

AN
**INDIGENOUS
PEOPLES'
HISTORY**
OF THE
UNITED STATES

ROXANNE DUNBAR-ORTIZ

REVISIONING AMERICAN HISTORY

BEACON PRESS BOSTON

BEACON PRESS
Boston, Massachusetts
www.beacon.org

Beacon Press books
are published under the auspices of
the Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations.

© 2014 by Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

17 16 15 8 7 6

Beacon Press's ReVisioning American History series consists of
accessibly written books by notable scholars that reconstruct
and reinterpret US history from diverse perspectives.

This book is printed on acid-free paper that meets the uncoated paper
ANSI/NISO specifications for permanence as revised in 1992.

Text design and composition by Wilsted & Taylor Publishing Services

Excerpts from Simon J. Ortiz's *from Sand Creek: Rising in This Heart
Which Is Our America* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2000)
are reprinted here with permission.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne.

An indigenous peoples' history of the United States / Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz.

pages cm — (ReVisioning American history)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8070-0040-3 (hardcover : alk. paper) —

ISBN 978-0-8070-0041-0 (ebook) 1. Indians of North America—Historiography.

2. Indians of North America—Colonization. 3. Indians, Treatment of—
United States—History. 4. United States—Colonization. 5. United States—
Race relations. 6. United States—Politics and government. I. Title.

E76.8.D86 2014

970.004'97—dc23

2013050262

INTRODUCTION

THIS LAND

We are here to educate, not forgive.

We are here to enlighten, not accuse.

—Willie Johns, Brighton Seminole Reservation, Florida

Under the crust of that portion of Earth called the United States of America—“from California . . . to the Gulf Stream waters”—are interred the bones, villages, fields, and sacred objects of American Indians.¹ They cry out for their stories to be heard through their descendants who carry the memories of how the country was founded and how it came to be as it is today.

It should not have happened that the great civilizations of the Western Hemisphere, the very *evidence* of the Western Hemisphere, were wantonly destroyed, the gradual progress of humanity interrupted and set upon a path of greed and destruction.² Choices were made that forged that path toward destruction of life itself—the moment in which we now live and die as our planet shrivels, overheated. To learn and know this history is both a necessity and a responsibility to the ancestors and descendants of all parties.

What historian David Chang has written about the land that became Oklahoma applies to the whole United States: “Nation, race, and class converged in land.”³ Everything in US history is about the land—who oversaw and cultivated it, fished its waters, maintained its wildlife; who invaded and stole it; how it became a commodity (“real estate”) broken into pieces to be bought and sold on the market.

US policies and actions related to Indigenous peoples, though

often termed “racist” or “discriminatory,” are rarely depicted as what they are: classic cases of imperialism and a particular form of colonialism—settler colonialism. As anthropologist Patrick Wolfe writes, “The question of genocide is never far from discussions of settler colonialism. Land is life—or, at least, land is necessary for life.”⁴

The history of the United States is a history of settler colonialism—the founding of a state based on the ideology of white supremacy, the widespread practice of African slavery, and a policy of genocide and land theft. Those who seek history with an upbeat ending, a history of redemption and reconciliation, may look around and observe that such a conclusion is not visible, not even in utopian dreams of a better society.

Writing US history from an Indigenous peoples’ perspective requires rethinking the consensual national narrative. That narrative is wrong or deficient, not in its facts, dates, or details but rather in its essence. Inherent in the myth we’ve been taught is an embrace of settler colonialism and genocide. The myth persists, not for a lack of free speech or poverty of information but rather for an absence of motivation to ask questions that challenge the core of the scripted narrative of the origin story. How might acknowledging the reality of US history work to transform society? That is the central question this book pursues.

Teaching Native American studies, I always begin with a simple exercise. I ask students to quickly draw a rough outline of the United States at the time it gained independence from Britain. Invariably most draw the approximate present shape of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific—the continental territory not fully appropriated until a century after independence. What became independent in 1783 were the thirteen British colonies hugging the Atlantic shore. When called on this, students are embarrassed because they know better. I assure them that they are not alone. I call this a Rorschach test of unconscious “manifest destiny,” embedded in the minds of nearly everyone in the United States and around the world. This test reflects the seeming inevitability of US extent and power, its destiny, with an implication that the continent had previously been *terra nullius*, a land without people.

Woody Guthrie’s “This Land Is Your Land” celebrates that the

land belongs to everyone, reflecting the unconscious manifest destiny we live with. But the extension of the United States from sea to shining sea was the intention and design of the country's founders. "Free" land was the magnet that attracted European settlers. Many were slave owners who desired limitless land for lucrative cash crops. After the war for independence but preceding the writing of the US Constitution, the Continental Congress produced the Northwest Ordinance. This was the first law of the incipient republic, revealing the motive for those desiring independence. It was the blueprint for gobbling up the British-protected Indian Territory ("Ohio Country") on the other side of the Appalachians and Alleghenies. Britain had made settlement there illegal with the Proclamation of 1763.

In 1801, President Jefferson aptly described the new settler-state's intentions for horizontal and vertical continental expansion, stating: "However our present interests may restrain us within our own limits, it is impossible not to look forward to distant times, when our rapid multiplication will expand itself beyond those limits and cover the whole northern, if not the southern continent, with a people speaking the same language, governed in similar form by similar laws." This vision of manifest destiny found form a few years later in the Monroe Doctrine, signaling the intention of annexing or dominating former Spanish colonial territories in the Americas and the Pacific, which would be put into practice during the rest of the century.

Origin narratives form the vital core of a people's unifying identity and of the values that guide them. In the United States, the founding and development of the Anglo-American settler-state involves a narrative about Puritan settlers who had a covenant with God to take the land. That part of the origin story is supported and reinforced by the Columbus myth and the "Doctrine of Discovery." According to a series of late-fifteenth-century papal bulls, European nations acquired title to the lands they "discovered" and the Indigenous inhabitants lost their natural right to that land after Europeans arrived and claimed it.⁵ As law professor Robert A. Williams observes about the Doctrine of Discovery:

Responding to the requirements of a paradoxical age of Renaissance and Inquisition, the West's first modern discourses

of conquest articulated a vision of all humankind united under a rule of law discoverable solely by human reason. Unfortunately for the American Indian, the West's first tentative steps towards this noble vision of a Law of Nations contained a mandate for Europe's subjugation of all peoples whose radical divergence from European-derived norms of right conduct signified their need for conquest and remediation.⁶

The Columbus myth suggests that from US independence onward, colonial settlers saw themselves as part of a world system of colonization. "Columbia," the poetic, Latinate name used in reference to the United States from its founding throughout the nineteenth century, was based on the name of Christopher Columbus. The "Land of Columbus" was—and still is—represented by the image of a woman in sculptures and paintings, by institutions such as Columbia University, and by countless place names, including that of the national capital, the District of Columbia.⁷ The 1798 hymn "Hail, Columbia" was the early national anthem and is now used whenever the vice president of the United States makes a public appearance, and Columbus Day is still a federal holiday despite Columbus never having set foot on the continent claimed by the United States.

Traditionally, historians of the United States hoping to have successful careers in academia and to author lucrative school textbooks became protectors of this origin myth. With the cultural upheavals in the academic world during the 1960s, engendered by the civil rights movement and student activism, historians came to call for objectivity and fairness in revising interpretations of US history. They warned against moralizing, urging instead a dispassionate and culturally relative approach. Historian Bernard Sheehan, in an influential essay, called for a "cultural conflict" understanding of Native–Euro-American relations in the early United States, writing that this approach "diffuses the locus of guilt."⁸ In striving for "balance," however, historians spouted platitudes: "There were good and bad people on both sides." "American culture is an amalgamation of all its ethnic groups." "A frontier is a zone of interaction between cultures, not merely advancing European settlements."

