



1973

## Book Reviews

Linda Price

Thomas K. Schoppert

Arthur Raymond

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Price, Linda; Schoppert, Thomas K.; and Raymond, Arthur (1973) "Book Reviews," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 49 : No. 2 , Article 11.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol49/iss2/11>

This Review is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in North Dakota Law Review by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.commons@library.und.edu](mailto:und.commons@library.und.edu).

## BOOK REVIEWS

**THE IROQUOIS IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.** By Barbara Graymont. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1972. Pp. 359. \$11.50 cloth.

Barbara Graymont's book is an intricate study of the relationship between the Iroquois Confederacy and the events of the American Revolution. Her stated premise and the theme which recurs throughout the book is the none too startling conclusion that competing American and British interests were the causative forces which lead to the dissolution of the Iroquois Confederacy as a nationalistic entity. By confining her historical analysis to the period of the American Revolution,<sup>1</sup> Ms. Graymont has been able to present a rather definitive perspective of the circumstances that necessitated Iroquoian involvement in the Revolution and the consequences that resulted from that involvement. However, recognition of the effort Ms. Graymont undoubtedly underwent in the compilation of her detailed work does not, in itself, inure to the benefit of her final result. Her attention to specificity and chronological accuracy, although in the finest traditions of historical research, tends to leave the reader somewhat confused in his attempt to follow the author's journey through historical documents, personal letters, sporadic battles and assorted personality studies. However, for those concerned more with a study of the circumstances that directly lead to the demise of the Iroquoian Confederacy and less with style and continuity of thought, *The Iroquois in the American Revolution* will no doubt be rewarding, though hardly adventurous.

Ms. Graymont begins her study with a somewhat brief presentation of the history, religion, social patterns and languages of the Iroquois. It is at this point that the layman and the expert part company. The beginning chapter appears to have been written with the understanding that the reader is generally well-schooled in native American cultural patterns as well as learned in colonial American interactions with those cultures. Be that as it may, the reader should be forewarned that failure to grasp the Iroquoian societal structure outlined by Ms. Graymont may leave him aimlessly wandering through the remaining chapters of the book, witnessing Iroquois' involvement in horrible slaughters, being duped by devious entrepreneurs and lied to by all manner of personages

---

1. The period covered by Ms. Graymont is roughly from 1770-1785.

2. As members of the Iroquois group, Ms. Graymont mentions the Hurons, Tionontati, Attiwandarant, Wenro, Erie, Black Minquas, Susquehannocks, Cherokees, Nottaways, Meherins as well as the tribes of Six Nation Confederacy.

including George Washington—with no apparent understanding of the why or wherefore of it all.

In the first place, just comprehending who the Iroquois were is a feat in itself. Ms. Graymont variously discusses some 16 tribes<sup>2</sup> and then eventually narrows her analysis to the Six Nation Confederacy.<sup>3</sup>

Ms. Graymont's analysis does disclose two key elements which precipitated the destruction of the Iroquois Confederacy by the American Revolution. First, militarily speaking, the Iroquois tribes were located in a disadvantageous geographic position. They occupied generally central New York State, but were spread from the shores of Lake Erie, through Ontario and Pennsylvania, down to the northern parts of Virginia and North Carolina. As a result they found themselves between the British and American military staging areas.

Secondly, the Iroquois Confederacy was not a stable, centralized governmental unit. It was more of a governing council composed of the chiefs of the six aforementioned tribes. As a result, tribal integrity was fostered concomitantly within the centralized union of the Confederacy. When war came, so did factionalism and the consequent divisive forces inherent in tribalism.

It is interesting to note that the Iroquois heritage dates from A.D. 1250—originating in what is now central New York State.<sup>4</sup> The Iroquois Confederacy itself is variously dated from 1450 to 1660, with the latter of the two dates given greater credence.<sup>5</sup> Ms. Graymont describes with great alacrity, though somewhat simplistically, the formation of the assorted Iroquois tribal entities into a viable union. She thereafter asserts that the Iroquois Confederacy was unable to deal diplomatically with Europeans since the Iroquois were incapable of comprehending the European concept of a nation state. In other words, the Iroquois supposedly felt that all white men represented the same interest and attempting to conceptualize competing interests among white men, let alone the concept of a national war, was above the Iroquois' ability. This assumption seems a little overbroad to be applied to a Confederacy of tribal interests who themselves were a loose union of competing local interests.

