The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era **14** (2015), 503–511
doi:10.1017/S1537781415000316

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781415000316 Published online by Cambridge University Press

FORUM: INDIGENOUS HISTORIES OF THE GILDED AGE AND PROGRESSIVE ERA

Boyd Cothran and C. Joseph Genetin-Pilawa

AN INTRODUCTION

Why do "they" continue to ignore "us"? This was a question raised during a series of conversations we had with colleagues working in the fields of Indigenous studies and nineteenth- and twentieth-century American history about the place of Indigenous history in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era's historiography. We whined. We kvetched. It was neither very pretty nor articulate at first. We had a sense that much of the most innovative and transformative works in the interdisciplinary field of Indigenous studies were coming out of the postbellum period, but also that few historians were paying attention. Despite the significance that Indigenous studies scholars place on the period between the Civil War and the 1920s—a period of tremendous violence perpetrated on Indigenous communities, of systematic land theft and other assaults on sovereignty, of boarding schools, illegal usurpations, and damaging cultural representations that advanced and ossified racialized ideologies—Native history has remained peripheral to academic journals such as the *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* and to survey textbooks, whose coverage of the period typically focus on non-Indigenous political and social history.[1]

Of course, we were asking the wrong question. One shouldn't complain about being ignored by a conversation that one is not actively participating in. Tokenism, moreover, was not our goal. Nor was our goal to claim a larger slice of pertinent textbook chapters. Instead, we wanted to show how Native history allows us to ask new and exciting questions about many of the central issues and themes of the era, and offers the possibly of posing new questions about the continuing relevance of the era today. We also wanted to show how the major themes that historians of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era have been wrestling with for decades should inform the work of critical Indigenous studies. We didn't want a dressing down but a conversation starter. We needed to ask better questions—both to ourselves and to other historians of the period.

We began by organizing a roundtable at the 2014 meeting of the Organization of American Historians in Atlanta to discuss the question: how does the study of Indigenous histories in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era reshape American historiography? Our premise was that over the last thirty years, scholars of the early colonial era and the Early Republic have thoroughly demonstrated why historians must consider Native experiences in constructing broader interpretations and narratives. From its humble beginnings

Boyd Cothran, York University; email: cothran@yorku.ca. C. Joseph Genetin-Pilawa, George Mason University; email: cgenetin@gmu.edu

© *Society for Historians of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*

in the 1970s and 1980s—with the so-called New Indian History—to the proliferation of Middle Grounds in the 1990s to the maturation of the field in the late 1990s and early 2000s—with the publications of books such as Jean O'Brien's *Dispossession by Degrees*, Susan Sleeper-Smith's *Indian Women and French Men*, and James Brooks's *Captives and Cousins*—to recent works such as Anne Hyde's *Empires, Nations, and Families*; Michael Witgen's *An Infinity of Nations*; Pekka Hämäläinen's *The Comanche Empire*; and Claudio Saunt's *West of the Revolution*, which have widened our analytical lenses for the pre-Civil War eras, the impact of Indigenous historical scholarship on the historiography of these periods has been enormous.[2] It is no longer possible to write or think of early colonial North American history or the history of the Early Republic and antebellum periods without taking seriously the political, economic, intellectual, and cultural contributions and influences of Indigenous people and societies. But in the midst of this historiographical rediscovery of the importance of Indigenous history to American history, scholars studying Native histories in the post-Civil War period have struggled to bring similar arguments to bear on broader themes in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. Each of the papers in our roundtable presented an argument for how scholars focusing on Indigenous experiences in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era might establish the centrality of these histories within larger narratives of U.S. development. And in this forum, we share some of them.

Our central contention is that thinking with Indigenous history pushes historians of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era and of Native America to ask new questions, think differently about old questions, and imagine alternate narratives. It is also our contention that scholars working in both fields would benefit from a more sustained engagement with the broader themes, arguments, debates, and methodologies of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era's historiography and of the interdisciplinary field of critical Indigenous studies. It is time to bring the two fields together to enrich both.