Later, trendy postmodernist studies insisted on Indigenous “agency” under the guise of individual and collective empowerment, making the casualties of colonialism responsible for their own demise. Perhaps worst of all, some claimed (and still claim) that the colonizer and colonized experienced an “encounter” and engaged in “dialogue,” thereby masking reality with justifications and rationalizations—in short, apologies for one-sided robbery and murder. In focusing on “cultural change” and “conflict between cultures,” these studies avoid fundamental questions about the formation of the United States and its implications for the present and future. This approach to history allows one to safely put aside present responsibility for continued harm done by that past and the questions of reparations, restitution, and reordering society.⁹

Multiculturalism became the cutting edge of post-civil-rights-movement US history revisionism. For this scheme to work—and affirm US historical progress—Indigenous nations and communities had to be left out of the picture. As territorially and treaty-based peoples in North America, they did not fit the grid of multiculturalism but were included by transforming them into an inchoate oppressed racial group, while colonized Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans were dissolved into another such group, variously called “Hispanic” or “Latino.” The multicultural approach emphasized the “contributions” of individuals from oppressed groups to the country’s assumed greatness. Indigenous peoples were thus credited with corn, beans, buckskin, log cabins, parkas, maple syrup, canoes, hundreds of place names, Thanksgiving, and even the concepts of democracy and federalism. But this idea of the gift-giving Indian helping to establish and enrich the development of the United States is an insidious smoke screen meant to obscure the fact that the very existence of the country is a result of the looting of an entire continent and its resources. The fundamental unresolved issues of Indigenous lands, treaties, and sovereignty could not but scuttle the premises of multiculturalism.

With multiculturalism, manifest destiny won the day. As an example, in 1994, Prentice Hall (part of Pearson Education) published a new college-level US history textbook, authored by four members of a new generation of revisionist historians. These radical

social historians are all brilliant scholars with posts in prestigious universities. The book's title reflects the intent of its authors and publisher: *Out of Many: A History of the American People*. The origin story of a supposedly unitary nation, albeit now multicultural, remained intact. The original cover design featured a multicolored woven fabric—this image meant to stand in place of the discredited “melting pot.” Inside, facing the title page, was a photograph of a Navajo woman, dressed formally in velvet and adorned with heavy sterling silver and turquoise jewelry. With a traditional Navajo dwelling, a hogan, in the background, the woman was shown kneeling in front of a traditional loom, weaving a nearly finished rug. The design? The Stars and Stripes! The authors, upon hearing my objection and explanation that Navajo weavers make their livings off commissioned work that includes the desired design, responded: “But it’s a real photograph.” To the authors’ credit, in the second edition they replaced the cover photograph and removed the Navajo picture inside, although the narrative text remains unchanged.

Awareness of the settler-colonialist context of US history writing is essential if one is to avoid the laziness of the default position and the trap of a mythological unconscious belief in manifest destiny. The form of colonialism that the Indigenous peoples of North America have experienced was modern from the beginning: the expansion of European corporations, backed by government armies, into foreign areas, with subsequent expropriation of lands and resources. Settler colonialism is a genocidal policy. Native nations and communities, while struggling to maintain fundamental values and collectivity, have from the beginning resisted modern colonialism using both defensive and offensive techniques, including the modern forms of armed resistance of national liberation movements and what now is called terrorism. In every instance they have fought for survival as peoples. The objective of US colonialist authorities was to terminate their existence as peoples—not as random individuals. This is the very definition of modern genocide as contrasted with premodern instances of extreme violence that did not have the goal of extinction. The United States as a socioeconomic and political entity is a result of this centuries-long and ongoing colonial process.

Modern Indigenous nations and communities are societies formed by their resistance to colonialism, through which they have carried their practices and histories. It is breathtaking, but no miracle, that they have survived as peoples.

To say that the United States is a colonialist settler-state is not to make an accusation but rather to face historical reality, without which consideration not much in US history makes sense, unless Indigenous peoples are erased. But Indigenous nations, through resistance, have survived and bear witness to this history. In the era of worldwide decolonization in the second half of the twentieth century, the former colonial powers and their intellectual apologists mounted a counterforce, often called neocolonialism, from which multiculturalism and postmodernism emerged. Although much revisionist US history reflects neocolonialist strategy—an attempt to accommodate new realities in order to retain the dominance—neocolonialist methods signal victory for the colonized. Such approaches pry off a lid long kept tightly fastened. One result has been the presence of significant numbers of Indigenous scholars in US universities who are changing the terms of analysis. The main challenge for scholars in revising US history in the context of colonialism is not lack of information, nor is it one of methodology. Certainly difficulties with documentation are no more problematic than they are in any other area of research. Rather, the source of the problems has been the refusal or inability of US historians to comprehend the nature of their own history, US history. The fundamental problem is the absence of the colonial framework.

Through economic penetration of Indigenous societies, the European and Euro-American colonial powers created economic dependency and imbalance of trade, then incorporated the Indigenous nations into spheres of influence and controlled them indirectly or as protectorates, with indispensable use of Christian missionaries and alcohol. In the case of US settler colonialism, land was the primary commodity. With such obvious indicators of colonialism at work, why should so many interpretations of US political-economic development be convoluted and obscure, avoiding the obvious? To some extent, the twentieth-century emergence of the field of “US

West” or “Borderlands” history has been forced into an incomplete and flawed settler-colonialist framework. The father of that field of history, Frederick Jackson Turner, confessed as much in 1901: “Our colonial system did not start with the Spanish War [1898]; the U.S. had had a colonial history and policy from the beginning of the Republic; but they have been hidden under the phraseology of ‘inter-state migration’ and ‘territorial organization.’”¹⁰

Settler colonialism, as an institution or system, requires violence or the threat of violence to attain its goals. People do not hand over their land, resources, children, and futures without a fight, and that fight is met with violence. In employing the force necessary to accomplish its expansionist goals, a colonizing regime institutionalizes violence. The notion that settler-indigenous conflict is an inevitable product of cultural differences and misunderstandings, or that violence was committed equally by the colonized and the colonizer, blurs the nature of the historical processes. Euro-American colonialism, an aspect of the capitalist economic globalization, had from its beginnings a genocidal tendency.

The term “genocide” was coined following the Shoah, or Holocaust, and its prohibition was enshrined in the United Nations convention adopted in 1948: the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. The convention is not retroactive but is applicable to US-Indigenous relations since 1988, when the US Senate ratified it. The terms of the genocide convention are also useful tools for historical analysis of the effects of colonialism in any era. In the convention, any one of five acts is considered genocide if “committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group”:

- killing members of the group;
- causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life
 - calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.¹¹

In the 1990s, the term “ethnic cleansing” became a useful descriptive term for genocide.

US history, as well as inherited Indigenous trauma, cannot be understood without dealing with the genocide that the United States committed against Indigenous peoples. From the colonial period through the founding of the United States and continuing in the twenty-first century, this has entailed torture, terror, sexual abuse, massacres, systematic military occupations, removals of Indigenous peoples from their ancestral territories, and removals of Indigenous children to military-like boarding schools. The absence of even the slightest note of regret or tragedy in the annual celebration of the US independence betrays a deep disconnect in the consciousness of US Americans.

Settler colonialism is inherently genocidal in terms of the genocide convention. In the case of the British North American colonies and the United States, not only extermination and removal were practiced but also the disappearing of the prior existence of Indigenous peoples—and this continues to be perpetuated in local histories. Anishinaabe (Ojibwe) historian Jean O’Brien names this practice of writing Indians out of existence “firsting and lasting.” All over the continent, local histories, monuments, and signage narrate the story of first settlement: the founder(s), the first school, first dwelling, first everything, as if there had never been occupants who thrived in those places before Euro-Americans. On the other hand, the national narrative tells of “last” Indians or last tribes, such as “the last of the Mohicans,” “Ishi, the last Indian,” and *End of the Trail*, as a famous sculpture by James Earle Fraser is titled.¹²

Documented policies of genocide on the part of US administrations can be identified in at least four distinct periods: the Jacksonian era of forced removal; the California gold rush in Northern California; the post-Civil War era of the so-called Indian wars in the Great Plains; and the 1950s termination period, all of which are discussed in the following chapters. Cases of genocide carried out as policy may be found in historical documents as well as in the oral histories of Indigenous communities. An example from 1873 is typical, with General William T. Sherman writing, “We must act with vindictive earnestness against the Sioux, even to their

extermination, men, women and children . . . during an assault, the soldiers can not pause to distinguish between male and female, or even discriminate as to age."¹³ As Patrick Wolfe has noted, the peculiarity of settler colonialism is that the goal is elimination of Indigenous populations in order to make land available to settlers. That project is not limited to government policy, but rather involves all kinds of agencies, voluntary militias, and the settlers themselves acting on their own.¹⁴

In the wake of the US 1950s termination and relocation policies, a pan-Indigenous movement arose in tandem with the powerful African American civil rights movement and the broad-based social justice and antiwar movements of the 1960s. The Indigenous rights movement succeeded in reversing the US termination policy. However, repression, armed attacks, and legislative attempts to undo treaty rights began again in the late 1970s, giving rise to the international Indigenous movement, which greatly broadened the support for Indigenous sovereignty and territorial rights in the United States.