In any event the remainder of the book is devoted to the chronological events of the Iroquois' role in the American Revolution. Ms. Graymont guides the reader through assorted battles and slaughters with occasional rest stops at varied historical docu-

---

3. This was composed of the Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, Cayugas, Senecas and Tuscararas.

4. See J. A. TUCK, *ONONDAGA IROQUOIS PREHISTORY* (1972).

5. B. GRAYMONT, *THE IROQUOIS IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION* 14 (1972).

ments and personal correspondences between people who lived through it all. Throughout this trek the ravages of war continually erode what little stability the Iroquois Confederacy had. The *coup de grace* comes when the British and Americans sign a separate peace with no provision for the economic or territorial well being of the Iroquois.

Unfortunately, Ms. Graymont avoids any true analysis of the impact of the white culture on the Iroquois nation state. One cannot help but recognize the racial overtones that continually surface as the reader follows the Iroquois, British and Americans into battle. Ms. Graymont does recognize the potentiality for such a study in her prologue, but apologetically indicates the area is too amorphous for adequate comment at this time.

In summation, it may be said that *The Iroquois in the American Revolution* is not something to be taken with a warm glass of milk and a fluffy pillow before retiring. It is the sort of book that gets put on some luckless student's assigned reading list. It became apparent to this reader that the Iroquois were involved in more revolutionary events than ever I would have believed possible, and Ms. Graymont has put every one of them in her book. But for the perseverant individuals whose knowledge of American history does not include a comprehension of the manner in which native American cultures were systematically torn apart, Ms. Graymont's compilation would provide a more than adequate instruction if not, indeed, a penance.

LINDA PRICE\*

THE PONCA CHIEFS: AN ACCOUNT OF THE TRIAL OF STANDING BEAR, By Thomas Henry Tibbles. Ed. by Kay Graber. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972 Pp. 142 \$2.25 paper.

One Sunday the Indians went to their church as usual, to hear the words of the minister, but some of the words which he said that tribe will never forget. He told them that he had heard that they were to be driven from their homes and sent far to the south, never to come back again. He said he was exceedingly sorry for them, as they had been honest, industrious, frugal, hard working, and had just gotten themselves nice houses and farms. Under all circumstances he

---

\* B.A. 1969, M.A. 1972, University of North Dakota.

advised them to do that which was right, and trust in God, that in the end he would protect them from their oppressors.<sup>1</sup>

The above warning starts the disruption of the Poncas to the "Indian Territory" in the South near the Arkansas River. This disruption was an incident marred by misery, frustration and despair, illness and disease and imprisonment, culminating in the case of *U.S. ex. rel. Standing Bear v. Crook*.<sup>2</sup> The *Ponca Chiefs* is a collection of articles written by Thomas Henry Tibbles while he was a journalist for the *Omaha Daily Herald*. Tibbles was not a lawyer. His book is more of a perspective for the historian than a significant contribution to the field of Indian Law.<sup>3</sup> Its importance for the lawyer is that it relates the human factors and conflicts surrounding the law of 1879.

The Poncas occupied Southern Dakota near the Niobrara and Missouri Rivers. They were industrious and resourceful cultivators and had a long, peaceful relationship with the white explorers, army and settlers. They were strongly attached to their land and showed a bewildering contempt when the "Indian Ring" attempted to persuade them to move to the southern "Indian Territory." Although under a Treaty signed in 1858 the Poncas could not be legally moved, they were coerced into moving south. Standing Bear and a number of chiefs and their followers first left for this foreign land to see if it was a suitable substitute for their Dakota land. The warm climate was unacceptable. Illness gripped every family in the "Indian Territory." Standing Bear stated that:

The sickness got no better. I resolved at last that I would make an attempt to save the lives of a few. If I failed it could be no worse than to stay there. We were ten weeks making the journey to Omaha.<sup>4</sup>

The Omahas spoke the same language as the Poncas and had many relatives among them. They invited the Poncas to stay and regroup from their illness. The Omahas were willing to give them portions of their land in order that the Poncas might begin their farming. While living with the Omahas the Poncas were reluctantly arrested by General Crook and confined at Fort Omaha until they