A brief sketch of Indigenous history across the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries may be helpful: During the antebellum period, Indigenous nations faced an expansionist American empire whose vision for the future held little space for Indigenous peoples. Removal and segregation characterized the federal government's policy. By the mid-nineteenth century, however, with their visions for continental empire seemingly inevitable following the territorial gains from Mexico, U.S.-Indian policy began to shift. In 1849 Congress transferred the Office of Indian Affairs (OIA), which had originally been part of the War Department, to the Department of the Interior. Following the Civil War, and motivated by the transformative potential of the era, reformers working with Indigenous communities began to optimistically imagine the OIA as a branch of the federal government capable of transformative change. In the late 1860s, under the administration of President Ulysses S. Grant, the OIA began instituting a set of programs collectively known as the Peace Policy. Designed to minimize conflict in the Great Plains and Far West, Grant's Peace Policy sought to provide opportunities for Native inclusion and assimilation. Almost simultaneously, however, postwar Americans' continuing desire for imperial incorporation limited the effectiveness of these programs as the government facilitated the spread of settlers west. This desire for a consolidated, continental empire would not be laid aside. And what followed was a period of some of the most intense violence in the history of U.S.-Indian relations. Indeed, conflicts such as the so-called Great Sioux War, Red Cloud's War, and the Modoc War, among many others,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781415000316 Published online by Cambridge University Press

punctuated the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. Despite the lofty goals of reformers, the violent consolidation of an American empire in the West, a process begun before the Civil War and that indeed had precipitated that conflict, persisted throughout the war years and beyond.

Hampered by the era's violence, the assimilationist goals of many reformers persisted nonetheless. In the 1880s, having militarily suppressed the majority of Indigenous peoples in the American West, United States policy makers, aided by newly professionalizing anthropologists and other social scientists, moved to hasten Native assimilation. They developed a policy known as allotment, through which communally held reservation lands were divided into single-family plots, in order to instill Euro-American gender norms and market-driven production and consumption. Once the reservations were fully allotted, the remaining territory would revert to public lands and be opened for non-Native settlement. At the same time, territorial expansion west continued across the Pacific as well. In the 1890s, American sugar planters with the help of the United States military and Congress first conquered and then annexed the islands comprising Hawai'i. Native Hawaiians, however, actively and vigorously resisted these impingements upon their sovereignty, as the work of Noenoe Silva and others have recently demonstrated.[3] Finally, to make matters worse, alongside the federal government's allotment and territorial expansionist policy, the OIA created other oftentimes coercive assimilationist policies, such as mandatory boarding schools for Indian children. These policies remained in effect throughout the Gilded Age and Progressive Era.

The years between the end of the Civil War and the New Deal, then, have long been considered by historians to be the nadir of the Indigenous experience in the United States. But in recent decades, Indigenous scholars have returned again and again to the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, rewriting our understanding of the period. Indeed, through the work of Fredrick Hoxie, Philip Deloria, and many others, we now know that the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was also a period of surprising diversity, survival, adaptation, resistance, and innovation.[4] For instance, in the 1910s, the generation of Native children who came of age in the boarding schools at the end of the nineteenth century banded together to form pan-Indian movements such as the Society of American Indians. These Indigenous-led organizations protested the federal treatment of Native communities and advocated for social, political, and economic development, as well as religious freedom for tribes. Thousands of Native men and women, moreover, served in World War I. And in part as recognition of that service, Congress enacted the Indian Citizenship Act in 1924. Many welcomed this expansion of the definition of citizenship, though not all Native people supported it. The 1920s also witnessed yet another reformulation of federal Indian policy. After a half century of experimentation, it had become clear that the allotment program was hugely detrimental to tribal communities. The 1928 Meriam Report, an investigation into Indian affairs by the federal government and the Brookings Institute, concluded that the program had failed miserably. Documenting the dire health and mortality statistics as well as the economic reality of reservation life, the Meriam Report's conclusions were clear: assimilationism had not improved the lives of Indigenous peoples as a whole. In the wake of the Meriam Report, a new generation of reformers, many of the same men and women who would serve Franklin Roosevelt in New Deal policy administration, rallied together to push through the Wheeler-Howard Act (known popularly as the Indian New Deal) that overturned

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781415000316 Published online by Cambridge University Press

allotment and put in its place a mechanism by which Native communities could approve a boilerplate constitution to protect some aspects of tribal sovereignty. Much like the Indian Citizenship Act, Wheeler-Howard was controversial, and many communities refused to ratify the OIA's constitutions. But a new era of Indigenous self-determination had dawned.