The early twenty-first century has seen increased exploitation of energy resources begetting new pressures on Indigenous lands. Exploitation by the largest corporations, often in collusion with politicians at local, state, and federal levels, and even within some Indigenous governments, could spell a final demise for Indigenous land bases and resources. Strengthening Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination to prevent that result will take general public outrage and demand, which in turn will require that the general population, those descended from settlers and immigrants, know their history and assume responsibility. Resistance to these powerful corporate forces continues to have profound implications for US socioeconomic and political development and the future.

There are more than five hundred federally recognized Indigenous communities and nations, comprising nearly three million people in the United States. These are the descendants of the fifteen million original inhabitants of the land, the majority of whom were farmers who lived in towns. The US establishment of a system of

Indian reservations stemmed from a long British colonial practice in the Americas. In the era of US treaty-making from independence to 1871, the concept of the reservation was one of the Indigenous nation reserving a narrowed land base from a much larger one in exchange for US government protection from settlers and the provision of social services. In the late nineteenth century, as Indigenous resistance was weakened, the concept of the reservation changed to one of land being carved out of the public domain of the United States as a benevolent gesture, a “gift” to the Indigenous peoples. Rhetoric changed so that reservations were said to have been “given” or “created” for Indians. With this shift, Indian reservations came to be seen as enclaves within state’ boundaries. Despite the political and economic reality, the impression to many was that Indigenous people were taking a free ride on public domain.

Beyond the land bases within the limits of the 310 federally recognized reservations—among 554 Indigenous groups—Indigenous land, water, and resource rights extend to all federally acknowledged Indigenous communities within the borders of the United States. This is the case whether “within the original or subsequently acquired territory thereof, and whether within or without the limits of a state,” and includes all allotments as well as rights-of-way running to and from them.¹⁵ Not all the federally recognized Indigenous nations have land bases beyond government buildings, and the lands of some Native nations, including those of the Sioux in the Dakotas and Minnesota and the Ojibwes in Minnesota, have been parceled into multiple reservations, while some fifty Indigenous nations that had been removed to Oklahoma were entirely allotted—divided by the federal government into individual Native-owned parcels. Attorney Walter R. Echo-Hawk writes:

In 1881, Indian landholdings in the United States had plummeted to 156 million acres. By 1934, only about 50 million acres remained (an area the size of Idaho and Washington) as a result of the General Allotment Act of 1887. During World War II, the government took 500,000 more acres for military use. Over one hundred tribes, bands, and Rancherias

relinquished their lands under various acts of Congress during the termination era of the 1950s. By 1955, the indigenous land base had shrunk to just 2.3 percent of its original size.¹⁶

As a result of federal land sales, seizures, and allotments, most reservations are severely fragmented. Each parcel of tribal, trust, and privately held land is a separate enclave under multiple laws and jurisdictions. The Diné (Navajo) Nation has the largest contemporary contiguous land base among Native nations: nearly sixteen million acres, or nearly twenty-five thousand square miles, the size of West Virginia. Each of twelve other reservations is larger than Rhode Island, which comprises nearly eight hundred thousand acres, or twelve hundred square miles, and each of nine other reservations is larger than Delaware, which covers nearly a million and a half acres, or two thousand square miles. Other reservations have land bases of fewer than thirty-two thousand acres, or fifty square miles.¹⁷ A number of independent nation-states with seats in the United Nations have less territory and smaller populations than some Indigenous nations of North America.

Following World War II, the United States was at war with much of the world, just as it was at war with the Indigenous peoples of North America in the nineteenth century. This was total war, demanding that the enemy surrender unconditionally or face annihilation. Perhaps it was inevitable that the earlier wars against Indigenous peoples, if not acknowledged and repudiated, ultimately would include the world. According to the origin narrative, the United States was born of rebellion against oppression—against empire—and thus is the product of the first anticolonial revolution for national liberation. The narrative flows from that fallacy: the broadening and deepening of democracy; the Civil War and the ensuing “second revolution,” which ended slavery; the twentieth-century mission to save Europe from itself—twice; and the ultimately triumphant fight against the scourge of communism, with the United States inheriting the difficult and burdensome task of keeping order in the world. It’s a narrative of progress. The 1960s social revolutions, ignited by the African American liberation movement, complicated the origin nar-

native, but its structure and periodization have been left intact. After the 1960s, historians incorporated women, African Americans, and immigrants as contributors to the commonweal. Indeed, the revised narrative produced the “nation of immigrants” framework, which obscures the US practice of colonization, merging settler colonialism with immigration to metropolitan centers during and after the industrial revolution. Native peoples, to the extent that they were included at all, were renamed “First Americans” and thus themselves cast as distant immigrants.

The provincialism and national chauvinism of US history production make it difficult for effective revisions to gain authority. Scholars, both Indigenous and a few non-Indigenous, who attempt to rectify the distortions, are labeled advocates, and their findings are rejected for publication on that basis. Indigenous scholars look to research and thinking that has emerged in the rest of the European-colonized world. To understand the historical and current experiences of Indigenous peoples in the United States, these thinkers and writers draw upon and creatively apply the historical materialism of Marxism, the liberation theology of Latin America, Frantz Fanon’s psychosocial analyses of the effects of colonialism on the colonizer and the colonized, and other approaches, including development theory and postmodern theory. While not abandoning insights gained from those sources, due to the “exceptional” nature of US colonialism among nineteenth-century colonial powers, Indigenous scholars and activists are engaged in exploring new approaches.

This book claims to be a history of the United States from an Indigenous peoples’ perspective but there is no such thing as a collective Indigenous peoples’ perspective, just as there is no monolithic Asian or European or African peoples’ perspective. This is not a history of the vast civilizations and communities that thrived and survived between the Gulf of Mexico and Canada and between the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific. Such histories have been written, and are being written by historians of Diné, Lakota, Mohawk, Tlingit, Muskogee, Anishinaabe, Lumbee, Inuit, Kiowa, Cherokee, Hopi, and other Indigenous communities and nations that have survived colonial genocide. This book attempts to tell the story of

the United States as a colonialist settler-state, one that, like colonialist European states, crushed and subjugated the original civilizations in the territories it now rules. Indigenous peoples, now in a colonial relationship with the United States, inhabited and thrived for millennia before they were displaced to fragmented reservations and economically decimated.

This is a history of the United States.

“INDIAN COUNTRY”

*Buffalo were dark rich clouds moving upon the rolling hills
and plains of America. And then the flashing steel came
upon bone and flesh.*

—Simon J. Ortiz, *from Sand Creek*

The US Army on the eve of the Civil War was divided into seven departments—a structure designed by John C. Calhoun during the Monroe administration. By 1860, six of the seven departments, comprising 183 companies, were stationed west of the Mississippi, a colonial army fighting the Indigenous occupants of the land. In much of the western lands, the army was the primary US government institution; the military roots to institutional development run deep.

President Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated in March 1861, two months after the South had seceded from the union. In April, the Confederate States of America (CSA) seized the army base at Fort Sumter near Charleston, South Carolina. Of more than a thousand US Army officers, 286 left to serve the CSA, half of them being West Point graduates, most of them Indian fighters, including Robert E. Lee. Three of the seven army department commanders took leadership of the Confederate Army. Based on demographics alone, the South had little chance of winning, so it is all the more remarkable that it persisted against the Union for more than four years. The 1860 population of the United States was nearly thirty-two million, with twenty-three million in the twenty-two northern states, and about nine million in the eleven southern states. More than a third of the nine million Southerners were enslaved people of African heritage. Within the CSA, 76 percent of settlers owned no

slaves. Roughly 60–70 percent of those without slaves owned fewer than a hundred acres of land. Less than 1 percent owned more than a hundred slaves. Seventeen percent of settlers in the South owned one to nine slaves, and only 6.5 percent owned more than ten. Ten percent of the settlers who owned no slaves were also landless, while that many more managed to barely survive on small dirt farms. The Confederate Army reflected the same kind of percentages.¹ Those who, even today, claim that “states’ rights” caused Southern secession and the Civil War use these statistics to argue that slavery was not the cause of the Civil War, but that is false. Every settler in the Southern states aspired to own land and slaves or to own *more* land and *more* slaves, as both social status and wealth depended on the extent of property owned. Even small and landless farmers relied on slavery-based rule: the local slave plantation was the market for what small farmers produced, and planters hired landless settlers as overseers and sharecroppers. Most non-slave-owning settlers supported and fought for the Confederacy.

LINCOLN’S “FREE SOIL” FOR SETTLERS

Abraham Lincoln’s campaign for the presidency appealed to the vote of land-poor settlers who demanded that the government “open” Indigenous lands west of the Mississippi. They were called “free-soilers,” in reference to cheap land free of slavery. New gold rushes and other incentives brought new waves of settlers to squat on Indigenous land. For this reason, some Indigenous people preferred a Confederate victory, which might divide and weaken the United States, which had grown ever more powerful. Indigenous nations in Indian Territory were more directly affected by the Civil War than anywhere else. As discussed in chapter 6, the southeastern nations—the Cherokees, Muskogeans, Seminoles, Choctaws, and Chickasaws (“Five Civilized Tribes”)—were forcibly removed from their homelands during the Jackson administration, but in the Indian Territory they rebuilt their townships, farms, ranches, and institutions, including newspapers, schools, and orphanages. Although a tiny elite of each nation was wealthy and owned enslaved Africans and

private estates, the majority of the people continued their collective agrarian practices. All five nations signed treaties with the Confederacy, each for similar reasons. Within each nation, however, there was a clear division based on class, often misleadingly expressed as a conflict between "mixed-bloods" and "full-bloods." That is, the wealthy, assimilated, slave-owning minority that dominated politics favored the Confederacy, and the non-slave-owning poor and traditional majority wanted to stay out of the Anglo-American civil war. Historian David Chang found that Muskogee nationalism and well-founded distrust of federal power played a major role in bringing about that nation's strategic alliance with the Confederacy. Chang writes: "Was the Creek council's alliance with the South a racist defense of slavery and its class privileges, or was it a nationalist defense of Creek lands and sovereignty? The answer has to be 'both.'"²

John Ross, principal chief of the Cherokee Nation, at first called for neutrality, but changed his mind for reasons similar to the Muskogees and asked the Cherokee council for authority to negotiate a treaty with the CSA. Nearly seven thousand men of the five nations went into battle for the Confederacy. Stand Watie, a Cherokee, held the post of brigadier general in the Confederate Army. His First Indian Brigade of the Army of the Trans-Mississippi was among the last units in the field to surrender to the Union Army on June 23, 1865, more than two months after Lee's surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia at Appomattox Courthouse in April 1865. During the war, however, many Indigenous soldiers became disillusioned and went over to the Union forces, along with enslaved African Americans who fled to freedom.³

Another story is equally important, though less often told. A few months after the war broke out, some ten thousand men in Indian Territory, made up of Indigenous volunteers, along with African Americans who had freed themselves and even some Anglo-Americans, engaged in guerrilla warfare against the Confederate Army. They fought from Oklahoma into Kansas, where many of them joined unofficial Union units that had been organized by abolitionists who had trained with John Brown years earlier. This was not likely the kind of war the Lincoln administration had desired—a multiethnic volunteer Union contingent fighting pro-slavery forces

in Missouri, where enslaved Africans escaped to join the Union side.⁴ The self-liberation by African Americans, occurring all over the South, led to Lincoln's 1863 Emancipation Proclamation, which allowed freed Africans to serve in combat.

In Minnesota, which had become a non-slavery state in 1859, the Dakota Sioux were on the verge of starvation by 1862. When they mounted an uprising to drive out the mostly German and Scandinavian settlers, Union Army troops crushed the revolt, slaughtering Dakota civilians and rounding up several hundred men. Three hundred prisoners were sentenced to death, but upon Lincoln's orders to reduce the numbers, thirty-eight were selected at random to die in the largest mass hanging in US history. The revered leader Little Crow was not among those hanged, but was assassinated the following summer while out picking raspberries with his son; the assassin, a settler-farmer, collected a \$500 bounty.⁵

One of the young Dakota survivors asked his uncle about the mysterious white people who would commit such crimes. The uncle replied:

Certainly they are a heartless nation. They have made some of their people servants—yes, slaves. . . . The greatest object of their lives seems to be to acquire possessions—to be rich. They desire to possess the whole world. For thirty years they were trying to entice us to sell them our land. Finally the outbreak gave them all, and we have been driven away from our beautiful country.⁶

THE GENOCIDAL ARMY OF THE WEST

To free the professional soldiers posted in the West to fight against the Confederate Army in the East, Lincoln called for volunteers in the West, and settlers responded, coming from Texas, Kansas, California, Washington, Oregon, Colorado, Nebraska, Utah, and Nevada. Having few Confederates to fight, they attacked people closer to hand, Indigenous people. Land speculators in the trans-Mississippi West sought statehood for the occupied former Mexican territories in order to attract settlers and investors. Their eagerness to

undertake the ethnic cleansing of the Indigenous residents to achieve the necessary population balance to attain statehood generated strong anti-Indian hysteria and violent actions. Preoccupied with the Civil War in the East, the Lincoln administration did little to prevent vicious and even genocidal actions on the part of territorial authorities consisting of volunteer Indian haters such as Kit Carson.

The mode of maintaining settler "law and order" set the pattern for postwar genocide. In the most infamous incident involving militias, the First and Third Colorado Volunteers carried out the Sand Creek Massacre. Although assigned to guard the road to Santa Fe, the units mainly engaged in raiding and looting Indigenous communities. John Chivington, an ambitious politician known as the "Fighting Parson," led the Third Colorado.⁷

By 1861, displaced and captive Cheyennes and Arapahos, under the leadership of the great peace seeker Black Kettle, were incarcerated in a US military reservation called Sand Creek, near Fort Lyon in southeastern Colorado. They camped under a white flag of truce and had federal permission to hunt buffalo to feed themselves. In early 1864, the Colorado territorial governor informed them that they could no longer leave the reservation to hunt. Despite their compliance with the order, on November 29, 1864, Chivington took seven hundred Colorado Volunteers to the reservation. Without provocation or warning, they attacked, leaving dead 105 women and children and 28 men. Even the federal commissioner of Indian affairs denounced the action, saying that the people had been "butchered in cold blood by troops in the service of the United States." In its 1865 investigation, the Congress Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War recorded testimonies and published a report that documented the aftermath of the killings, when Chivington and his volunteers burned tepees and stole horses. Worse, after the smoke had cleared, they had returned and finished off the few survivors while scalping and mutilating the corpses—women and men, young and old, children, babies. Then they decorated their weapons and caps with body parts—fetuses, penises, breasts, and vulvas—and, in the words of Acoma poet Simon Ortiz, "Stuck them / on their hats to dry / Their fingers greasy / and slick."⁸ Once back in Denver, they displayed the trophies to the adoring public in Denver's

Apollo Theater and in saloons. Yet, despite the detailed report of the deeds, neither Chivington nor any of his men were reprimanded or prosecuted, signaling a free field for killing.⁹