---

1. T. H. TIBBLES, *THE PONCAS CHIEFS: AN ACCOUNT OF THE TRIAL OF STANDING BEAR* 5 (1972).

2. United States *ex rel.* *Standing Bear v. Crook*, Fed. Cas. No. 14, 891 (Cir. Ct. Neb. 1897).

3. See *Elk v. Wilkins*, 112 U.S. 94 (1884); *Perry v. Archard*, 64 Ark. 79, 42 S.W. 421 (1897).

4. T. H. TIBBLES, *THE PONCA CHIEFS: AN ACCOUNT OF THE TRIAL OF STANDING BEAR* 15 (1972); see also D. BROWN, *BURY MY HEART AT WOUNDED KNEE: AN INDIAN HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN WEST* 333-48 (1971).

could be moved back to the "Indian Territory." Their eagerness to live among the Omahas and the bitterness at confinement is expressed by Ta-zha-but:

Eight days ago I was at work on my farm which the Omahas gave me. I was living peacefully with all men. I have never committed a crime. I was arrested and brought back as a prisoner. Does your law do that? I have been told since the great war all men were free men, and that no man can be made a prisoner unless he does wrong. I have done no wrong, and yet I am a prisoner. Have you a law for white men, and a different law for those who are not white?<sup>5</sup>

It is at the point of their confinement that Tibbles embroils himself with Standing Bear and the other Poncas; his accounts of the meetings at Fort Omaha and the subsequent trial form the substance of his book. Tibbles helped the Poncas arrange for legal counsel in an attempt to obtain a writ of *habeas corpus* from Judge Dundy of the Federal District Court of Nebraska challenging their confinement.

Two crucial questions in the field of Indian Law faced Judge Dundy. First, were Indians "persons" within the meaning of the *habeas corpus* statute?<sup>6</sup> Secondly, did Indians have the inherent right of expatriation—the withdrawing of the individual Indian from his tribe at any time?

Judge Dundy in holding that Indians were entitled to the writ of *habeas corpus* as persons but not as citizens, relied on the Webster definition of "person."<sup>7</sup> Further he held:

. . .[T]hat Indians, are persons, such as are described by and included within the laws before quoted. It is said, however, that this is the first instance on record in which an Indian had been permitted to sue out and maintain a writ of *habeas corpus* in a federal court, therefore, the court must be without jurisdiction in the premises. This is *non sequitur*. I confess I do not know of another instance where this has been done, but I can also say that the occasion for it perhaps has never been so great.<sup>8</sup>

Although the applicability of *habeas corpus* relief for the off-reservation Indian is important in the field of civil rights,<sup>9</sup> the as-

5. T. H. TIBBLES, *THE PONCA CHIEFS: AN ACCOUNT OF THE TRIAL OF STANDING BEAR* 21 (1972).

6. *Id.* at 98.

7. "Webster describes a person as 'a living soul'; a self-conscious being; a moral agent; especially a living human being; a man, woman, or child; an individual of the human race. This is comprehensive enough, it would seem, to include an Indian." *Id.* at 100.

8. *Id.*

9. See 25 U.S.C. § 1303 (1971).

pect of the right of expatriation is probably of more importance in that it has often been a gauge as to how the federal government's programs have suited the individual Indian who has desired to remain and live on his reservation. Judge Dundy viewed the right of expatriation as:

. . . a natural and inherent right of all people indisputable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and, whereas in the recognition of this principle the government has freely received immigrants from all nations, and invested them with the rights of citizenship.<sup>10</sup>

"The door for the individual Indian was open to move from his particular reservation into the outside world."<sup>11</sup> However, over the years this has had serious consequences for tribal autonomy and Indian relations with the federal government. Cohen writes that:

The right of expatriation established by the Standing Bear case remains a significant human right. . . . The right to expatriation is an answer not only to federal oppression but to tribal oppression as well. It would be remarkable if the development of Indian self-government failed to give rise to dissatisfied individuals. . . who considered their tribal status a misfortune. History shows that nations lose in strength when they seek to prevent such unwilling subjects from renouncing allegiance.<sup>12</sup>

The *Ponca Chiefs* is most valuable because it views the events of history through the eyes of the participants. The significant actors in this book, the army, the Indian Bureau, the concerned like William Henry Tibbles and the courts, have had an impact on the promotion of "tribal self-government." They had an impact in the year 1879, and today manifestations of those forces can still be felt. The *Ponca Chiefs* is not a modern historian's impression of what happened in the past. Perhaps it was written in the past to predict the future. A foundation for the modern reader and lawyer, as to the wrongs that are still visible today, the bitterness that still lives on, and the injustice that still must be undone, was laid by William Henry Tibbles in 1879.