Indigenous histories of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era are complex and intersect with many of the major historiographical themes of the period. And while a number of influential studies over the past few decades have reshaped how Indigenous studies approach the era, their mark on the broader field of Gilded Age and Progressive Era historiography is harder to discern.[5] The questions this forum poses are centered on a series of keywords—important Gilded Age and Progressive Era themes—as a way to point toward a more productive scholarly discourse. These keywords are Periodization, Settler Colonialism, Citizenship, Welfare, Race, and Performance and Representation.

Periodization. The question of periodization in Gilded Age and Progressive Era scholarship remains important and vibrant, just as it does in studies of Indigenous histories, too.[6] When does the Indigenous Gilded Age and Progressive Era begin? When does it end? While some Indigenous studies scholars have recently questioned the importance of the Civil War as a turning point in Indigenous history, this forum suggests that major new themes do emerge out of the war to shape and change the nation, often affecting Indigenous people first. And this initially took the form of a debate over the nature and meaning of the state and the proper relationship between the individual and the state. Indeed, in the aftermath of the Civil War, several discrete but intertwined debates took place over the role and nature of the state and the federal government's obligations to it citizens and wards around the future place of Indians in the soon-to-be reconstructed nation. Even before the war ended, Indian policy reformers, those who would influence the creation of organizations such as the National Indian Defense Association and the Indian Rights Association (both founded in the 1880s) began to fight bitterly over the path that federal policy should take. These debates have long been treated as peripheral to the central narrative of state development during the Gilded Age. But as C. Joseph Genetin-Pilawa argues in this forum, the OIA provided an important meeting place for debates over how interventionist the state should be and the role of public and private policy innovations in the late nineteenth century.

Settler Colonialism. If the OIA provided a laboratory for social policy, it rarely acknowledged the importance of Indigenous sovereignty to debates over citizenship and inclusion within the nation-state. Was the newly emerging state of the postbellum period—one that viewed Reconstruction as a political reunion based solely upon formal political equality and inclusion rather than economic independence and self-determination—really just an extension of American colonialism? Was the Indigenous Gilded Age merely the continuation of American wars of empire against Indigenous peoples? How are the experiences of Indigenous people in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era related to the larger historiography of American imperialism? Shouldn't it be essential to think about the American turn to an overseas empire within the context of a continuing settler colonial state at home? And, importantly, was the fledgling welfare state an agent of colonialism?

"Colonialism" and "colonization" are words often employed in Indigenous history; sometimes others adopt them without clear definitions. So what do we mean? We use

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781415000316 Published online by Cambridge University Press

colonization to mean the expansion, establishment, and exploitation of colonies. Colonization often led to various processes of colonialism, which relied upon epidemic diseases, ecological devastation, social upheaval, systemic violence, and exploitive labor practices, and allowed European and North American settler nations to develop ideological and intellectual formations such as the doctrine of discovery that legitimated their claims to sovereignty over property owned, used, and governed by Indigenous nations. As a result, by the mid-nineteenth century most North American Indigenous communities were engulfed in a particular processes of colonialism known as "settler colonialism," by which we mean a specific colonial formation involving the elimination of Native populations; the large-scale immigration of settler populations; and the imposition of settler social and cultural conventions, governmental and legal structures, and economic systems of relations.[7] Settler Colonialism, moreover, is an ongoing process in North America today, one that, as Boyd Cothran highlights in his contribution to this forum, continues to structure not only American collective memory of the Indigenous experience during this era but also American understandings of the violence of imperialism at home and aboard more generally. Framing the periods in terms of settler colonialism is an important contribution that Native history can make to the historiography of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era.

Citizenship. Naming the United States a settler colonial society allows us to think about the relationship between the individual and the state in different ways. In the nineteenth century, citizenship demarcated who could participate in the making of the nation's laws and institutions. Throughout the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, many Americans used the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to expand this notion of citizenship. But while political participation remained limited and circumscribed, claims to "social citizenship," or the right to belong to a national community in which a citizen was guaranteed security and economic welfare, began to emerge. We can see this emergence in institutions such as veteran's benefits and mother's pensions, but would these rights extend to Indigenous wards of the state? And more importantly, if they did, what curtailments of Indigenous sovereignty would they demand? Could citizenship in the settler nation and Indigenous sovereignty coexist? Would citizenship act as a force of liberation for Indigenous peoples? Using the Great Fire of 1918 in the Western Great Lakes, Chantal Norrgard explores the uses of claims to social citizenship in the Progressive Era as she examines the distribution of resources and aid in the disaster's aftermath as well as the tangled legal process it produced.