US Army colonel James Carleton formed the Volunteer Army of the Pacific in 1861, based in California. In Nevada and Utah, a California businessman, Colonel Patrick Connor, commanded a militia of a thousand California volunteers that spent the war years massacring hundreds of unarmed Shoshone, Bannock, and Ute people in their encampments. Carleton led another contingent of militias to Arizona to suppress the Apaches, who were resisting colonization under the great leader Cochise. At the time, Cochise observed:

When I was young I walked all over this country, east and west, and saw no other people than the Apaches. After many summers I walked again and found another race of people had come to take it. How is it? Why is it that the Apaches wait to die—that they carry their lives on their finger nails? . . . The Apaches were once a great nation; they are now but few. . . . Many have been killed in battle.¹⁰

Following a scorched-earth campaign against the Apaches, Carleton was promoted to the rank of brigadier general and placed in command of the Department of New Mexico. He brought in the now-seasoned killing machine of Colorado Volunteers to attack the Navajos, on whom he declared total war. He enlisted as his principal commander in the field the ubiquitous Indian killer Kit Carson.¹¹ With unlimited authority and answering to no one, Carleton spent the entire Civil War in the Southwest engaged in a series of search-and-destroy missions against the Navajos. The campaign culminated in March 1864 in a three-hundred-mile forced march of eight thousand Navajo civilians to a military concentration camp at Bosque Redondo in the southeastern New Mexico desert, at the army base at Fort Sumner, an ordeal recalled in Navajo oral history as the “Long Walk.” One Navajo named Herrero said,

Some of the soldiers do not treat us well. When at work, if we stop a little they kick us or do something else. . . . We do not mind if an officer punishes us, but do not like to be treated

badly by the soldiers. Our women sometimes come to the tents outside the fort and make contracts with the soldiers to stay with them for a night, and give them five dollars or something else. But in the morning they take away what they gave them and kick them off. This happens most every day.¹²

At least a fourth of the incarcerated died of starvation. Not until 1868 were the Navajos released and allowed to return to their homeland in what is today the Four Corners area. This permission to return was not based on the deadly conditions of the camp, rather that Congress determined that the incarceration was too expensive to maintain.¹³ For these noble deeds, Carleton was appointed a major general in the US Army in 1865. Now he led the Fourth Cavalry in scorched-earth forays against Plains Indians.

These military campaigns against Indigenous nations constituted foreign wars fought during the US Civil War, but the end of the Civil War did not end them. They carried on unabated to the end of the century, with added killing technology and more seasoned killers, including African American cavalry units. Demobilized officers and soldiers often could not find jobs, and along with a new generation of young settlers—otherwise unemployed and often seeking violent adventure—they joined the army of the West, some of the officers accepting lower ranks in order to get career army assignments. Given that war was centered in the West and that military achievement had come to foster prestige, wealth, and political power, every West Point graduate sought to further his career by volunteering in the army. Some of their diaries echo those of combat troops in Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Iraq, who later were troubled by the atrocities they witnessed or committed. But most soldiers persevered in their ambition to succeed.

Prominent Civil War generals led the army of the West, among them Generals William Tecumseh Sherman, Philip Sheridan (to whom is ascribed the statement "The only good Indian is a dead Indian"), George Armstrong Custer, and Nelson A. Miles. The army would make effective use after 1865 of innovations made during the Civil War. The rapid-fire Gatling gun, first used in battle in 1862, would be employed during the rest of the century against Indigenous

civilians. Non-technological innovations were perhaps even more important, the Civil War having fostered an extreme patriotic ideology in the Union Army that carried over into the Indian wars. Now more centralized under presidential command, US forces relied less on state contributions and were thus less subject to their control. The prestige of the Department of War rose within the federal government, so that it had far more leeway to send troops to steamroll over Indigenous peoples who challenged US dominion.

The Union Army victory over the Confederate Army transformed the South into a quasi-captive nation, a region that remains the poorest of the United States well over a century later. The situation was similar to that in South Africa two decades later when the British defeated the Boers (descendants of the original seventeenth-century Dutch settlers). As the British would later do with the Boers, the US government eventually allowed the defeated southern elite to return to their locally powerful positions, and both US southerners and Boers soon gained national political power. The powerful white supremacist southern ruling class helped further militarize the United States, the army practically becoming a southern institution. Following the effective Reconstruction experiment to empower former slaves, the US occupying army was withdrawn, and African Americans were returned to quasi-bondage and disenfranchisement through Jim Crow laws, forming a colonized population in the South.

COLONIAL POLICY PRECEDES MILITARY IMPLEMENTATION

In the midst of war, Lincoln did not forget his free-soiler settler constituency that had raised him to the presidency. During the Civil War, with the southern states unrepresented, Congress at Lincoln's behest passed the Homestead Act in 1862, as well as the Morrill Act, the latter transferring large tracts of Indigenous land to the states to establish land grant universities. The Pacific Railroad Act provided private companies with nearly two hundred million acres of Indigenous land.¹⁴ With these land grabs, the US government broke multiple treaties with Indigenous nations. Most of the western ter-

ritories, including Colorado, North and South Dakota, Montana, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, were delayed in achieving statehood, because Indigenous nations resisted appropriation of their lands and outnumbered settlers. So the colonization plan for the West established during the Civil War was carried out over the following three decades of war and land grabs. Under the Homestead Act, 1.5 million homesteads were granted to settlers west of the Mississippi, comprising nearly three hundred million acres (a half-million square miles) taken from the Indigenous collective estates and privatized for the market.¹⁵ This dispersal of landless settler populations from east of the Mississippi served as an "escape valve," lessening the likelihood of class conflict as the industrial revolution accelerated the use of cheap immigrant labor.

Little of the land appropriated under the Homestead Acts was distributed to actual single-family homesteaders. It was passed instead to large operators or land speculators. The land laws appeared to have been created for that result. An individual could acquire 1,120 or even more acres of land, even though homestead and preemption (legalized squatting) claims were limited to 160 acres.¹⁶ A claimant could obtain a homestead and secure title after five years or pay cash within six months. Then he could acquire another 160 acres under preemption by living on another piece of land for six months and paying \$1.25 per acre. While acquiring these titles, he could also be fulfilling requirements for a timber culture claim of 160 acres and a desert land claim of 640 acres, neither of which required occupancy for title. Other men within a family or other partners in an enterprise could take out additional desert land claims to increase their holdings even more. As industrialization quickened, land as a commodity, "real estate," remained the basis of the US economy and capital accumulation.¹⁷ The federal land grants to the railroad barons, carved out of Indigenous territories, were not limited to the width of the railroad tracks, but rather formed a checkerboard of square-mile sections stretching for dozens of miles on both sides of the right of way. This was land the railroads were free to sell in parcels for their own profit. The 1863–64 federal banking acts mandated a national currency, chartered banks, and permitted the government to guarantee bonds. As war profiteers, financiers,

and industrialists such as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and J. P. Morgan used these laws to amass wealth in the East, Leland Stanford, Collis P. Huntington, Mark Hopkins, and Charles Crocker in the West grew rich from building railroads with eastern capital on land granted by the US government.¹⁸

Indigenous nations, as well as Hispanos, resisted the arrival of railroads crisscrossing their farms, hunting grounds, and homelands, bringing settlers, cattle, barbed wire fencing, and mercenary buffalo hunters in their wake. In what proved a prelude to the genocidal decades to follow, the Andrew Johnson administration in 1867–68 sent army and diplomatic representatives to negotiate peace treaties with dozens of Indigenous nations. The 371 treaties between Indigenous nations and the United States were all promulgated during the first century of US existence.¹⁹ Congress halted formal treaty making in 1871, attaching a rider to the Indian Appropriation Act of that year stipulating “that hereafter no Indian nation or tribe within the territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent nation, tribe, or power with whom the United States may contract by treaty. Provided, further, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to invalidate or impair the obligation of any treaty heretofore lawfully made and ratified with any such Indian nation or tribe.”²⁰ This measure meant that Congress and the president could now make laws affecting an Indigenous nation with or without negotiations or consent. Nevertheless, the provision reaffirmed the sovereign legal status of those Indigenous nations that had treaties. During the period of US-Indigenous treaty making, approximately two million square miles of land passed from Indigenous nations to the United States, some of it through treaty agreements and some through breach of standing treaties.