THOMAS K. SCHOPPERT\*

10. T. H. TIBBLES, *THE PONCA CHIEFS: AN ACCOUNT OF THE TRIAL OF STANDING BEAR* 105-06 (1972).

11. This was the way in which the Indian Bureau was to dissolve the Indian problem. The more intolerable the oppression of the Bureau upon the life of the Tribe, the more successful was the Bureau in achieving its objective. The year's quota of spiritual refugees from the tribal life was, on each reservation, the criterion of the Indian Superintendent's success.

F. COHEN, *HANDBOOK OF FEDERAL INDIAN LAW* 178 (Univ. of New Mexico reprint, 1971).

12. *Id.*

\* B.A. University of Washington (1968); J.D. University of North Dakota (1972).

## BOOK REVIEWS

**THE SEARCH FOR AN AMERICAN INDIAN IDENTITY—MODERN PAN-INDIAN MOVEMENTS.** By Hazel Hertzberg. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1971. Pp. 362. \$12.00 cloth.

“Pan-Indian” is another of the catch phrases such as “self-determination,” “the establishment” and many others thrown into the popular jargon of the day. However “Pan-Indian,” in fact, is not a well-known, popular term. It is one used primarily by anthropologists and sociologists in their examination of the American Indian.

If “Pan-Indian” is to be defined as movements to coalesce or unify the development of American Indian needs into one, Hertzberg begs the question. She divides her work into three major groupings: 1. Reform Pan-Indianism; 2. Fraternal Pan-Indianism, and 3. Religious Pan-Indianism. For the most part, Hertzberg’s accounts of Pan-Indian movements are reportorial examinations of the happenings of the day in which the events described took place.

With the coming of the Europeans to the land which was identified as America, the natives immediately were labelled “Indians,” setting them apart as a different people. These “Indians” greeted Europeans as tribesmen and treated them as tribesmen. These Europeans of various nations treated the American natives as individual tribes and thus were able to segregate tribe from tribe. Only in the East, Hertzberg points out, did any tendency exist for a political confederacy. Thus defeat of American Indians was gradual and piecemeal -- tribe by tribe. There never was a continental Indian war.

More than that, rivalry among European powers promoted intertribal hostilities, intensifying differences and creating new ones. Each European power treated with individual Indian tribes as if they were independent, “foreign” nations. Indian tribes, however, treated with Europeans as if they were just another tribe. According to Hertzberg, this concept worked for the Indians so long as there were several European powers in rivalry with each other in this land. When the United States of America was born, the American Indians were doomed to defeat. Now with the rise and dominance of a single power on the continent, Indian tribes were forced to deal with one power. Indian policy from the top down was dictated by one power and all policy coordinated into one line of action.

A key point in Hertzberg’s theory is that a major misconception of treaties with Indians concerns Europeans dealing with tribes

as if they were nations. Indians, however, dealt with Europeans as if they were other tribes. Europeans regarded land deals as giving permanent and exclusive possession. Indian treaty signers felt, however, that such deals did not compromise their rights to live, hunt or fish on that land.

As a result of these land deals, treaty-making often divided Indians intra-tribally as well as inter-tribally.

One of the key factors which Hertzberg fails to realize, or at least, seemingly fails to realize, is the mechanical functioning of tribal governments. Most Indian governments were by consensus. Because of the freedom of the individual or minority groups to dissent from the majority consensus in days of old, the minority group often separated itself from the majority group. The minority then could start its own band under the lead spokesman. Thus the "minority" leader became the "majority" leader of a new group.

This, of course, created factionalism and factionalism anew. In the olden days of freedom this was desirable because the areas of agreement and alliances far outnumbered the areas of disagreement.

