

laterally abrogated the Choctaw land patent, seized communal land holdings, and terminated the tribe itself—hardly the treatment undergone by white citizens and land holders.

Kidwell's unique and unsupported assertions are not limited to her descriptions of the Dawes era. In her discussion of U.S. Indian removal policy, she reduces Choctaw dispossession and expulsion from their homelands to a "conundrum" for the Choctaws, a simple choice between becoming "subject to state law" or "moving to the western lands to preserve their sovereignty" (p. xvi). This trivializes the monumental injustices of U.S. conquest and attributes the resulting thousands of Choctaw deaths to Choctaw "preference." Kidwell minimizes the dishonest tactics used by the United States to obtain this "removal" treaty by stating that "a small group of Choctaw leaders" signed a treaty in which "they agreed to move west" (xvi). John Marshall's notorious Supreme Court decision, *Cherokee Nation v Georgia* (1831), which enshrined the concept of indigenous nations as "wards" of the U.S. government and thus set up two centuries of Native subjugation under U.S. law, is, to Kidwell, "a product of the fierce debate over states' rights and the power of the federal government in America" (p. xvi) and has nothing to do with "Indians." The American conquest and destruction of Native Americans which is at the heart of the dispossession and exile of the Choctaws and tens of thousands of Native peoples from around the country is thus summarily dismissed.

Aside from these problems in methodology and interpretation, the text is permeated with racialized thinking. Kidwell's Choctaws are "mixed-bloods" (progressive) and "full-bloods" (regressive). She reduces complex political struggles involving Choctaws of every hue to a racial binary: "tensions . . . between full-blood and mixed-blood elements" (p. 42). Modern scholarship has shown how these divisions were not based on "blood" but had their own internal and complex logic.

Finally, Kidwell asserts that, at the turn of the twentieth century, the Choctaws threw off all their traditions and belief systems and embraced predatory capitalism's ideals of "self-interest," "the importance of private property," and the commodification of land. The fundamental "source of Choctaw identity," Kidwell states, abruptly changed to the accumulation of "money." "Choctaws had learned the importance of private property and self-interest," says Kidwell. "The traditional value of land as communal property was converted into the value of money. . . the value of community was converted to that of self-interest," she asserts (p. xviii). In this instance, and many others, the author makes the elementary error of inductive reasoning: her mixed-blood family's frantic quest for assimilation is assumed to represent all Choctaw people, which not only contradicts the historical evidence but also grossly distorts the historical record. Kidwell's work should be retitled as the story of a handful of assimilationist mixed-bloods, not a history of the Choctaw people of Oklahoma.

To say that Kidwell lags behind current scholarship is perhaps putting it too mildly. Kidwell asserts that a "key point" in "contemporary scholarship on the history of American Indians" is that they were "not passive victims of American colonization" (xviii). While one would certainly agree that earlier scholars shifted the paradigm of Indian victimization to one of Indian agency, this revelation is now some forty years old.

Leading Indigenous scholarship in the twenty-first century has advanced the framework and structure of historical inquiry to include critical analysis of the historical record in terms of colonization, human rights, and decolonization of American history. Monographs that simply reify old stereotypes and tired celebratory interpretations of Native subjugation and U.S. tyranny have become obsolete.

DONNA L. AKERS  
University of Nebraska,  
Lincoln

JILL ST. GERMAIN. *Broken Treaties: United States and Canadian Relations with the Lakotas and the Plains Cree, 1868–1885*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 2009. Pp. xxvi, 450. \$60.00.

Jill St. Germain seeks to refine and expand upon her earlier work in this follow up to *Indian Treaty Making in the United States and Canada, 1867–1877* (2004). Moving from policy concerns to the nature of Indian-Euro-American interactions that resulted in the Second Treaty of Ft. Laramie between Lakotas and the United States (1868) and Treaty Number 6 between Plains Crees and Canada (1876), St. Germain places people at the center of her narrative and challenges established historical interpretations that she refers to as the "broken treaties tradition." In the United States, this is framed by open acknowledgment of the federal government's failure to live up to its promises and treaty obligations, which has led many to read history backward and cast a pall of inevitability over narratives by defining the treaty-making process as fatally doomed even before it began. Furthermore, it diminishes Native agency by claiming that Indians did not fully understand the Western process of treaty making. In Canada, a century of denial about the true nature of relations with indigenous peoples served to glorify imperial history by claiming a mythical northern superiority in honoring treaty obligations: pointing to a paucity of nineteenth-century warfare as evidence of Canadian honor and morality in Indian relations, Canadians favorably contrasted their history with that of the United States. However, in order to do so, they had to define the Métis uprising (in which Plains Crees participated) as an aberration rooted in Indian savagery. Finally confronted in the 1980s, this racist, self-serving narrative of denial was replaced with a new orthodoxy that excoriated Canadian actions and minimized Native agency and the treaty making process in its own way. Scholars now accused Canada of using Cree efforts to gain better treaty terms as an excuse to subjugate them during the Métis

Rebellion; Cree treaty negotiations simply became stage dressing for Canadian aggression. St. Germain rejects the determinism of the broken treaty tradition on both sides of the forty-ninth parallel. In so doing, she aims to enhance Native agency and provide a corrective to the literature by investigating the negotiations and early implementation of these two treaties by all concerned parties. She has chosen Second Ft. Laramie and Number Six for their infamy as case examples of broken treaties, for their mutual inability to stave off major impending wars, and as avenues for seeking deeper meaning through a transnational comparison.