In an effort to create Indigenous economic dependency and compliance in land transfers, the US policy directed the army to destroy the basic economic base of the Plains Nations—the buffalo. The buffalo were killed to near extinction, tens of millions dead within a few decades and only a few hundred left by the 1880s. Commercial hunters wanted only the skins, so left the rest of the animal to rot. Bones would be gathered and shipped to the East for various uses. Mainly it was the army that helped realize slaughter of the herds.²¹

Old Lady Horse of the Kiowa Nation could have been speaking for all the buffalo nations in her lament of the loss:

Everything the Kiowas had came from the buffalo. . . . Most of all, the buffalo was part of the Kiowa religion. A white buffalo calf must be sacrificed in the Sun Dance. The priests used parts of the buffalo to make their prayers when they healed people or when they sang to the powers above.

So, when the white men wanted to build railroads, or when they wanted to farm or raise cattle, the buffalo still protected the Kiowas. They tore up the railroad tracks and the gardens. They chased the cattle off the ranges. The buffalo loved their people as much as the Kiowas loved them.

There was war between the buffalo and the white men. The white men built forts in the Kiowa country, and the woolly-headed buffalo soldiers shot the buffalo as fast as they could, but the buffalo kept coming on, coming on, even into the post cemetery at Fort Sill. Soldiers were not enough to hold them back.

Then the white men hired hunters to do nothing but kill the buffalo. Up and down the plains those men ranged, shooting sometimes as many as a hundred buffalo a day. Behind them came the skinners with their wagons. They piled the hides and bones into the wagons until they were full, and then took their loads to the new railroad stations that were being built, to be shipped east to the market. Sometimes there would be a pile of bones as high as a man, stretching a mile along the railroad track.

The buffalo saw that their day was over. They could protect their people no longer.²²

Another aspect of US economic development that affected the Indigenous nations of the West was merchant domination. All over the world, in European colonies distant from their ruling centers, mercantile capitalists flourished alongside industrial capitalists and militaries, and together they determined the mode of colonization. Mercantile houses, usually family-owned, were organized to carry

goods over long stretches of water or sparsely populated lands to their destinations. The merchants' sources of commodities in remote regions were the nearby small farmers, loggers, trappers, and specialists such as woodworkers and metalsmiths. The commodities were then sent to industrial centers for credit against which money could be drawn. Thus, in the absence of a system of indirect credit, merchants could acquire scarce currency for the purchase of foreign goods. The merchant, thereby, became the dominant source of credit for the small operator as well as for the local capitalist. Mercantile capitalism thrived in colonial areas, with many of the first merchant houses originating in the Levant among Syrians (Lebanese) and Jews. Even as mercantile capitalism waned in the twentieth century, it left its mark on Native reservations where the people relied on trading posts for credit, a market for their products, and commodities of all kinds—an opportunity for super-exploitation. Merchants and traders, often by intermarrying Indigenous women, also came to dominate Native governance on some reservations.²³

As noted above, at the end of the Civil War the US Army hardly missed a beat before the war “to win the West” began in full force. As a far more advanced killing machine and with seasoned troops, the army began the slaughter of people, buffalo, and the land itself, destroying the natural tall grasses of the plains and planting short grasses for cattle, eventually leading to the loss of the topsoil four decades later. William Tecumseh Sherman came out of the Civil War a major general and soon commanded the US Army, replacing war hero Ulysses S. Grant when Grant became president in 1869. As commanding general through 1883, Sherman was responsible for the genocidal wars against the resistant Indigenous nations of the West.

Sherman's family was among the first generation of settlers who rushed to the Ohio Valley region after the total war that drove the people of the Shawnee Nation out of their homes, towns, and farms. Sherman's father gave his son the trophy name Tecumseh after the Shawnee leader who was killed by the US Army. The general had been a successful lawyer and banker in San Francisco and New York before he turned to a military career. During the Civil War, most famously in the siege of Atlanta, he made his mark as a proponent and practitioner of total war, scorched-earth campaigns against civil-

ians, particularly targeting their food supplies. This had long been the colonial and US American way of war against the Indigenous peoples east of the Mississippi. Sherman sent an army commission to England to study English colonial campaigns worldwide, looking to employ successful English tactics for the US wars against Indigenous peoples. In Washington, Sherman had to contend with the upper echelons of the military that were under the sway of Carl von Clausewitz's book *On War*, which dealt with conflict between European nation-states with standing armies. This dichotomy of training the US military for standard European warfare but also training it in colonial counterinsurgency methods continues in the twenty-first century. Although a man of war, Sherman, like most in the US ruling class, was an entrepreneur at heart, and his mandate as head of the army and his passion were to protect the Anglo conquest of the West. Sherman regarded railroads a top priority. In a letter to Grant in 1867 he wrote, "We are not going to let a few thieving, ragged Indians stop the progress of [the railroads]."24

An alliance of the Sioux, Cheyenne, and Arapaho Nations was blocking the "Bozeman Trail," over which thousands of crazed gold seekers crashed through Indigenous territories in the Dakotas and Wyoming in 1866 to reach newly discovered goldfields in Montana. The army arrived to protect them, and in preparation for constructing Fort Phil Kearny, Lieutenant Colonel William Fetterman led eighty soldiers out to clear the trail in December 1866. The Indigenous alliance defeated them in battle. Strangely, this being war, the defeat of the US Army in the battle has come down in historical annals as "the Fetterman Massacre." Following this event, General Sherman wrote to Grant, who was still army commander: "We must act with vindictive earnestness against the Sioux, even to their extermination, men, women, and children." Sherman made it clear that "during an assault, the soldiers can not pause to distinguish between male and female, or even discriminate as to age."²⁵

In adopting total war in the West, Sherman brought in its most notorious avatar, George Armstrong Custer, who proved his mettle right away by leading an attack on unarmed civilians on November 27, 1868, at the Southern Cheyenne reservation at Washita Creek in Indian Territory. Earlier, at the Colorado Volunteers' 1864

Sand Creek Massacre, the Cheyenne leader Black Kettle had escaped death. He and other Cheyenne survivors were then forced to leave Colorado Territory for a reservation in Indian Territory. Some young Cheyenne men, determined to resist reservation confinement and hunger, decided to hunt and to fight back with guerrilla tactics. Since the army was rarely able to capture them, Custer resorted to total war, murdering the incarcerated mothers, wives, children, and elders. When Black Kettle received word from Indigenous spies within the army ranks that the mounted troops of the Seventh Cavalry were leaving their fort and headed for the Washita reservation, he and his wife rode out at dawn in a snowstorm, unarmed, to attempt to talk with Custer and assure him that no resisters were present on the reservation. Upon Black Kettle's approaching the troops with a hoisted white flag, Custer ordered the soldiers to fire, and a moment later Black Kettle and his wife lay dead. All told, the Seventh Cavalry murdered over a hundred Cheyenne women and children that day, taking ghoulis trophies afterward.²⁶

COLONIAL SOLDIERS

Many of the intensive genocidal campaigns against Indigenous civilians took place during the administration of President Grant, 1869–77. In 1866, two years before Grant's election, Congress had created two all-African American cavalry regiments that came to be called the buffalo soldiers. Some four million formerly enslaved Africans were free citizens in 1865, thanks to the Emancipation Proclamation, which took effect in January 1863. The legislation was intended to have a demoralizing effect on the CSA, but it gave belated official recognition to what was already fact: many African Americans, especially young men, had freed themselves by fleeing servitude and joining Union forces.²⁷ Up to 1862, Africans had been barred from serving in their own capacity in the army. Now the Union Army incorporated them but at lower pay and in segregated units under white officers. The War Department created the federal Bureau of Colored Troops, and one hundred thousand armed Africans served in the unit. Their courage and commitment made them

the best and most effective fighters, although they had the highest mortality rate. At the end of the Civil War, 186,000 Black soldiers had fought and 38,000 had died (in combat and from disease), a higher death toll than that of any individual state. The state with the highest casualty count was New York, with troops comprising mostly poor white immigrant soldiers, largely Irish. After the war many Black soldiers, like their poor white counterparts, remained in the army and were assigned to segregated regiments sent west to crush Indigenous resistance.