Today, confined to reservations and locked into the strait jackets of outdated constitutions, this majority-minority consensus leads to divisive power struggles. It is the one thing which prevents the very Pan-Indian unity which Dr. Hertzberg says is so strong. In days of old the minority could separate itself. Today the intra-tribal differences fester into open sores of discontent over majority -- or minority, leadership, policies and programs.

From the outset, Dr. Hertzberg builds her case on the premise that Pan-Indianism is a "movement." At the same time she admits in later chapters that even Pan-Indian leaders themselves often do not recognize such terminology or such movements. This is a direct contradiction.

One dislikes to build a critique of a book or of a "movement" on a definition. However, if "movement" is to be understood as a coordinated development toward a single agreed-upon goal, then the Pan-Indian movement is not nearly so strong, nor enduring, as Dr. Hertzberg implies. She, of course, did not have the knowledge of hindsight of the events of today.

Witness, for example, the occupation of Bureau of Indian Affairs offices in Washington, D. C., in November, 1972. Whatever else may be said about that sit-in, it certainly does not represent the unified opinion — translated into action — of all Indians of the

United States. Look, if you will, at the differences between urban Indians and reservation Indians. One can go so far as to say that each group has at heart the good of the American Indian. By and large, however, it is safe to say that reservation Indians and urban Indians are divided into two groups.

Modern Pan-Indianism then does not represent all-Indian unity, but rather the concerted efforts of one or more factions of factionalism. By definition this is not Pan-Indianism. What Dr. Hertzberg describes in early chapters as "Reform Pan-Indianism," subtitled, "The Society of American Indians," is, in fact, one faction pushing its cause.

One cannot argue with Dr. Hertzberg that such eminent early spokesmen as Dr. Charles Eastman or Arthur Parker were sincere, honest, ardent spokesmen for advancement of solutions to the American Indian problems. They fully believed they were doing the right thing; supporting the right causes; developing the right answers.

One must, however, look at two factors: Official and unofficial white policy toward Indian problems and, secondly, the make-up of the Indian leaders of that which Dr. Hertzberg calls "Reform Pan-Indianism."

Earlier it was pointed out that when the United States was born and a single power ruled in this land, the Indian peoples were doomed to defeat. However, even with a single power in control of Indian affairs, the Indian tribes faced a diversity of authority and policy. This diversity of authority and policy was within the government itself. For example, look at the variable, conflicting and diametrically opposed policies of the War Department and the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the mid- and later 1800's. More than that, friends were divided. Witness also the missionaries with their bewildering salesmanship of a wide variety of church denominations.

Even more perplexing was the fact that friend and foe alike often supported the same causes. This is illustrated by the Removal Act of 1830 which was supported by friend and enemy of the Indian. The friend supported the act because it would remove the Noble Red Man from the path of the onward crush of the white frontier. There would be no Indian genocide. Foes supported the Removal Act because this opened former Indian lands for settlement by the whites. Aborigines as wards, heathens, savages had no rights.

Secondly, one must look at the leaders of Reform Pan-Indianism and its vehicle, the Society of American Indians, to fully understand Pan-Indianism as projected by Hertzberg.

As discussed by Dr. Hertzberg, Indians then as now are composed of three different types. Involved as leaders of the Society of American Indians were many of the first generation of "educated" Indian spokesmen. They represented that small group of men and women who left the reservation and won college degrees. Included were such names as Dr. Charles Eastman, a Sioux; Dr. Carlos Montezuma, an Apache; Arthur Parker from the Iroquois — and others.

This group of Indian leaders of the Society of American Indians had successfully bridged the cultural gap. While identified as Indian, they lived in the white world — and for the most part they lived well. Having sprung from the Indian culture, they believed they spoke for the American Indian. Eastman, in fact, was perhaps the most famous Indian in his day. When he spoke, white people listened. Dr. Montezuma, on the other hand, was captured as a small boy and was raised in the white culture. However, he forever was a fighter for what he believed was right for the Indian people.

The second group of Indian leaders, comprises that group of men and women who lived the Indian life during childhood, went to white man's schools and then returned to the reservations to work with and for their people.

The third group included strong and powerful leaders who were not educated in white man's school, often did not speak English, and were the real leaders of their clans and tribes.