The thrust of St. Germain's narratives have been told before by many previous scholars, particularly with reference to Lakota-U.S. relations. Readers well versed in these narratives will not find much new on that count. However, such is not the author's goal. Rather, St. Germain makes a solid contribution to the literature by adding new understanding to these two historical episodes. She makes convincing arguments by casting Native participation in treaty negotiation and implementation on its own terms, and she successfully draws important parallels between Lakota and Cree experiences, elucidating fundamental traits in the colonial interactions between expanding settler empires and independent, migratory Indigenous nations of the northern plains/prairie region. At the same time, she outlines important historical differences stemming from differentials in power among Lakotas and Crees. Likewise, St. Germain illustrates the similarities in American and Canadian approaches to colonial expansion while avoiding the temptation to paint with too broad a brush, and pointing out crucial differences born from different demographics, economies, histories, and nuanced policy constructions.

In terms of methodology, there is room for more complexity in this book. While St. Germain works through a nice assortment of primary sources overall, she nevertheless shows a proclivity for frequently building a narrative to a large degree around just one set of primary documents at a time, with only minor augmentation from other collections. Richer narratives might have been constructed had she woven together a wider array of sources simultaneously. Likewise, a fuller engagement with the extant literature on these well-documented topics would have been welcome, as would have a stricter adherence to the Chicago citation format, particularly in creating fuller footnotes when initially citing a source. But these detractions aside, the book is a strong piece of scholarship that joins the recent work of Jeffrey Ostler, David G. McCrady, and others in enhancing our historical understanding of a period and topic that has long been studied but frequently misinterpreted.

AKIM D. REINHARDT  
Towson University

ERIC V. MEEKS. *Border Citizens: The Making of Indians, Mexicans, and Anglos in Arizona*. Austin: University of

Texas Press. 2007. Pp. xiii, 326. Cloth \$60.00, paper \$24.95.

A significant contribution that Spanish Borderlands history has made to American historiography is its ability to provide a different historical context for discussions of race and ethnicity. Seeing how "Indians," "Mexicans," and "Anglos" encountered and defined one another has deepened our understanding about how racial-ethnic identities are historically constructed in particular places and times, but few works have investigated these issues as thoroughly and provocatively as Eric V. Meeks's well-written book. Meeks argues that the history of Arizona followed a dualistic process whereby the establishment of an Anglo political economy and "the ways in which race, ethnicity shaped labor markets, defined citizenship criteria, and inscribed national boundaries" were constantly challenged by people of indigenous and Mexican descent through resistant adaptation, the "unanticipated, resilient, and sometimes defiant ways in which people adapt to impositions by those in power" (p. 4). Meeks's work is not merely a discussion of subordinate, subaltern resistance to a dominant political economy; rather, by examining race and ethnicity from the 1880s to roughly the 1980s he points to the tension and complexity of identity formation by Native Americans and peoples of Mexican descent. For example, in the 1960s a group calling itself the Pascua Yaquis requested federal recognition as Native Americans with rights to establish a reservation, even though the majority of Yaqui spoke Spanish or Yaqui, had adapted "Mexican" cultural practices and kinship ties, occupied similar socioeconomic spaces with Mexicans and Mexican Americans, and resisted being identified as Native American. By examining inter-, intra-ethnic, and racial tensions, Meeks forces readers to question their assumptions about what constitutes "Anglo," "Indian," and "Mexican" identities in the twentieth century.

Meeks interlinks the issues of labor and economic development with shifting ideas of cultural citizenship. In the first chapter, he examines how emerging "boundaries of race, class, culture and language would determine who would have access to resources, who could work where, who could join craft unions, who would be accepted as first- or second-class citizens and who would be excluded from citizenship altogether" (p. 17). Meeks's discussion of Arizona's developing political economy into the twentieth century is clearly and convincingly argued, particularly with regard to how racial inequality was ascribed to and defined by specific ethnic and racial groups. Rather than grouping Native Americans into one monolithic unit, Meeks's specific treatment of Tohono O'odham, Yaqui, Pima, Maricopa, Opata, Navajo, and Hopi peoples provides an understanding of the shifts within identity and social status of all these groups in response to the developing Anglo elite. In eight chapters, Meeks describes Arizona's agricultural beginnings, the arrival of railroads and extractive mining, the growth of federal agencies, the mi-