This reality strikes many as tragic, as if oppressed former slaves and Indigenous peoples being subjected to genocidal warfare should magically be unified against their common enemy, "the white man." In fact, this is precisely how colonialism in general and colonial warfare in particular work. It is not unique to the United States, but rather a part of the tradition of European colonialism since the Roman legions. The British organized whole armies of ethnic troops in South and Southwestern Asia, the most famous being the Gurkhas from Nepal, who fought as recently as Margaret Thatcher's war against Argentina in 1983.²⁸ The buffalo soldiers were such a specially organized colonial military unit. As Stanford L. Davis, a descendant of a buffalo soldier, writes:

Slaves and the black soldiers, who couldn't read or write, had no idea of the historical deprivations and the frequent genocidal intent of the U.S. government toward Native Americans. Free blacks, whether they could read and write, generally had no access to first-hand or second-hand unbiased information on the relationship. Most whites who had access often didn't really care about the situation. It was business as usual in the name of "Manifest Destiny." Most Americans viewed the Indians as incorrigible and non-reformable savages. Those closest to the warring factions or who were threatened by it, naturally wanted government protection at any cost.²⁹

Many Black men opted for army service for survival reasons, as it gave them food and shelter, pay and a pension, and even some glory. The United States had its own motives for assigning Black troops to

the West. Southerners and the eastern population did not want thousands of armed Black soldiers in their communities. There was also fear that if they demobilized, the labor market would be flooded. For US authorities, it was a good way of getting rid of the Black soldiers *and* the Indians.

The Civil War also set the template for the rapid “Americanization” of immigrants. Jewish immigrants fought on both sides in the war, and as individuals they earned a level of freedom from US bigotry they had never experienced before.

Indian scouts and soldiers were essential to the army as well, both as individuals and as nations making war on other Indigenous nations. Many decades later, Native Americans have continued to volunteer in US wars in percentages far beyond their populations. Wichita Nation citizen Stan Holder appeared in a 1974 documentary film on the Vietnam War, *Hearts and Minds*, in which he explained his volunteering for service. While growing up he had heard the older people’s stories about Wichita warriors, and, looking around, the only warriors he could identify were marines, so he enlisted in what he considered a warrior society. It is no accident that the US Marine Corps evokes that image in angry young men. As with Black men who volunteered in the Indian wars and enlisted and served in other wars, Native men seized the security and potential glory of the colonialist army.

The explicit purpose of the buffalo soldiers and the army of the West as a whole was to invade Indigenous lands and ethnically cleanse them for Anglo settlement and commerce. As Native historian Jace Weaver has written: “The Indian Wars were not fought by the blindingly white American cavalry of John Ford westerns but by African Americans and Irish and German immigrants.”³⁰ The haunting Bob Marley song “Buffalo Soldier” captures the colonial experience in the United States: “Said he was a buffalo soldier / Win the war for America.”³¹

The army of the West was a colonial army with all the problems of colonial armies and foreign occupation, principally being hated by the people living under occupation. It’s no surprise that the US military uses the term “Indian Country” to refer to what it considers enemy territory. Much as in the Vietnam War, the 1980s covert wars

in Central America, and the wars of the early twenty-first century in Muslim countries, counterinsurgent army volunteers in the late-nineteenth-century US West had to rely heavily on intelligence from those native to the land, informers and scouts. Many of these were double agents, reporting back to their own people, having joined the US Army for that purpose. Failing to find guerrilla fighters, the army resorted to scorched-earth campaigns, starvation, attacks on and removals of civilian populations—the weapons of counterinsurgency warfare. During the Soviet counterinsurgency in Afghanistan in the 1980s, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees called the effect “migratory genocide”—an apt term to apply retrospectively to the nineteenth-century US counterinsurgency against Indigenous peoples.³²

ANNIHILATION UNTO TOTAL SURRENDER

The US Army’s search-and-destroy missions and forced relocations (ethnic cleansing) in the West are well documented but perhaps not normally considered in the light of counterinsurgency.

Mari Sandoz recorded one such story in her 1953 best-selling work of nonfiction *Cheyenne Autumn*, on which John Ford based a 1964 film.³³ In 1878, the great Cheyenne resistance leaders Little Wolf and Dull Knife led more than three hundred Cheyenne civilians from a military reservation in Indian Territory, where they had been forcibly confined, to their original homeland in what is today Wyoming and Montana. They were eventually intercepted by the military, but only following a dramatic chase covered by newspaper reporters. So much sympathy was aroused in eastern cities that the Cheyennes were provided a reservation in a part of their original homeland. A similar feat was that of the Nimi’ipuu (Nez Perce) under Chief Joseph, who tried to lead his people out of military incarceration in Idaho to exile in Canada. In 1877, pursued by two thousand soldiers of the US cavalry led by Nelson Miles, Nimi’ipuu led eight hundred civilians toward the Canadian border. They held out for nearly four months, evading the soldiers as well as fighting hit-and-run battles, while covering seventeen hundred miles. Some

were rounded up and placed in Pauls Valley, Oklahoma, but they soon left on their own and returned to their Idaho homeland, eventually securing a small reservation there.

The longest military counterinsurgency in US history was the war on the Apache Nation, 1850–86. Goyathlay, known as Geronimo, famously led the final decade of Apache resistance. The Apaches and their Diné relatives, the Navajos, did not miss a beat in continuing resistance to colonial domination when the United States annexed their territory as a part of the half of Mexico taken in 1848. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo between the United States and Mexico, which sealed the transfer of territory, even stipulated that both parties were required to fight the “savage” Apaches. By 1877 the army had forced most Apaches into inhospitable desert reservations. Led by Geronimo, Chiricahua Apaches resisted incarceration in the San Carlos reservation designated for them in Arizona. When Geronimo finally surrendered—he was never captured—the group numbered only thirty-eight, most of those women and children, with five thousand soldiers in pursuit, which meant that the insurgents had wide support both north and south of the recently drawn US-Mexico border. Guerrilla warfare persists only if it has deep roots in the people being represented, the reason it is sometimes called “people’s war.” Obviously, the Apache resistance was not a military threat to the United States but rather a symbol of resistance and freedom. Herein lies the essence of counterinsurgent colonialist warfare: no resistance can be tolerated. Historian William Appleman Williams aptly described the US imperative as “annihilation unto total surrender.”³⁴

Geronimo and three hundred other Chiricahuas who were not even part of the fighting force were rounded up and transported by train under military guard to Fort Marion, in St. Augustine, Florida, to join hundreds of other Plains Indian fighters already incarcerated there. Remarkably, Geronimo negotiated an agreement with the United States so that he and his band would surrender as prisoners of war, rather than as common criminals as the Texas Rangers desired, which would have meant executions by civil authorities. The POW status validated Apache sovereignty and made the captives eligible for treatment according to the international laws of

war. Geronimo and his people were transferred again, to the army base at Fort Sill in Indian Territory, and lived out their lives there. The US government had not yet created the term "unlawful combatant," which it would do in the early twenty-first century, depriving legitimate prisoners of war fair treatment under international law.

