"Indian for a While": Charles Eastman's "Indian Boyhood" and the Discourse of Allotment

Author(s): David J. Carlson and Charles Eastman

Source: *American Indian Quarterly*, Autumn, 2001, Vol. 25, No. 4 (Autumn, 2001), pp. 604-625

Published by: University of Nebraska Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1186018

"Indian for a While"

Charles Eastman's Indian Boyhood *and the Discourse of Allotment*

DAVID J. CARLSON

What boy would not be an Indian for a while when he thinks of the freest life in the world?

Charles Alexander Eastman, *Indian Boyhood*

In 1893 when Charles Eastman began working on the sketches that would eventually become his first autobiography, *Indian Boyhood,* he had just moved his family from the Pine Ridge Reservation (where he was employed as the agency physician) to St. Paul MN.[1] The relocation was not wholly voluntary. Conflicts earlier that year with Pine Ridge's military agent over irregularities in remunerations paid to the Wounded Knee massacre survivors had precipitated Eastman's temporary resignation from the Indian Bureau.[2] In his first entry into a dispute with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA, an agency whose goals he had heretofore supported), Eastman found himself marginalized by erstwhile supporters and frustrated by an inability to protect his brethren from graft and government corruption. At precisely such a moment, having come into direct conflict with the institutional apparatus of federal Indian law, he commenced writing a series of autobiographical sketches, addressed to a predominantly white audience.[3] In all, six articles were serialized in *St. Nicholas: An Illustrated Magazine for Young Folks* between December 1893 and May 1894.[4] These pieces later became incorporated into the text of *Indian Boyhood* when it was published in 1902 (by which time Eastman was again working for the BIA as the agency physician at the Crow Creek Reservation).

Reflecting both his long-standing immersion in the bureaucracy of colonial domination and his desire to act as a cultural mediator between whites and Native Americans, Eastman's *Indian Boyhood* is a complex and intriguing work.[5] Like a number of his contemporaries (writers such as Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins, Zitkala-Ša, and Francis LaFlesche), Eastman set out to interpret Indian

culture and identity for the benefit of his (hopefully sympathetic) white readership. Consequently, *Indian Boyhood* contains a great deal of ethnographic material, seemingly intended to suggest the possibility and desirability of assimilating all Native Americans into the cultural and political mainstream of the United States. At the same time, Eastman also frames his work as an *autobiography,* a sincere attempt to record, organize, and make sense of his own individual memories of the process of becoming "civilized."[6] What is most interesting about *Indian Boyhood* is the complex way in which these personal and collective narratives intertwine. In the end, I would suggest that this blending is notable not merely as evidence of Eastman's literary sophistication but also as an index of his embeddedness in the colonial institutions of his time.

My goal in this article is to show how both the ethnographic and the autobiographical aspects of *Indian Boyhood* take shape around a specific legal model of self: the paternalistic identity model of the Indian as child, which buttressed the federal government's allotment policy. The book's complexity derives from its author's specific engagement with the hegemonic legal discourse of allotment on the Western reservations during his adult life.[7] Looking back on his childhood, Eastman produced a text that established him as a national spokesman and authority on Indian affairs, naturalized the process of cultural assimilation, and legitimized the ideology of allotment. In doing so, though, he also provided subsequent generations of readers with a stark example of the extreme pressures felt by Native American mediator figures during the early decades of the twentieth century.

Contemporary readers hoping to understand both the genesis and significance of *Indian Boyhood* should first turn their attention to a seminal occurrence preceding its composition. In 1887, the same year that Eastman received his Bachelor of Science degree from Dartmouth College, Congress passed the General Allotment Act, or Dawes Act, which sought to "civilize" Native Americans by forcibly turning them into homesteaders. The allotment approach centered around the division of reservation lands into small individually owned plots and marked the beginning of one of the bleakest periods in the history of relations between whites and Native Americans in the United States. The federal allotment policy fused long-standing paternalistic assumptions about Indians' cultural inferiority with turn-of-the-century theories of human psychology, development, and education. This conjunction produced the most potent mechanisms of colonial domination Native Americans living in the United States had ever experienced. During the allotment era, the U.S. government aggressively sought to reshape Native American identity through a combination of legal and bureaucratic control, "humanitarian" benevolence, and vocational education. The belief that individual property rights and ownership define civilized

life was not new, of course; such ideas have deep roots in contractarian political theory and the Anglo-American common law tradition, both of which had informed U.S. Indian law since the revolutionary era. The major innovation of the Dawes Act was the idea that a comprehensive federal bureaucracy could actually speed up Indians' cultural development by beginning to force Indian "children" to act as *individuals.* This fusion of a particular way of "knowing" the Indian with potent institutions designed to disseminate that system of knowledge (ranging from the explicitly coercive Courts of Indian Offenses to the more insidious Indian school system) marks allotment law as a quintessential example of a *discourse,* in the Foucauldian sense of the word.[8] As a pervasive system of political and cultural domination, allotment penetrated into the daily experience and consciousness of thousands of Native Americans who lived their lives in the shadow of government bureaucracy.[9]

If most Native Americans at the turn of the century were forced to grapple with the ideological assumptions and institutional power of allotment law, few had as much direct experience with, and understanding of, the colonial bureaucracy as Charles Eastman. Though he spent his first fifteen years living the traditional life of a Santee youth in the woods of Minnesota and on the plains of western Canada, for most of his adult life Eastman was known to white Americans as one of the best exemplars of the Indian's ability to assimilate into modern society. He came to the public's attention by rapidly progressing though the Indian educational system and subsequently making a career for himself in the Indian service. Eastman attended the Santee Normal School from 1873 to 1876 and later studied at Beloit College, Knox College, Dartmouth College, and Boston University (where he received his medical degree in 1890).

While studying in the East, he also established friendships with influential philanthropists committed to the cause of Indian reform. Mr. and Mrs. Frank Wood of Boston, trustees of Wellesley College, extended both personal and financial support to Eastman and arranged for him to present a paid lecture at Wellesley in 1882, which brought him to the attention of a larger community of reformers in the East. Connections like these were instrumental in subsequently securing him various positions in the Indian service, including his first appointment as physician at Pine Ridge. At the same time, they also provided Eastman with a first-rate, albeit informal, legal education. The Woods kept him informed of pending legislation and shifts in Indian policy, and he was even consulted about various provisions of the Dawes Act (which he supported) as it worked its way through Congress in 1887.[10] This kind of involvement in legal reform and policy development would continue throughout Eastman's career. In 1911, for example, he was a founding member of the American Indian Association, later called the Society of American Indians, and he frequently contributed to the society's journal, *American Indian Magazine.* Between his orga-

nizational affiliations, personal ties, and professional involvement in the Indian service, then, Eastman experienced an unusual degree of immersion in the legal discourse of "Indianness."