Thus it was the first leaders of the Pan-Indian movements, as described by Dr. Hertzberg, which had perhaps the least contact with reservation Indians and problems. Because of their own geniuses, however, they felt they knew what was best for their fellow man. Some of them, in fact, tried to retain their tribal identity and relationships. Others endeavored to shed them.

Consequently, it can be seen that the early leaders had a common interest — to remove the Indian from economic and social doldrums to which he was subjected through circumstances beyond his control.

Early in the game the first splits developed. Dr. Montezuma, labelled as the "activist" of his day, was like a voice in the wilderness as he called for abolishment of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and doing away with reservations. A favorite appellation attached to him was the "fiery Apache."

Other leaders of the Society, however, were leary about coming out so strongly against the BIA. Some of them felt it should be abolished. However, they realized that to do so precipitously with

one swing of the axe, would be too cruel and inhuman to the old people on the reservation.

The Dawes Act of 1887 formed the basis for the Indian policy during the next half-century. This was known as the Allotment Act. Lands were allotted to the Indian peoples in trust with the title held by the United States Government. Surplus lands on reservations were sold to whites and the money set aside for the education of Indian youth. In the farmer society, white agrarians could support themselves and their families on a quarter section of land. In the Indian society, vast acreages were needed for the hunt. The Dawes Act then doomed the Indian to economic slavery. Even though the day of the hunt had since passed, this was the only type of life they knew.

However, the Dawes Act incorporated more than just the Allotment Procedures. Inherent in the Act was the melting pot theory of the American society. The Indian was to be placed into this cauldron, although he was to contribute nothing. His values and his cultures were to be left behind. He would emerge from that melting pot as a red-skinned white man.

Indian peoples, however, did not respond to the melting pot theory. They clung tenaciously to the old ways of life and refused to let themselves be tossed into the pot. While much was destroyed, the old value system which was at the base of their culture and their religion remained. It was these values which carried them through the most trying period of their various tribal histories.

Widespread corruption aggravated the difficulties. Hertzberg remarked: "The Indian service was a classic example of a corrupt bureaucracy. Nowhere was the spoils system more destructive than in the Indian system."<sup>1</sup> The reservation agents, who held dictatorial and autocratic power, most often were political appointees chosen as a reward for political service to a political party.

"Progressives" and "friendlies" accepted rule by the agents and tried to cooperate with the government. "Conservatives" or "hostiles" were uncooperative and clung to the old tribal ways. Thus, there developed widespread factionalism within individual tribes and between tribes.

In building her case for Pan-Indianism, Hertzberg states: "Many tribes showed extraordinary capacity to combine old ways with the new."<sup>2</sup> Ancient tribal conditions adapted to changed conditions

---

1. H. W. HERTZBERG, *THE SEARCH FOR AN AMERICAN INDIAN IDENTITY—MODERN PAN INDIAN MOVEMENTS* 5 (1971).

2. *Id.* at 6.

and new ones evolved. Patterns of accommodation were developed.

According to Hertzberg, the new Pan-Indianism which evolved in the early part of the 20th century signified an effort to find a common ground. "This was the effort to find a common ground, beyond the tribe a broader identity and unity based on shared cultural elements, shared experiences, shared needs and a shared common fate."<sup>3</sup>

Again Hertzberg errs. The "effort to find a common ground" was from the top down. This "effort" came from the War Department, from the Department of Interior and from the white, unofficial friends of the Indian. No support came from the grass roots population or the real tribal leaders. The author cites Pontiac and the Delaware Prophet, and Tecumseh and the Shawnee Prophet. She feels that Oklahoma was to become a center and a focus for Pan-Indianism.

Hertzberg's conclusion that Pan-Indianism is a truly inter-tribal movement simply represents abortive efforts by certain entities to gain support for certain specific causes. If Pan-Indianism is to be defined as Indian unity in the full sense of the word, then these efforts cited by Hertzberg are not Pan-Indianism at all. Rather, it is as if one group says to another group: "We should all drink the same brand of coffee and that brand should be the brand we drink." Everyone still is drinking coffee but they argue over which brand to drink. Nothing has been done to radically change the system at all.

