the fact that he does not attempt to simplify the historical reality to make it neatly fit with his arguments. Rather than portraying a simplistic story of good Lakota versus evil Euro-Americans (or good Euro-Americans versus evil Lakota), Ostler shows the complexity of the voices and desires behind the policies of American colonization, as well as those behind Lakota choices. This in-depth exploration of the character of the historical actors described makes him emphasize the differences not only between Euro-Americans and Lakota communities but also within them. This quality leads Ostler to write a history that does not indulge in romantic stereotypes but at the same time does not end up giving in to the recent revisionist scholarship that blames Indian peoples for their own problems. Without ambiguities, Ostler condemns American colonialism but does so in a very balanced way that does not attempt to go beyond what the evidence warrants. His conclusions seem to be validated by the historical record.

Overall, Ostler’s book is an excellent example of the products of a new generation of historians who maintain an Indian-friendly perspective while not perpetuating the “noble savage” stereotype.

Daniele Bolelli
California State University, Long Beach


This well-edited collection joins a growing body of scholarship that examines powwows as social, cultural, and historical phenomena. In creating and organizing this volume, the editors have set their sights squarely on the controversial and—in the opinion of many of the authors of the book—theoretically problematic idea of pan-Indianism, a term first coined by James Howard both to describe and theorize the social and cultural reorganization of Indian Country in Oklahoma at midcentury. Howard’s original formulation of pan-Indianism was intended to address the new and original dance, dress, and music styles at powwow festivals in the 1950s, practices that had no tribal affiliations or antecedents and that, in his opinion, had come about as a result of large-scale intertribal contact. Originally linked to theories of cultural evolutionism, Howard’s pan-Indian thesis posited that these activities represented the last stages of the acculturation process and predicted that pan-Indian activities would slowly but inevitably replace tribally specific music and dance, followed by the loss of all tribally specific cultural practices and identities. It is this aspect of his theory that has come under the most intense scrutiny and drawn the greatest fire, most forcefully by William Powers in War Dance: Plains Indian Musical Performance (1990) and most recently by Tara Browner in Heartbeat of the People: Music and Dance of the Northern Pow-wow (2002). These scholars, among others, suggest that Howard’s theory is troublesome on three