Eastman's views on the allotment policy remained fairly stable throughout his career as a lecturer and public servant; he consistently affirmed the principle of Indian assimilation into the social and political fabric of the United States, and he viewed the allotment policy as a major stepping-stone to full citizenship. Interestingly enough, he also showed a willingness to tolerate, for a time at least, some of the paternalistic elements of U.S. Indian policy, provided that those elements would give way, in time, to individual autonomy and political equality. Perhaps Eastman's most direct and detailed endorsement of the ideology of allotment appears in a 1915 article, "The Indian as Citizen," which appeared in *Lippincott's Magazine*.[11] This article also provides some interesting insights into his typical rhetorical strategies, strategies that also appear in his autobiographical writings. Eastman opens the piece deferentially, using the passive voice and acknowledging the Indian's need for assistance in the transition to modern life. "After due protest and resistance," he notes, the Indian "is found to be easily governed by civilized law and usages" and "is capable of sustaining a high moral and social standard, when placed under wise guidance."[12] As the article continues, Eastman presents exemplary accounts of assimilation, specifically, William Duncan's Christian Indian community of Metlakatla AK and the Sioux citizen community at Flandreau SD (where Eastman's father took him at age sixteen). For Eastman, the essential lesson provided by these case studies is the following: "Who can say that civilization is beyond the reach of the untutored primitive man *in a single generation*?"[13] With this as his keynote, then, Eastman uses the rest of his article to argue in support of the basic mechanisms of the allotment policy (rapid assimilation and cultural change through altered legal and property relations). He notes that the Dawes Act opened the "door to American citizenship," comments approvingly on the fact that over one-half of the nation's 330,000 Indians had been allotted lands in fee simple, and criticizes the Burke bill of 1906 for slowing down the process. Commenting also on his own work in revising the allotment rolls among the Sioux (an issue I will take up again shortly), Eastman places himself firmly in the pro-allotment camp, affirming the notion that after a period of transitional "wardship" Native Americans will blend into the fabric of American society. Indeed, he reflects positively on the fact that the "bands of citizen Sioux with whom I am acquainted, are becoming more and more identified with the general farming population of Nebraska and the Dakotas."[14]

Bearing in mind the details of his biography and evidence of his philosophical commitments, it should not surprise us that Eastman's initial autobiographical act would evince a broad identification with the ideology behind the

allotment policy. Confronted with the discursive power of allotment law and needing to negotiate his way through a complex modern world, he was committed early in his career to defining himself (indeed, to defining "Indianness") in terms of the law's paternalistic model of Indian identity. Assuming the identity model of the Indian as child in *Indian Boyhood,* Eastman worked to establish himself as a mediating voice within the colonial legal order by providing his white readers with a reassuringly familiar and acceptable image of the Indian. This emphasis appears from the outset of the book in his adaptation of generic conventions taken from the Euro-American literary tradition. The fact that *Indian Boyhood* is a book about Eastman's own childhood roots draws immediate attention to its author's familiarity with assumptions about identity formation characteristic of modern nonnative autobiography. As H. David Brumble III has pointed out, a distinguishing characteristic of precontact Native American autobiographical expression is its lack of interest in early childhood memories. Coup tales (stories of valor), tales of hunting prowess, and accounts of actions that earned the performer a new name might be told, and such tales might indeed delve back into earlier experience.[15] However, childhood itself, as an area of intrinsic interest in dealing with the origins of adult identity, does not emerge as a subject with the same prominence that we see in Western autobiographical discourse (especially since Rousseau). Eastman's initial conception for his autobiographical text thus shows his engagement with conventions familiar to his white readers. In this respect, his work resembles that of a number of other contemporary Native American writers, such as Zitkala-Ša and Francis LaFlesche, who were also active as both cross-cultural interpreters and activists on behalf of Native peoples.[16]

Still, *Indian Boyhood* is much more than a generic coming-of-age story. Eastman also frames his account of childhood experience in accordance with the conventions of a particularly popular form of contemporary American writing about childhood—the late-nineteenth-century "boy book." When we recall that the chapters of *Indian Boyhood* were initially serialized in a youth magazine, it should probably not surprise us that the text shares certain affinities with popular works like Hamlin Garland's *Boy Life on the Prairie* (1899) or Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn* (1884), texts that obliquely invoke "Indianness" as part of a romanticized atmosphere of youthful adventure. As Marcia Jacobson points out, the American "boy book" of the turn of the century is characterized by its primitivist nostalgia for a life before the restraints and responsibilities of modern (i.e., commercial and industrial) adult life. Jacobson also notes that the image of childhood developed in the literature was deeply influenced by the so-called recapitulation theory of psychological development, popularized in the United States by G. Stanley Hall. According to that theory, the individual's progression from childhood to maturity reenacts the historical pro-

gression of the human race from savagery to civilization.[17] A boy's "natural" inclination to "savagery" (an inclination represented in part by his affinity for outdoor activities like hunting and fishing) thus represents a necessary prelude to his development of a higher moral consciousness and eventual integration into the adult life of modern Western society. It is here, on this point, that we begin to see how Eastman's engagement with the literary conventions of white America also marks an engagement with its legal ideology, vis-à-vis Native Americans. The resemblance between the "boy" of recapitulation psychology and the colonialist fantasy of the "white man's Indian" is deep; both turn on a particularly paternalistic, teleological identification of ontology with phylogeny—the common assumption being that individual development and cultural development proceed along parallel trajectories. In penning the sketches that would become *Indian Boyhood,* then, Eastman was responding not only to the tradition of boy books but also to a powerful cultural consensus about the nature of Indian identity.