Welfare State. Debates over the limits of the state's obligation to its citizens were not limited to the aftermath of natural disasters. Indeed, as Cathleen Cahill demonstrates, they came to dominate debates over civil employee pension reform. While many argued that faithful civil servants deserved to retire—a minimal guarantee—others questioned the efficacy and fairness of taxing private employers to fund government largess. In the midst of these debates were the livelihoods of thousands of Indigenous employees of the U.S. Indian Service. Looking anew at the story of social welfare through the lens of the OIA and its employees, Cahill reveals the contradictory nature of Progressive Era reform, including the ways it reinforced the racialist underpinning of American society. Thinking about the welfare state as an agent of colonialism is a helpful contribution that Native History can make to an already rich and ongoing project of exposing the contradictions inherent in Progressive Era reforms while enriching our larger understanding of the era and its institutions.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781415000316 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781415000316 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Race. The meaning, making, and remaking of race in America is one of the richest themes of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era's historiography. From debates over the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth amendments and the goals of Reconstruction and its "unfinished revolution" to the experiences of migrants and the passage of racialized immigration restriction to the development of eugenic ideas and legislation, race has proven a central concept in understanding the period. Perhaps above all others, race and the formation of social institutions such as Jim Crow segregation loom large within the Gilded Age and Progressive Era historiography.[8] This story is often understood in terms of blackness and whiteness with blackness being constructed in opposition to competing claims to whiteness. But what happens when we consider the ways that these tensions were more complicated than a simple racial binary leads us to believe? What happens when we consider Indianness alongside blackness and whiteness as all part of the making of race in America during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era? In her contribution, Malinda Maynor Lowery seeks to reshape, as she puts it, "a master narrative of American history that traces a story from slavery to freedom to inclusion and citizenship." To do this, she explores the shifting racial categories and labels applied to three Lumbee Indians accused of murdering a white man in Montgomery County, Georgia. She concludes that while segregation was a "one-size-fits-all" solution in theory, in practice it emerged from small places with differing histories and local cultures and knowledge. By focusing on the ways the accused murderers employed blackface, she draws together racial and cultural history and connects her case study with the histories of minstrelsy and vaudeville. A consideration of the role Indigenous history played in the story of race in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, then, seems to unsettle the central racial binary of the era in surprising and generative ways.

Performance and Representation. The evolving culture industries of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era bring together many of the themes of this forum and the interventions it seeks to make. For instance, John Troutman, in his essay, expands the story of race and cultural history that Lowery tells by examining histories of representation and performance beyond the nation's borders. Historians of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era have done a considerable work tracing the development of distinctly American cultural forms and institutions such as vaudeville, traveling medicine shows, circuses and so-called freak shows, exhibitionist sport entertainment, traveling Indian shows, and the lyceum to name a few.[9] But, by looking at Native Hawaiian performers, Troutman demonstrates how they not only confronted modernity, but disseminated new musical technology in the form of the steel guitar through an Indigenous musical tradition. Following the social networks that these performers developed on the vaudeville circuit, Troutman shows how they remade modern music and how the culture industries of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era provided Indigenous people a culturally generative as well as politically and socially significant space.

Performance and cultural representation moved beyond music and stage shows during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. And Boyd Cothran's essay demonstrates the enduring legacies of physical U.S.-Indigenous violence, suggesting that the cultural persistence of such events has provided a prism through which to view episodes of ongoing U.S. global imperialism. By surveying memorial practices in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era and then comparing the legal and cultural aftermath of the Modoc War (1872–73) with the killing of Osama bin Laden, subsequent code name controversy,

and the "torture memos" drafted by Deputy Assistant Attorney General John Yoo, Cothran asserts that the Indian Wars of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era created a narrative of American innocence and redemptive violence that continues today.

All of these contributions could stand alone. Many are rehearsed in much greater detail in book-length monographs.[10] But taken together they seek to present a sustained call for us to consider more thoroughly the importance of Indigenous history to our understanding of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. We've each taken a different tack. Some of the essays are more focused arguments on specific issues or themes. Others provide greater historiographical overviews of broad themes. The end result of this mosaic approach is a varied, engaging, thought provoking, and, we hope, convincing case for the importance of conversations between Indigenous history and the history of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. We didn't set out to answer all the questions we asked, but we hope that by doing the asking we are opening up a path to productive discussions and collaborations.