Hertzberg believes that the Ghost Dance, which in the Dakotas ended on a cold winter day, December 29, 1890, at the Massacre at Wounded Knee, combined tribalism and Pan-Indianism. She referred to the Messiah Craze as a religion. Quite frankly, this writer's extensive research does not substantiate either claim. The Ghost Dance was not a religion. Wherever the Ghost Dance was extant, it was a local phenomena — not a unified, "nationalistic" effort. Hertzberg's claim that most Sioux Ghost Dancers were "hostiles" simply is not borne out by the facts of history. Not one act of violence was committed.

Her statement that: "Today, messianic movements . . . are viewed . . . as instances of a common and recognizable type of response to situations of deep cultural stress,"<sup>4</sup> cannot mean such response is, by definition, Pan-Indianism.

At any rate, Hertzberg cites the events of the last two decades of the 1800's and the first decade of the 1900's as those which re-

---

3. *Id.* at 6.

4. *Id.* at 13.

shaped the "recurrent Pan-Indian theme — Helping to produce modern Pan-Indian movements whose major theme was accommodation to and acceptance of white society as permanent."<sup>5</sup>

She further states that of all these factors, perhaps the most important single element in stimulating Pan-Indianism was the expanding educational opportunity for all Indians.

Dr. Hertzberg cites the theory of General Richard Henry Pratt, founder of Carlisle: "Kill the Indian and save the man,"<sup>6</sup> as the educational philosophy which guided the work of those early Indian leaders. In the first several conferences of the American Society of Indians, she points out the impact of the Carlisle graduates on the conferences.

The Christian reformers held to the theory that they must Christianize and civilize the Indian all at the same time. Thus, the Indian was to lose his Indian identity.

The melting pot theory of the American society was one in which all races were to synthesize into a new product. Each of the European national groups was to contribute its own culture. The resultant new product was to be called "American." However, the Indian was to shed his cultural skin, jump into the melting pot and come out as a white man. This was called the "vanishing policy."

Every "movement" of the day gave substance to the "vanishing policy." Education, Christian reformers, the United States melting pot, and friends alike, would remake the Indian into a red-skinned carbon copy of the white man. There was no blending of cultures, no accommodation of one culture to the other as far as the Indian culture and values were concerned. Indian self-respect and self-help was defeated.

Educated Indians of the day wanted to remain Indian and at the same time use the adaptable parts of the white world in their Indianess. This, Hertzberg says, was a primary force leading to Pan-Indianism.

Growth of formal activities which led to the Pan-Indianism lauded by Hertzberg in her book started with the Eastman brothers — Dr. Charles Eastman and the Rev. John Eastman, along with the Rev. Sherman Coolidge. That early beginning was somewhat of an abortive effort and the real movement was not started until 1908 through the impetus of Fayette A. McKenzie of Ohio State

---

5. *Id.* at 14.

6. *Id.* at 16.

\* B.A. 1951, Wesleyan University at Mitchell, South Dakota; Director, Office of Indian Studies, University of North Dakota; Member, North Dakota House of Representatives, 1970-73.

University. Although he was not an Indian, McKenzie enlisted the aid of Dr. Charles Eastman and the Rev. Sherman Coolidge. In 1911 the first group was called together. These "modern" Indian leaders included Dr. Eastman, Dr. Carlos Montezuma, Thomas L. Sloan, Charles E. Daganett, Laura Cornelius, and Henry Standing Bear. This fledgling group became the founders of the Society of the American Indian. Dr. Eastman was regarded as the "dean" of the progressive American Indians of the day and was, perhaps, the most famous Indian of his time.

They came from various backgrounds and their personal persuasions and ideologies varied. In later developments the original half dozen were joined by other eminent American Indians of the day. Strangely, however, even the original six did not stay together. Montezuma, the fiery Apache, served the role of Devils Advocate as he split from the main group over the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

As the Society of the American Indian vacillated over the proposal to exterminate the Bureau of Indian Affairs, its strength rose and fell like tides responding to the pull of the moon. Eventually it was to become totally ineffective and die from these causes. During its heyday it waxed strong, although never implementing the changes sought for the American Indian peoples.

The real changes were brought about by late comers to the scene. Here again Dr. Eastman had a hand. The effective changes were brought about principally by such men as John Collier who was slated to become the top administrator of Indian affairs during the Franklin Delano Roosevelt administration of the 1930's.