In a sense, the assumptions behind recapitulation psychology (and Indian law) provided Eastman with a blueprint for pursuing his goal of cross-cultural mediation. *Indian Boyhood* presents its readers simultaneously with a story of individual and cultural identity, identifying Eastman's personal experience with the collective experience of his people, the Santee Sioux. Throughout the book, he refers to "Indian children" and "Indians" almost as frequently as to himself in the first person. The opening of a chapter called "Life in the Woods" provides a representative example: "The month of September recalls to every Indian's mind the season of the fall hunt. I remember one such expedition which is typical of many" (183). Of course, following the work of critics like Hertha Wong and Arnold Krupat, one might argue that the association of personal and collective experience in Eastman's autobiographical act represents a gesture toward preserving traditional forms of Native American self-narration, what Wong refers to as "communo-bio-oratory."[18] Such a hypothesis begins to fall apart, though, when we also consider what kind of narrative structure Eastman imposes on such experience in the text. If he suggests that his personal story is also a representative one, Eastman's primary intent in doing so does not seem to have been to challenge the dominant Western paradigm of the individual self. Rather, he foregrounds the teleology of allotment law, rooted in the Euro-American emphasis on growing out of boyish "savagery" into a more "mature," civilized form of identity.

One of the first places that we begin to see hints of Eastman's privileging of the teleological, assimilationist ideology of the allotment era is in the way he positions himself as the narrator of his life story. It is a commonplace among many critics of autobiography (most notably Philippe Lejeune) that a part of what constitutes the genre, on a formal-linguistic level, is the simultaneous

temporal separation *and* sense of connection between the autobiographer as author of his or her story and as the subject of that story.[19] This sense of similarity and difference is generated both formally and functionally, through the use of verb tense (usually past tense) and the first person pronoun.[20] In this context, it is interesting that throughout *Indian Boyhood,* even when he is talking about himself (as opposed to "Indian children" generally), Eastman regularly discusses his experiences in the *third person.* In the opening pages of the book, he actually shifts between two modes of expression, enacting at the pronominal level a fairly radical sundering of the bonds between childhood and adult selves. Relating some of his earliest recollections of childhood, Eastman notes that at birth he "had to bear the humiliating name of 'Hakadah,' meaning the pitiful last" (4). Immediately after making this observation, though, Eastman the narrator begins to refer to Eastman the child as "the babe" or "Hakadah," terms that he uses from that point on at least as frequently as he uses *I.* Part of what is going on at a moment like this, of course, is Eastman's attempt to dramatize the fact that he left his birth name (Hakadah) behind when he was later renamed Ohiyesa ("the winner"). Recalling Wong's discussion of naming practices among the Plains tribes as "serial, but nonlinear autobiographical acts," we might read such a gesture as evidence of Eastman's debt to traditional identity models.[21]

Yet there seems to be something more drastically disruptive (rather than constitutive) in Eastman's syntactic shifts here, especially when we compare his authorial stance with that taken by Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins (who consistently uses the first person pronoun in her 1883 autobiography, *Life among the Piutes*) or when we take note of other biographical details.[22] Eastman's work in revising the Sioux allotment roles between 1903 and 1909 provides particularly striking evidence that he appreciated the significance of being renamed as a central element in the assimilation process. During this period immediately after the publication of *Indian Boyhood*, working under the supervision of author and Indian activist Hamlin Garland, Eastman renamed close to 25,000 individual Sioux. He describes this labor in *From the Deep Woods to Civilization,* remarking that his responsibilities included "the revision of the Sioux allotment roles, including the determination of family groups, and the assignation of surnames when those were lacking." He goes on to note that "originally, the Indians had no family names," leading to "difficulties and complications in the way of land inheritance, hence my unique commission."[23] The claim that the Sioux lack family names is true from a Western legal perspective, but it overlooks the complex ways in which Siouan languages define kinship relations on a number of levels.[24] Eastman's willingness to engage in the work of renaming on behalf of the federal government and his characterization of that work in his second autobiography highlight the degree to which his experience had taken him

away from the traditions of his youth. In light of such details, the shifting, disjunctive use of pronouns in *Indian Boyhood* seems more suggestive of his commitment to allotment-era legal models of assimilation than to enduring traditional notions of serial identity.

The role that third person point of view plays in suggesting a sense of distance from the Indian past appears even more strikingly in a chapter called "Hakadah's First Offering." Here, more than anywhere else in the book, Eastman works in a particularly literary (one might even say "fictional") narrative mode. Hakadah appears to the reader very much as a character; were one to take this section out of its larger context in the book, it would be impossible to tell that he and Eastman are the same person. In the chapter, the narrator tells the reader that when Hakadah was eight years old, his grandmother insisted that he offer his most prized possession to the Great Mystery as a sacrifice. We are then told that the boy realized that this prized possession was his beloved hunting dog, but he still committed himself, reluctantly, to the sacrifice. The chapter then shifts to a surprising, speculative digression (clearly outside of the autobiographical mode) in which the narrator imagines Hakadah's grandmother nearly relenting in her insistence that the boy sacrifice his beloved pet. (This odd addition to the autobiographical narrative seems addressed primarily to some members of Eastman's middle-class audience, who may have found the entire scene distasteful.) The sacrifice proceeds, though, and the chapter ends with his grandmother praying to the Great Mystery to accept the offering and make Hakadah "a warrior and hunter" as great as his father and grandfather (96). At this moment, the narrative collapses beneath a final irony, for the reader knows that Hakadah will become the physician Charles Eastman and not a great Santee warrior. Eastman's exclusive use of third person narration in the chapter reinforces this ironic sense of discontinuity between his present (adult/civilized) and past (childhood/Indian) selves. The tale offers no hint of a consciousness of serial identity and little even of the nostalgia of a "boy book." In the end, the divide only becomes more clear when we recall Eastman's observation earlier in the book that he had been renamed Ohiyesa during an intertribal lacrosse contest *when he was four years old,* four years before Hakadah's offering is said to have taken place (32). Even bearing in mind the initial serialization of the chapters of *Indian Boyhood,* such a narrative discrepancy suggests an unusually large gap between Eastman's adult self-consciousness and his childhood self.[25]

There are a number of ways to read this inconsistency. One might infer that Eastman's discomfort with the recollection of participating in this sacrificial rite was so great that the vicissitudes of memory entered in and disrupted his sense of chronology. Alternately, one might read this apparent narrative "slip" as an intentional rhetorical strategy, suggestive somehow of the radical discontinuities

of Eastman's life. Whether it was intentional or accidental, though, the impact of the discrepancy remains the same; it further stresses that "Charles Eastman," the adult autobiographical narrator, and "Hakadah," the child protagonist of this part of the autobiographical narrative, have fundamentally different identities.