Let the conversation begin.

NOTES

[1]There are two notable exceptions to this statement. The first was a special issue organized by former editor Alan Lessoff from three independent article submissions in 2010. The essays, by Michelle Patterson, Katherine Osburn, and Angela Firkus, were organized loosely around the theme of "Indian Policy in the Progressive Era," and the issue had commentary by Sherry Smith. The second was the publication, in January 2015, of Philip Deloria's Distinguished Scholar Address on Native citizenship and the Society of American Indians. See *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 9:4 (Oct. 2010); and Philip Deloria, "American Master Narratives and the Problem of Indian Citizenship in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era," *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 14:1 (Jan. 2015): 3–12.

[2]"New Indian History" emerged out of the dramatic Native political activism of the 1970s, the rise of social history, and an increasing interest in race and ethnicity in American history. It broke from scholarly trends that focused on Indian Wars and U.S.-Indian relations by portraying Native people as either blood-thirsty villains or noble savages in the process of being swept aside by American progress by examining Indian agency, Native perspectives, and critiquing U.S colonialism. For examples, see Vine Deloria Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: And Indian Manifesto* (New York: Macmillan, 1969); Anthony F. C. Wallace, *Death and Rebirth of the Seneca* (New York: Vintage Books, 1972); Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975); Neal Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500–1643* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982); James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); and R. David Edmunds, *The Potawatomis: Keepers of the Fire* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987). For a historiographical overview, see Daniel K. Richter, "Whose Indian History," *William and Mary Quarterly* 50:2 (Apr. 1993): 379–93.

"Middle Grounds" refers to the concept, laid out in Richard White's seminal *Middle Ground* (1991), that Native communities and European settlers in the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Great Lakes created a mutually defined (though often on misunderstandings) society based on Native and Europeans practices in which no group dominated but all influenced each other. His book influenced a generation of scholars to seek out "middle grounds" of cultural contact and exchange across North America. See Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991). For examples of scholars who were influenced by White's work or responded to it, see Daniel Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992); Daniel Usner, *Indians, Settlers, and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy: The Lower Mississippi Valley before 1783* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992); Gregory Dowd, *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745–1815* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); Jill Lepore: *The Name of War: King*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781415000316 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity (New York: Knopf, 1998); James Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1999); and Kathleen DuVal, *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); Alan Taylor, *The Divided Ground: Indians, Settlers, and the Northern Borderland of the American Revolution* (New York: Random House, 2006). See also "Forum: The Middle Ground Revisited," *William and Mary Quarterly* 63:1 (Jan. 2006): 3–96."

For examples cited in the text, see Susan Sleeper-Smith, *Indian Women and French Men: Rethinking Cultural Encounter in the Western Great Lakes* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001); James Brooks, *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Jean O'Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees: Indian Land and Identity in Natick, Massachusetts, 1650–1790* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Anne Hyde, *Empires, Nations, Families: A New History of the North American West* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011); Michael Witgen, *An Infinity of Nations: How the Native New World Shaped Early North America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2013); Pekka Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); and Claudio Saunt, *West of the Revolution: An Uncommon History of 1776* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2014).

For other examples of some of the best new work in Indigenous studies, see Juliana Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Texas Borderlands* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Pekka Hamalainen, *The Comanche Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008); Ned Blackhawk, *Violence Over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008); Brian DeLay, *War of a Thousand Deserts: Indian Raids and the U.S.-Mexican War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); Jeani O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010); and Brett Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012); Kathryn Magee Labelle, *Dispersed But Not Destroyed: A History of the Seventeenth-Century Wendat People* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2013).

[3]Noenoe Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).

[4]Frederick Hoxie's classic study of federal assimilation policies in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, *A Final Promise*, built upon a foundation laid by Francis Prucha in *American Indian Policy in Crisis*. Examining the ways reformers and newly professionalized academics influenced policy makers, Hoxie plays with Gilded Age and Progressive Era chronology by asserting that there were actually two phases to the assimilation campaign: an early, optimistic attempt that ended by the late1890s; and a second, pessimistic push that lasted through the 1920s and resulted in a dramatic marginalization for tribal communities. Hoxie's more recent *This Indian Country* highlights how Indian activists in the period resisted assimilation through legal and political battles. Cultural historian Philip Deloria demonstrated how, contrary to white American cultural expectations, Native people at the turn of the twentieth century engaged with modernity in important and profound ways in *Indians in Unexpected Places*.