It was Collier who was able to implement an entirely new theory about the American Indian. The Vanishing Pot was dead. For Collier said in effect: "Rather than assimilating the Indian and destroying his Indianness, we should build on it." It was Eastman who had a hand in instigating the Meriam Task Force out of the Brookings Institution. Henry Roe Cloud probably was the most active in formulating the policy contained in the Meriam report. It was started in 1926 and formally issued in 1928. From it came the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934.

The Indian Reorganization Act, whose congressional authors were Howard and Wheeler, was the father of modern self-determination of the 1960's and 1970's. For it was in this Act of the Roosevelt Administration that seeds were planted for revival of tribes, tribal councils and self-rule.

The further extension of this development has seen the birth of self-determination in actuality. The growing pains were long—from

1911 to 1971. But Pan-Indianism? Hardly. For even today the Indian peoples of this land remain disunited.

Dr. Hertzberg's examination of Pan-Indianism forms a valuable historical study of particular movements conducted by certain groups. In reading it, one will learn much about development of thought and action throughout nearly a century. But to label this Pan-Indianism is not necessarily correct. True Pan-Indianism has not yet come to the American scene. Perhaps Dr. Hertzberg's study and publication of her findings into "The Search for an American Indian Identity" will spur the Pan-Indian movement into the picture of success American Indians so desperately need.

ARTHUR RAYMOND\*

# **ANNOUNCEMENT**

We have purchased the  
entire back stock and  
reprint rights of

## **North Dakota Law Review**

---

Complete sets to date  
are now available. We  
can also furnish single  
volumes and issues.

---

**WILLIAM S. HEIN & CO., INC.**  
**1285 Main Street**  
**Buffalo, New York 14209**

# NORTH DAKOTA LAW REVIEW

Member National Conference of Law Reviews

VOLUME 49

SPRING 1973

NUMBER 3

## BOARD OF EDITORS

EDWARD J. WARD, *Editor-in-Chief*

PAUL E. GODLEWSKI  
*Research and Book Review Editor*

THOMAS H. ANDREWS, JR.  
*Special Projects Editor*

REED E. HALL  
*Case Comment Editor*

STEPHEN D. DIXON  
*Note Editor*

JOHN W. DWYER  
*Articles Editor*

E. THOMAS CONNY III  
*Business Manager*

## EDITORIAL STAFF

D. SCOTT BALLOU  
JOSEPH H. LOUWAGIE  
ROBERT N. WILLIAMS

DAVID NISS  
ROBERT RAU  
ORELL D. SCHMITZ

## JUNIOR STAFF MEMBERS

DAMON E. ANDERSON  
OWEN L. ANDERSON  
JOHN V. BOULGER  
DAVID A. ENGEN  
ROBERT J. ERICKSON

THOMAS HAMLIN  
JAMES S. HILL  
CARLAN J. KRAFT  
DAVID S. MARING  
RUSSELL J. MYHRE

RICHARD W. OLSON  
H. JEFFREY PETERSON  
DUANE H. SCHURMAN  
GARY R. THUNE

## FACULTY ADVISOR

BRUCE E. BOHLMAN

## SECRETARIES

MARIA HANIFEN

MAUREEN QUAM

The North Dakota Law Review is the  
Journal of the

## STATE BAR ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA

MICHAEL R. MCINTEE, *President*

ALAN B. WARCUP, *President-Elect*

RICHARD B. BEAR, *Sec'y.-Treas.*

ROBERT P. SCHULLER, *Executive Director*

314 MDU Office Building  
Bismarck, North Dakota

The views herein expressed are those of the individual authors and are not necessarily those of the State Bar Association or the North Dakota Law Review.

THE NORTH DAKOTA LAW REVIEW is published four times a year in November, January, March and May by the University of North Dakota School of Law in co-operation with the State Bar Association of North Dakota.

Communications concerning editorial matters and permission to reprint material contained herein should be addressed to: Editor, North Dakota Law Review, University of North Dakota School of Law, Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201.

Communications concerning business matters and requests for reprints should be addressed to: Business Manager, North Dakota Law Review, University of North Dakota School of Law, Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201. Subscription \$7.00 per volume, \$3.00 per issue. Second class postage paid at Grand Forks, North Dakota.

Subscriptions will be automatically renewed, unless notice of cancellation is received.

Copyright, 1973, by the University of North Dakota School of Law.