The phenomenon I have been tracing in Eastman's use of narrative technique can best be explained as an attempt to represent, through language, the legal fiction of a rapidly bridgeable divide between Indian life and civilized life. Eastman's engagement with legal models of identity in *Indian Boyhood* is suggested by much more than pronoun usage alone, though. The dedication appearing opposite the book's title page provides further evidence of his commitment to the telos of allotment law. Repeatedly referring to *the* Indian in the past tense (and thus again blending the collective and personal dimension of the book), the dedication invokes dominant legal assumptions about the historical trajectory of Native identity. Noting that "the North American Indian was the highest type of pagan and uncivilized man," Eastman situates his book as a specific kind of *bequest* to his son. Eastman, the father, is looking back both on his own "Indian boyhood" and on a vanished Indian past from the perspective of his adult (civilized) life. He leaves his own child a form of written knowledge of the way of life now lost to him, for his son "came too late to behold the drama of savage existence." Eastman's language here echoes the cultural mythology of the vanishing Indian, a mythology that had been explicitly integrated into the body of Indian law in Chief Justice John Marshall's opinion in the 1823 case of *Johnson and Graham's Lessee v. William McIntosh.*[26] As a communicative act addressed to Eastman's son, then, the dedication to *Indian Boyhood* seems to acknowledge the child's natural identification with "Indianness," but it also implicitly suggests a historical trajectory to personal and cultural maturation. In framing his autobiographical writing in such a way, Eastman foregrounds the root assumptions inherent in the legal discourse underpinning the reservation system and the allotment policy.

These practices of distancing his present self from his past and suggesting an inevitable and necessary progression beyond Indian boyishness appear in other ways throughout the text, most noticeably in Eastman's manner of rationalizing and demystifying his own experiences of Indian culture. As noted earlier, as a part of his act of self-definition as a civilized Indian, Eastman sets himself up in the book as an interpreter of the Indian to his white audience; he does so, however, with a surprising degree of condescension. In his role as cultural interpreter, one of Eastman's dominant rhetorical modes in *Indian Boyhood* is explanation by analogy. A representative moment finds him describing a midsummer festival by comparing it with a state fair. Admittedly, analogical translation need not always involve condescension or the imposition of cultural hi-

erarchies. Frequently, though, Eastman's interpretive acts impose "rational" models on Indian cultural practices and either explain away their mystery or dismiss them as superstitious relics. In a later chapter, for instance, Eastman recounts a visit to a storyteller, Smoky Day, who utters the following remarkable pronouncement:

> Well, this time I will tell you one of the kind we call myths or fairy stories. They are about men and women who do wonderful things—things that ordinary people cannot do at all. Sometimes they are not exactly human beings, for they partake of the nature of men and beasts, or of men and gods. I tell you this beforehand, so that you may not ask any questions, or be puzzled by the inconsistency of the actors in these old stories. (108)

Considering the centrality of stories and storytelling to the social order and the worldviews of Native American peoples, it seems peculiar to read of a traditional Sioux elder suggesting that his stories are mere fairy tales. Not surprisingly, perhaps, considering the historical moment, Eastman's "translation" shapes the significance of the moment by explaining away its mystery and its spiritual significance—turning sacred discourse, in effect, into mere folklore. Such a gesture both increases the sense of distance between Eastman the author and the subject of his autobiography and suggests his acute awareness of the expectations of his white readers.[27]

Perhaps the most significant example of this pattern of pseudoscientific distancing from traditional Indian life appears in a late chapter, "The End of the Bear Dance." Here Eastman deals with a traditional healing ritual—a telling choice of subject, considering his subsequent medical training and employment by the BIA as a physician (a functionary seen by the Indian Bureau as a key figure in the cultural war against traditionalists on the reservations).[28] He opens by noting that "it was one of the superstitions of the Santee Sioux to treat disease from the standpoint of some animal or inanimate thing" (145). As a whole, the chapter centers around his recollection of a sick friend, Redhorn, whom Eastman retrospectively diagnoses as having had tuberculosis. According to Eastman, Redhorn placed excessive faith in his grandmother, who falsely pretended to be a great "medicine woman" when in fact she merely "conjured" the sick. Eastman characterizes the healing arts taught him by his own beloved grandmother as a form of herbalism; he sets her natural science (the knowledge of the medicinal properties of plants) against Redhorn's grandmother's superstition. The chapter goes on to describe Redhorn's insistence on giving a Bear Dance to cure himself (at his grandmother's urging). Eastman provides only limited details of the proceedings, and his main purpose seems to be to debunk the ritual. When one of the participants fell down, Eastman recalls, the people felt sure that this was a bad omen. Confirming their suspicions, both

Redhorn and the man who fell during the ritual later perished. Eastman gives no clinical explanation for the death of the second, but he does close the chapter noting that "to the people, another Indian superstition had been verified" (152). This phrasing implies that the educated Charles Eastman did not accept the pseudoscience of this Native practice. His reluctance to offer a detailed discussion of the ritual and insistence on criticizing Native culture only add to the sense that this facet of Indianness is a form of childishness that *Dr.* Eastman had left behind.

Interestingly enough, a passage such as the Bear Dance chapter, in which Eastman seems to be playing the role of amateur anthropologist, demonstrates with particular clarity the dominant influence of legal ideology (as opposed to other discursive frameworks) on *Indian Boyhood.* Following H. David Brumble's insights in *American Indian Autobiography,* one might first be inclined to read Eastman's interpretation of the Bear Dance as evidence that evolutionary anthropology, and not law, provided the primary ideological framework for his autobiography.[29] Indeed, most readers would acknowledge that the book's thematic organization (with chapters such as "Games and Sports," "An Indian Sugar Camp," and "A Midsummer Night's Feast") does give it a somewhat ethnographic feel. Nevertheless, the teleological elements we have been observing in the autobiography mark it as more directly engaged with legal, rather than anthropological, discourse. Although Lewis Henry Morgan's evolutionary model of primitive cultures (appearing in his 1851 work *Ancient Society* as well as in his 1871 book *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity*) placed the Indian at a point of development well beneath (and historically behind) that of the civilized white man, evolutionary anthropology did not accept the possibility of rapid or forced cultural change.[30] According to Morgan's classificatory scheme, generations would be required to move the Indian from the state of savage barbarism to that of civilization, and such movement would derive more from internal pressures (or miscegenation) than from external coercion. Consequently, federal policies of forced assimilation (like allotment) were rejected by many evolutionary anthropologists (including Morgan) as being foolishly utopian and unscientific. The notion of an abrupt transition between cultural stages, then, is more properly a legal one—rooted in the contractarian legal fiction regarding the progression from the state of nature to civil society. To the extent that it documents (in terms of both narrative structure and content) its author's transition from his traditional culture to modernity in the span of a few years, then, *Indian Boyhood* embraces a *legal* discourse of the Indian as child. The root assumptions behind Eastman's narrative posture in "The End of the Bear Dance" have a closer resemblance to Locke's *Second Treatise of Government* or a BIA policy document than to Morgan's ethnographic work.