See Frederick Hoxie, *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880–1920* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984); Francis Prucha, *American Indian Policy in Crisis: Christian Reformers and the Indian, 1865–1900* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976); Frederick Hoxie, *This Indian Country: American Indian Activists and the Place they Made* (New York: Penguin Books, 2013); Philip Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2004).

[5]Influential studies over the past few decades include Tsianina Lomawaima, *They Called It Prairie Light: The Story of the Chilocco Indian School* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996); Brenda Child, *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900–1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998); Emily Greenwald, *Reconfiguring the Reservation: The Nez Perces, Jicarilla Apaches, and the Dawes Act* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002); and Jane Simonsen, *Making Home Work: Domesticity and Native American Assimilation in the West, 1860–1919* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Ari Kelman, *A Misplaced Massacre: Struggling Over the Memory of Sand Creek* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013); Karl Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2003); Clyde Ellis, *A Dancing People: Powwow Culture on the Southern Plains* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2003); Claudio Saunt, *Black, White, and Indian: Race and the Unmaking of an American Family* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Rose Stremlau, *Sustaining the Cherokee Family: Kinship and the Allotment of an Indigenous Nation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781415000316 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We consider the books published recently by the authors in this forum to be among these influential works. A few other examples include Margaret Jacobs, *White Mother to a Dark Race: Settler Colonialism and the Removal of Indigenous Children in the American West and Australia, 1880–1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); and Karl Jacoby, *Shadows at Dawn: A Apache Massacre and Violence of History* (New York: Penguin Books, 2009); David Chang, *The Color of the Land: Race, Nation, and the Politics of Land Ownership in Oklahoma, 1832–1929* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010).

[6]For a recent example of how this questions remains vibrant in Gilded Age and Progressive Era historiography, see Rebecca Edwards, "Politics, Social Movements, and the Periodization of U.S. History," *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 4:4 (Oct. 2009): 463–73.

[7]Scholars including Patrick Wolfe, who work at the intersections of anthropology, literary criticism, and cultural theory, have encouraged us to think in nuanced and specific ways about the forms that colonization has taken throughout global history. Most important, as Osage anthropologist Jean Dennison asserted, "in the United States and other settler colonies, the process of conquest has been neither completed nor abandoned." It has always been caught in repetition and in a constant state of rearticulation. See Jean Dennison, *Colonial Entanglement: Constituting a Twenty-First-Century Osage Nation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 6. For more, see Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8:4 (Dec. 2006): 387–409; James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Angloworld* (London: Oxford University Press, 2009), 79–94."

[8]A full accounting of this vast historiography is not practical, but consider, for example, C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955); Edward L. Ayers, *he Promise of the New South: Life after Reconstruction* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); *Grace Elizabeth Hale, The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890–1940* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1998); Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, *Gender and Jim Crow: Women and the Politics of White Supremacy in North Carolina, 1896–1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Jennifer Lynn Ritterhouse, *Growing up Jim Crow: How Black and White Southern Children Learned Race* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2006).

[9]Alan Trachtenberg, *The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982); T. J. Jackson Lears, *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America, 1877–1920* (New York: HarperCollins, 2009); Linda Frost, *Never One Nation: Freaks, Savages, and Whiteness in U.S. Popular Culture, 1850–1877* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005); Joy S. Kasson, *Buffalo Bill's Wild West: Celebrity, Memory, and Popular History* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2000); Rebecca Edwards, *New Spirits: Americans in the "Gilded Age," 1865–1905* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); John F. Kasson, *Houdini, Tarzan, and the Perfect Man: The White Male Body and the Challenge of Modernity in America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001)."

[10]See C. Joseph Genetin-Pilawa, *Crooked Paths to Allotment: The Fight over Federal Indian Policy after the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012); Chantal Norrgard, *Seasons of Change: Labor, Treaty Rights, and Ojibwe Nationhood* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014); Cathleen Cahill, *Federal Fathers and Mothers: A Social History of the Indian Service, 1869–1933* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011); Malinda Maynor Lowery, *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010); John Troutman, *Indian Blues: American Indians and the Politics of Music, 1879–1934* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009); Boyd Cothran, *Remembering the Modoc War: Redemptive Violence and Making of American Innocence* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781415000316 Published online by Cambridge University Press