If Eastman's emphasis on the Indian's capacity for rapid cultural develop-

ment is rooted in legal discourse, legal engagement also explains his intimation that such development should be encouraged. In another broad appeal to allotment-era thinking, Eastman provides his readers with subtle suggestions about the desirability of using external pressure to forcefully accelerate progression. In a section titled "Early Hardships" he discusses various sufferings he endured while living on the Plains in the 1860s and offers the following summary remarks on the Indian's way of life:

> Such was the Indian's wild life! When game was to be had and the sun shone they easily forgot the bitter experiences of the winter before. Little preparation was made for the future. They are the children of Nature, and occasionally she whips them with the lashes of experience, yet they are forgetful and careless. Much of their suffering might have been prevented by a little calculation. (15)

Eastman's characterization of his people as thoughtless children provides yet another example of the dissociative mode operative throughout his text. The use of the impersonal *they* in presenting this personal memory adds to the sense of distance, but the elision between past and present tense here is also interesting ("they *are* the children of nature"). With such a gesture, Eastman moves subtly from an autobiographical statement about the suffering he and his own band of Santee Sioux experienced during the 1860s to a broader generalization about present-day reservation Indians. The wild nature of the Indian, the passage argues, is tied to a kind of cultural inefficiency and to a deficient memory, precisely the assumptions buttressing the legal discourse of allotment. The text implies that, in much the same way nature had sought to discipline her children when they roamed the Plains, the austere measures of the law of assimilation would be justifiable on the reservations to prepare Indians to integrate into the modern economic order. As Indian Commissioner Thomas J. Morgan had stated in his 1889 report to Congress, "He [the Indian] is not entitled to be supported in idleness."[31] Eastman's comment about the efficacy of a little "calculation," especially coming in the context of a discussion of the unreliability of game as a food source, reads like a subtle endorsement of the allotment policy's project of aggressively transforming Indians into landholders and farmers.

Not surprisingly, having addressed the need to induce Indian traditionalists to adopt the white man's approach to economic self-sufficiency, Eastman also takes up the issue of means. He does so through a wide-ranging discussion of education that, once again, demonstrates his deep engagement with the legal ideology of his time. The importance of having a national system of Indian education to supplement the allotment policy of forced assimilation had been articulated by the Lake Mohonk Conference (to which Eastman was connected

through friendship with philanthropists like the Woods) as early as its second Annual Meeting in 1884.[32] Indian education, as the attendees of the conference saw it, required industrial, educational (especially language-related), and moral/religious components. Commissioner Morgan's report to the gathering a few years later (in 1889) indicates how thoroughly this educational theory was integrated into the legal discourse of allotment. The government-sponsored system of Indian education over which he presided was theoretically intended to support the property distribution component of the allotment policy in bridging the gap between savage and civilized life. Morgan noted that the education of the Indian involved a "comprehensive system of training and instruction which will convert them into American citizens."[33] The system he discussed was to be universal, completely systematized, and, if necessary, compulsory. Its curriculum would stress both industrial training and "that general literary culture which the experience of the white race has shown to be the very essence of education."[34] English language instruction was paramount. As for the overall intent of the system, Morgan was quite explicit:

> That which is fundamental in all this is the recognition of the complete manhood of the Indians, their individuality, their right to be recognized as citizens of the United States, with the same rights and privileges which we accord to any other class of people. . . . Education should seek the disintegration of the tribes, and not their segregation. They should be educated, not as Indians, but as Americans.[35]

Adulthood (gendered male), individuality, citizenship, and rights all emerge as linked, overlapping categories here. As a whole, Morgan's point that education could and should usher Indians into a kind of civic manhood resonates with the legal ideology of the wild Indian as child. At the same time, it holds out the promise that such education could lead to the end of legal domination, an idea that held great appeal for educated Indian elites like Eastman.

By the time *Indian Boyhood* was published in 1902, Eastman's familiarity with the theoretical and practical aspects of the Indian education system had been broadened well beyond his experiences from his days as a student. His wife and collaborator, Elaine Goodale Eastman, had worked as the superintendent of day schools at Pine Ridge and continued to be actively involved in Indian education. Beyond this, during 1899 and 1900, Eastman worked as the "outing agent" for Colonel Richard Henry Pratt's famous Carlisle Indian School, coordinating a program whereby Indian students lived with white families for a time to further their assimilation into civilized ways. His treatment of the theme of education in *Indian Boyhood* thus reflects an increasingly keen sense of the relationship between education and assimilation during the allotment era. In a chapter called "The Boy Hunter," he opens with the following reflec-

tion: "It will be no exaggeration to say that the life of the Indian hunter was a life of fascination. From the moment he lost sight of his rude home in the midst of the Forest, his untutored mind lost itself in the myriad beauties and forces of nature" (73). The link made among Indian, hunter, and child duplicates key assumptions about Native identity underpinning late-nineteenth-century Indian law. Framing his discussion of his own childhood experiences as a hunter in such terms, Eastman again places a gap between that past self and his current incarnation as a civilized physician, a gap mediated by a legal discourse defining the passage from the state of nature to civil society. The Indian's "natural" state, at the same time, is interpreted broadly through the lens of Lockean sensationalism (which had provided the philosophical foundation for assimilationist policies of educational conditioning since the revolutionary era).[36] The passage characterizes the childlike Indian as one who remains caught in passive responsiveness to sense impressions (as soon as he enters the forest he is "fascinated" and loses himself in the immediacy of nature), having failed to progress to the more mature mode of active reflection. Though there is a mild sort of romantic appeal here regarding some form of immediate experience, Eastman's use of terms suggests the importance of being "tutored" (a keyword used frequently in the history of missionary education among Native peoples). The idyll must come to an end, and, thus, some form of education would seem to be in order to help the "untutored mind."

Eastman addresses the link between education and assimilation even more directly in a chapter called "An Indian Boy's Training." He opens that chapter again acting as cross-cultural interpreter, with a pointed statement that Indian custom was indeed a form of systematic education. Through these traditional practices, young Ohiyesa learns about his people's cosmology and his immediate family and kinship groups.[37] Here Eastman evinces a more appreciative sense of his past than in the sections dealing with traditional healing practices, but his point is not only to present precontact Indian culture to his readers in a positive light. He also stresses the Indians' capacity both to learn and to change in order to challenge the notion of an essential, static Indian self. Eastman notes: "It seems to be a popular idea that all the characteristic skill of the Indian is instinctive and hereditary. This is a mistake. *All the stoicism and patience of the Indian are acquired traits,* and continual practice alone makes him master of the art of woodcraft" (43, emphasis added). If all "Indian" characteristics are learned, though, a key implication of this comment, in the overall context of this book, is that they could be unlearned and that "civilized" practices could come to replace them. From such a perspective, the issue of identity formation becomes one of evaluating and internalizing models and ways of life. Eastman's emphasis on the adaptability of the Indian reassures his white readers about the potential for assimilation.

In light of Eastman's quasi-Lockean comments about education, it is striking to note how much of *Indian Boyhood* suggests the value of impressing onto the Indian-child the models of self encoded in the white man's law. In many respects, the opening lines of the book encapsulate the overall thrust of the narrative, building on dissociative language to invoke the assimilationist assumptions that Indians can, and should, change their identity. Here again, the conventions of the boy book provide Eastman with his starting point:

> What boy would not be an Indian for a while when he thinks of the freest life in the world? This life was mine. Every day there was a real hunt. There was real game. Occasionally there was a medicine dance away off in the woods where no one would disturb us, in which the boys impersonated their elders, Brave Bull, Standing Elk, High Hawk, and Medicine Bear, and the rest. They painted and imitated their fathers and grandfathers to the minutest detail, and accurately too, because they had seen the real thing all of their lives. (3)

Linking the Indian way of life with boyish pleasure, Eastman reiterates that Native American identity is a stage in the progression from childhood to adulthood (the phrase "for a while" looms large). While doing so, he also stresses the importance of the universal, childish affinity for acting and role-playing in the process of identity formation. Describing his recollection of Indian boys "impersonating" their elders, Eastman suggests that, as with any child, his process of becoming fully a part of his culture involved a kind of mimicry of others. If an Indian boy like him grew into an Indian man primarily by "impersonation," though, the door is likewise opened for such a boy to assume new masks once exposed to other models of self. There is a bit of the primitivism of the "boy book" at work here, of course; Eastman appeals to his white audience by painting Indian life as a sort of pleasurable idyll for a civilized child.[38] At the same time, though, his representation of the Indian's playful capacity for learning counters any tendency toward essentialist arguments about the "nature" of the Indian, arguments that could be used to consign Native peoples to inevitable extinction.

In this context, it is instructive to juxtapose a pair of related observations that Eastman makes elsewhere in the book. He notes both that "the Indian Youth was a born hunter" (73) and that "Indians are born imitators" (59). The first comment, taken from the section cited earlier in which Eastman describes the "fascination" that nature held for Indians, stresses how an Indian boy's birth initially ties his identity to a specific anterior stage of cultural development—the state of nature predating contractarian society. The second statement works in a slightly different register. It relates more directly to Eastman's assumptions about education and acculturation, reinforcing the environmen-

talist idea that an Indian's identity, like that of any child, is a function of imitation and modeling, not essence. Overall, *Indian Boyhood* presents an image of the Native American (especially the young) as extraordinarily malleable and impressionable (in the Lockean sense). Thus, while Eastman's recollections of the many ways in which figures like his Grandmother Uncheedah, his Uncle Mysterious Medicine, and the storyteller Smoky Day impressed on him a sense of self can be read as positive treatments of Native life, they also cut in another direction, suggesting both the past tense nature of traditional Indian life and the ability of Indians to rapidly learn new ways of living. It is instructive that, as evidence of his skill as a child "mimic," Eastman describes playing not only "medicine dance" but also "white man" (59). "We painted two or three of our number with white clay," he recalls, but he also notes that he and his playmates quickly focused in on imitating the commercial practices of the "white shirts." He informs the readers that the "merchandise consisted of sand for sugar, wild beans for coffee, dried leaves for tea, pulverized earth for gun-powder, pebbles for bullets and clear water for 'spirit water.' We traded for these goods with skins of squirrels, rabbits, and small birds" (60). Equally able to learn the ways of modern and traditional life, Eastman's Indian boy emerges from such scenes as a paragon of adaptability.

In the end, what may be most striking about *Indian Boyhood* to modern readers is the fact that Eastman offers little apparent challenge to the dominant colonialist discourse of his time. I would suggest, though, that his acceptance of the legal model of the Indian as child in the text is understandable, in terms of both his unusual biography and the pressures of his position as a cultural mediator. If Eastman gives his readers back a reassuring portrait of the white man's Indian, he does so in part because that was the public life he had come to lead. Educated in white schools, married (happily for a time) to a patrician reformer from New England, and praised as an example of the Indian's capacity for achievement, Eastman defined himself through the lens of allotment-era legal discourse, at least in the early years of his career. Writing an autobiography dominated by the legal model of the Indian provided him with a way of reinforcing this public persona. At the same time, Eastman seems to have recognized the limits of white charity and benevolence and thus to have seen the need to establish himself as a national voice if he hoped to be an effective advocate for Indian interests. Having learned firsthand the difficulties faced by even an "exemplary" Indian in directly and aggressively challenging the Indian bureaucracy, Eastman divined the importance of making the right kind of appeal to white America. For a Native American leader at the turn of the century, this often meant assuming one's status as a "ward," or cultural child, who desired the support needed for a successful transition into modern life.

Still, in offering white readers an image of Indian life congruent with their

understanding of childhood, Eastman was not merely capitulating to colonial power. To the extent that he was able to bring a picture of America's Indian "children" into the public consciousness, Eastman opened up the possibility of tapping into legal structures beyond the discourse of allotment. By the late nineteenth century, discussions of the responsibilities of the government to its Indian wards could sound at times remarkably like the changing discourse of custody law. At that time, the custodial powers of fathers began to be seen not simply as a form of property right inviolably vested in a biological father but, rather, as a kind of trust linked to his responsibility as a guardian. Family law in the nineteenth century thus opened up a greater degree of judicial discretion, as "fatherhood" in particular was redefined as a transferable form of trusteeship, regulated under law. Native Americans occupied, not surprisingly, a sort of ambiguous middle ground in this legal landscape. On the one hand, the government's restrictions of Indian sovereignty seemed an embodiment of earlier notions of absolute paternal authority over, and "ownership" of, the child. At the same time, the legal culture's emphasis on parental authority as a form of trusteeship subject to public oversight (a view similar to that taken by benevolent eastern reformers with regard to Indian policy) theoretically circumscribed such authority under the rubric of the "best interests of the child."[39] Even as other legal avenues were closing for Native Americans, this broad shift in thinking about the legal status of children opened up the possibility that the courts (and the court of public opinion) might be used as venues for making claims. Admittedly, Native Americans won few legal battles during this period. Nevertheless, many members of the national intellectual elite, like Eastman, recognized that the struggles of the foreseeable future would be legal ones in which Native peoples would have little opportunity to *demand* rights or restitution.[40] Calling for equitable trusteeship became, for some, the most viable form of resistance. In this respect, being "Indian for a while" provided Eastman with the rhetorical and political foundation to make appeals to white America.

Within a few years of the publication of *Indian Boyhood,* Eastman began writing works reflecting both a gradual shift in his articulation of his own "Indianness" and the beginning of a more complicated form of legal consciousness. The Eastman whom readers encounter in the pages of *From the Deep Woods to Civilization* (1916) and *The Soul of the Indian* (1911), for example, had emerged somewhat from the shadow of legal paternalism to articulate a more critical view of America.[41] In the closing paragraph of *From the Deep Woods to Civilization,* he defines himself simultaneously as an "Indian" and an "American" individual, a position that enables him to challenge and qualify certain assumptions about modern life. "I am an Indian," he writes, "and while I have learned much from civilization, for which I am grateful, I have never lost my

Indian sense of right and justice. I am for development and progress along social and spiritual lines, rather than those of commerce, nationalism, or material efficiency. Nevertheless, so long as I live, I am an American."[42] Eastman's effort here to redefine the ideology of assimilation and assert that certain "Indian" values are, in fact, closer to the essence of the American myth of progress reflects a later stage in the process of legal engagement that dominated his adult life.[43] In time, Eastman became a forceful and influential advocate for Native American rights. It was, however, the reputation and audience he built by becoming the model Indian-child that provided the necessary foundation for such subsequent acts of mediation and self-definition.

NOTES

1. Charles A. Eastman, *Indian Boyhood* (New York: Dover Publications, 1971 [1902]). Page numbers for quotes from the autobiography have been cited parenthetically in the text.

2. For an overview of the conflict with Brown, see Raymond Wilson, *Ohiyesa: Charles Eastman, Santee Sioux* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1983), 67–81. Eastman provides his own version of events in his second autobiography in a chapter called "War with the Politicians." See Charles A. Eastman, *From the Deep Woods to Civilization*, introduction by Raymond Wilson (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977 [1916]), 116–35.

3. I use the term *Indian law* as it is defined in Felix S. Cohen's seminal *Handbook of Federal Indian Law.* Cohen and his modern editors note that the term "refers to the body of jurisprudence created by treaties, statutes, executive orders, court decisions, and administrative action defining and implementing the relationship among the United States, Indian tribes and individuals, and the states" (see Rennard Strickland et al., *Felix S. Cohen's Handbook of Federal Indian Law* [Charlottesville: The Michie Company, 1982], 1).

4. Eastman's wife, Elaine Goodale Eastman (who had her own history of political and legal activism on behalf of Native Americans and who had been a successful writer of poetic juvenilia), greatly influenced his decision to commence a writing career. Seething at the treatment they had received at the hands of the BIA (reflected in the publicity campaign she waged on their behalf in papers ranging from *The New York Post* to the *Omaha Daily Bee*), Elaine actively encouraged her husband to try to publish the thoughts and reflections that he was beginning to pen, with her editorial assistance. Wilson, *Ohiyesa,* 73, 131. See also Elaine Goodale Eastman, *Sister to the Sioux* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978).

5. For an excellent biographical sketch of Eastman, focusing on his role as a mediator, see Frances Karttunen, *Between Worlds: Interpreters, Guides, and Survivors* (New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 135–64.

6. On the dedication page for *Indian Boyhood,* Eastman characterizes the text as "the imperfect record of my boyish impressions and experiences up to the age of fifteen years." Elaine Goodale Eastman's foreword to his *From the Deep Woods to Civilization* also describes the earlier work as one that "pictures the first of three distinct periods in the life of the writer of this book" (xvi).

7. Similar to the work of earlier Indian authors, like Samson Occom and William Apess, Eastman's text highlights the signal importance of engagement with the discourse of Indian law within the tradition of Native American autobiographical writing.

8. The most general treatments of Foucault's ideas regarding the relationship among the "will to truth," institutional structures, and power appear in Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language,* trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972).

9. For a discussion of the ways in which some of Eastman's contemporaries responded to the allotment policy and its assimilationist assumptions, see Carol Batker, "'Overcoming All Obstacles': The Assimilation Debate in Native American Women's Journalism of the Dawes Era," in *Early Native American Writing: New Critical Essays,* ed. Helen Jaskoski (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 190–203. Batker argues that writers such as Lucy Hunter (Winnebago) and Zitkala-Ša (Sioux) "accepted integrationist policy and at the same time developed a rhetoric of Native rights that assumed a separate Indian identity" ("'Overcoming All Obstacles,'" 191). Regrettably, Batker offers only a brief account of this new pan-Indian rights consciousness. The nuances of the discourse of Native American "rights" developed in the wake of allotment, a discourse grounded in what postcolonial critics would call a "hybrid" model of Indian identity, deserves greater scholarly attention.

10. See Wilson, *Ohiyesa,* 33.

11. See Charles A. Eastman, "The Indian as Citizen," *Lippincott's Magazine* (January 1915): 70–76. Combined with a number of other journalistic pieces, this article also appears in Charles A. Eastman, *The Indian To-day: The Past and Future of the First American* (New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1915).

12. Eastman, "The Indian as Citizen," 70.

13. Eastman, "The Indian as Citizen," 72, emphasis added.

14. Eastman, "The Indian as Citizen," 72.

15. See H. David Brumble III, *American Indian Autobiography* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988).

16. Three of Zitkala-Ša's autobiographical sketches ("Impressions of an Indian Childhood," "The School Days of an Indian Girl," and "An Indian Teacher among Indians"), subsequently combined with other texts and published in 1921 in the volume *American Indian Stories,* were first published in the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1900. LaFlesche's account of his experiences as a student at the Presbyterian mission school on the Omaha Reservation in Nebraska was also published in 1900. See Zitkala-Ša, *American Indian Stories,* foreword by Dexter Fisher (Lincoln: University of Nebraska

Press, 1985 [1921]); and Francis LaFlesche, *The Middle Five: Indian Schoolboys of the Omaha Tribe* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963 [1900]).

17. Marcia Jacobson, *Being a Boy Again: Autobiography and the American Boy Book* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1994), 13.

18. Hertha Dawn Wong, *Sending My Heart Back across the Years: Tradition and Innovation in Native American Autobiography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 19. See also Arnold Krupat, *Ethnocriticism: Ethnography, History, Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

19. See Philippe Lejeune, *On Autobiography,* trans. Katherine Leary (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989), 3–30.

20. In his essay "The Nature of Pronouns," Benveniste emphasizes the "pragmatic," or performative, nature of pronouns, which, rather than referring to objective subject positions, actually produce such subject positions in the context of intersubjective communication. Autobiography, considered in this linguistic framework, is the act of representing the self by entering into a kind of conversation with the past, through the act of memory. This "intersubjective" relation between present and past self is realized through the medium of language and the act of narration. See Emile Benveniste, *Problems in General Linguistics,* trans. Mary Elizabeth Meek (Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1971), 217–22.

21. Wong, *Sending My Heart Back across the Years,* 43–44.

22. See Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins, *Life among the Piutes: Their Wrongs and Claims* (Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press, 1994 [1883]).

23. Eastman, *From the Deep Woods to Civilization,* 182. For a more critical Indian perspective on the impact of allotment on Sioux families, see Ella Deloria, *Speaking of Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998 [1944]), 86–98.

24. On this topic, see Raymond DeMallie, "Kinship and Biology in Sioux Culture," in *North American Indian Anthropology: Essays on Society and Culture,* ed. Raymond J. DeMallie and Alfonso Ortiz (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994), 125–46.

25. Even the Christian conversion narrative, which posits an essential break between the sinful self before redemption and the awakened self, tends to allow for a closer connection between past and present consciousness that Eastman does.

26. In his opinion, Marshall notes that "the tribes of Indians inhabiting the country were fierce savages. . . . To leave them in possession of their country was to leave the country a wilderness; to govern them as a distinct people, was impossible" (quoted in Francis Paul Prucha, *Documents of United States Indian Policy,* 2d ed. [Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990], 36–37).

27. It is worth noting that in other early writings Eastman shows a willingness to strike a different rhetorical balance in his acts of cultural translation. For example, in his 1895 essay "The Sioux Mythology," while characterizing "these people" (another act of distancing) as "uncivilized" and "untutored," Eastman nevertheless goes out of his way to foreground the rationality of traditional Sioux religion. "The human mind," he

writes, "equipped with all its faculties, is capable even in an uncultured state of a logical process of reasoning" (88). The "nature worship" of the Indian, in this respect, is a rational way of conceiving the relation between God and man, through analogy. Eastman's discussion of the "advent" of the white man (which, he notes, disabused the Sioux of the notion that the earth was flat and "suspended in a dark space") clearly shows his commitment to assimilation and "progress." However, this essay's more aggressive advocacy of traditional Sioux cultural practices only serves to highlight the comparative reticence of *Indian Boyhood.* See Charles A. Eastman, "The Sioux Mythology," *Popular Science Monthly* (November 1894—April 1895): 88–91.

28. On the role of the agency physicians in opposing traditional "medicine men," see Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Policy in Crisis: Christian Reformers and the Indian, 1865–1900* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976), 193–226.

29. Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography,* 147–64.

30. For a general overview of Morgan's ethnological theories and his attitudes about the proper pace of assimilation, see Robert E. Beider, *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820–1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986), 194–246.

31. Quoted in Prucha, *Documents of United States Indian Policy,* 177.

32. The Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian was a loose-knit group of reformers interested in Indian affairs who met at Lake Mohonk NY from 1883 to 1916. The conferences were extremely influential in the formulation of federal Indian policy during those years. Eastman knew many of the members of the organization well and addressed the group on numerous occasions.

33. Quoted in Prucha, *Documents of United States Indian Policy,* 178.

34. Quoted in Prucha, *Documents of United States Indian Policy,* 179.

35. Quoted in Prucha, *Documents of United States Indian Policy,* 179–80.

36. Beginning in the eighteenth century, Locke's notions that the natural mind is a "tabula rasa" and that knowledge is a product of sensory experience buttressed a range of environmentalist theories explaining racial differences. A key corollary of Locke's epistemology is the idea that individuals may be molded by various kinds of training and education. This proved an influential premise in revolutionary and postrevolutionary theories about education and cultural assimilation. On the general importance of Locke and environmentalism in early national Indian policy, see Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1973).

37. For helpful insight into this general process of cultural education, provided by another well-known Sioux mediator, see Ella Deloria, *Speaking of Indians,* 24–74.

38. The opening of the book thus unquestionably allows non-Indian readers to experience safely the pleasures of what Philip Deloria calls "playing Indian," an act of cross-cultural mimicry whose particular significance varied historically but which generally has been tied to the need of white Americans to buttress their sense of identity

by appropriating "Indianness." In the period during which Eastman was writing, Deloria describes the act of "playing Indian" in the proliferation of "back to nature" organizations (like the Boy Scouts), which are rooted in a range of anxieties about modernity. Eastman, it should be noted, was involved later in his life in the Boy Scout movement and contributed pieces to *Boy's Life* magazine. See Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

39. See Michael Grossberg, *Governing the Hearth: Law and the Family in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 234–307.

40. The Supreme Court's decision in *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock* (1903) established Congress's "plenary power" to abrogate treaty stipulations through statutes. This decision undermined the strongest remaining legal basis by which Native tribes could counter white encroachment on their territorial and cultural sovereignty.

41. Charles A. Eastman, *The Soul of the Indian: An Interpretation* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980 [1911]).

42. Eastman, *From the Deep Woods to Civilization,* 195.

43. For a good discussion of Eastman's ability to get beyond the binary formulations of his earlier work, see Erik Peterson, "An Indian, An American: Ethnicity, Assimilation and Balance in Charles Eastman's *From the Deep Woods to Civilization,*" *SAIL* (summer/fall 1992): 145–60.