During the Grant administration, the United States began experimenting with new colonial institutions, the most pernicious of which were the boarding schools, modeled on Fort Marion prison. In 1875, Captain Richard Henry Pratt was in charge of transporting seventy-two captive Cheyenne and other Plains Indian warriors from the West to Fort Marion, an old Spanish fortress, dark and dank. After the captives were left shackled for a period in a dungeon, Pratt took their clothes away, had their hair cut, dressed them in army uniforms, and drilled them like soldiers. "Kill the Indian and save the man" was Pratt's motto. This "successful" experiment led Pratt to establish the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Pennsylvania in 1879, the prototype for the many militaristic federal boarding schools set up across the continent soon after, augmented by dozens of Christian missionary boarding schools. The decision to establish Carlisle and other off-reservation boarding schools was made by the US Office of Indian Affairs, later renamed the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). The stated goal of the project was assimilation. Indigenous children were prohibited from speaking their mother tongues or practicing their religions, while being indoctrinated in Christianity. As in the Spanish missions in California, in the US boarding schools the children were beaten for speaking their own languages, among other infractions that expressed their humanity. Although stripped of the languages and skills of their communities, what they learned in boarding school was useless for the purposes of effective assimilation, creating multiple lost generations of traumatized individuals.³⁵

Just before the centennial of US independence, in late June 1876, then-Lieutenant Colonel Custer, commanding 225 soldiers of the Seventh Cavalry, prepared to launch a military assault on the civilians living in a cluster of Sioux and Cheyenne villages that lay along the Little Bighorn River. Led by Crazy Horse and Sitting Bull, the Sioux and Cheyenne warriors were ready for the assault and wiped

out the assailants, including Custer, who after death was promoted to general. The proud author of multiple massacres of Indigenous civilians, starting during the Civil War with his assault on unarmed and reservation-incarcerated Cheyennes on the Washita in Indian Territory, Custer “died for your [colonialist] sins,” in the words of Vine Deloria Jr.³⁶ A year later, Crazy Horse was captured and imprisoned, then killed trying to escape. He was thirty-five years old.

Crazy Horse was a new kind of leader to emerge after the Civil War, at the beginning of the army’s wars of annihilation in the northern plains and the Southwest. Born in 1842 in the shadow of the sacred Paha Sapa (Black Hills), he was considered special, a quiet and brooding child. Already the effects of colonialism were present among his people, particularly alcoholism and missionary influence. Crazy Horse became a part of the Akicita, a traditional Sioux society that kept order in villages and during migrations. It also had authority to make certain that the hereditary chiefs were doing their duty and dealt harshly with those who did not. Increasingly during Crazy Horse’s youth, the primary concern was the immigrant defilement of the Sioux territory. A steady stream of Euro-American migrants clotted the trail to Oregon Territory. Young militant Sioux wished to drive them away, but the Sioux were now dependent on the trail for supplies. In 1849, the army arrived and planted a base, Fort Laramie, in Sioux territory. Sporadic fighting broke out, leading to treaty meetings and agreements, most of which were bogus army documents signed by unauthorized individuals. Crazy Horse was a natural in guerrilla warfare, becoming legendary among his people. Although Crazy Horse and other militants did not approve of the 1868 US treaty with the Sioux, some stability held until Custer’s soldiers found gold in the Black Hills. Then a gold rush was on, with hordes of prospectors from all over converging and running rampant over the Sioux. The treaty had ostensibly been a guarantee that such would not occur. Soon after, the Battle of the Little Bighorn put an end to Custer but not to the invasion.

Indigenous peoples in the West continued to resist, and the soldiers kept hunting them down, incarcerating them, massacring civilians, removing them, and stealing their children to haul off to faraway boarding schools. The Apache, Kiowa, Sioux, Ute, Kick-

apoo, Comanche, Cheyenne, and other nations were attacked, leaving community after community decimated. By the 1890s, although some military assaults on Indigenous communities and valiant Indigenous armed resistance continued, most of the surviving Indigenous refugees were confined to federal reservations, their children transported to distant boarding schools to unlearn their Indigenousness.

GHOST DANCING

Disarmed, held in concentration camps, their children taken away, half starved, the Indigenous peoples of the West found a form of resistance that spread like wildfire in all directions from its source, thanks to a Paiute holy man, Wovoka, in Nevada. Pilgrims journeyed to hear his message and to receive directions on how to perform the Ghost Dance, which promised to restore the Indigenous world as it was before colonialism, making the invaders disappear and the buffalo return. It was a simple dance performed by everyone, requiring only a specific kind of shirt that was to protect the dancers from gunfire. In the twentieth century Sioux anthropologist Ella Deloria interviewed a sixty-year-old Sioux man who remembered the Ghost Dance he had witnessed fifty years before as a boy:

Some fifty of us, little boys about eight to ten, started out across country over hills and valleys, running all night. I know now that we ran almost thirty miles. There on the Porcupine Creek thousands of Dakota people were in camp, all hurrying about very purposefully. In a long sweat lodge with openings at both ends, people were being purified in great companies for the holy dance, men by themselves and women by themselves, of course. . . .

The people, wearing the sacred shirts and feathers, now formed a ring. We were in it. All joined hands. Everyone was respectful and quiet, expecting something wonderful to happen. It was not a glad time, though. All wailed cautiously and in awe, feeling their dead were close at hand.

The leaders beat time and sang as the people danced, going round to the left in a sidewise step. They danced without rest, on and on, and they got out of breath but still they kept going as long as possible. Occasionally someone thoroughly exhausted and dizzy fell unconscious into the center and lay there “dead.” Quickly those on each side of him closed the gap and went right on. After a while, many lay about in that condition. They were now “dead” and seeing their dear ones. As each one came to, she, or he, slowly sat up and looked about, bewildered, and then began wailing inconsolably. . . .

Waking to the drab and wretched present after such a glowing vision, it was little wonder that they wailed as if their poor hearts would break in two with disillusionment. But at least they had seen! The people went on and on and could not stop, day or night, hoping perhaps to get a vision of their own dead, or at least to hear the visions of others. They preferred that to rest or food or sleep. And so I suppose the authorities did think they were crazy—but they weren’t. They were only terribly unhappy.³⁷

When the dancing began among the Sioux in 1890, reservation officials reported it as disturbing and unstoppable. They believed that it had been instigated by Hunkpapa Teton Sioux leader Tatanka Yotanka (Sitting Bull), who had returned with his people in 1881 from exile in Canada. He was put under arrest and imprisoned in his home, closely guarded by Indian police. Sitting Bull was killed by one of his captors on December 15, 1890.

All Indigenous individuals and groups living outside designated federal reservations were considered “fomenters of disturbance,” as the War Department put it. Following Sitting Bull’s death, military warrants of arrest were issued for leaders such as Big Foot, who was responsible for several hundred civilian refugees who had not yet turned themselves in to the designated Pine Ridge Reservation. When Big Foot heard of Sitting Bull’s death and that the army was looking for him and his people—350 Lakotas, 230 of them women and children—he decided to lead them through the subzero weather to Pine Ridge to surrender. En route on foot, they encountered US

troops. The commander ordered that they be taken to the army camp at Wounded Knee Creek, where armed soldiers surrounded them. Two Hotchkiss machine guns were mounted on the hillside, enough firepower to wipe out the whole group. During the night, Colonel James Forsyth and the Seventh Cavalry, Custer's old regiment, arrived and took charge. These soldiers had not forgotten that Lakota relatives of these starving, unarmed refugees had killed Custer and decimated his troops at the Little Bighorn fourteen years earlier. With orders to transport the refugees to a military stockade in Omaha, Forsyth added two more Hotchkiss guns trained on the camp, then issued whiskey to his officers. The following morning, December 29, 1890, the soldiers brought the captive men out from their campsites and called for all weapons to be turned in. Searching tents, soldiers confiscated tools, such as axes and knives. Still not satisfied, the officers ordered skin searches. A Winchester rifle turned up. Its young owner did not want to part with his beloved rifle, and, when the soldiers grabbed him, the rifle fired a shot into the air. The killing began immediately. The Hotchkiss guns began firing a shell a second, mowing down everyone except a few who were able to run fast enough. Three hundred Sioux lay dead. Twenty-five soldiers were killed in "friendly fire."³⁸ Bleeding survivors were dragged into a nearby church. Being Christmastime, the sanctuary was candlelit and decked with greenery. In the front, a banner read: PEACE ON EARTH AND GOOD WILL TO MEN.

The Seventh Cavalry attack on a group of unarmed and starving Lakota refugees attempting to reach Pine Ridge to accept reservation incarceration in the frozen days of December 1890 symbolizes the end of Indigenous armed resistance in the United States. The slaughter is called a battle in US military annals. Congressional Medals of Honor were bestowed on twenty of the soldiers involved. A monument was built at Fort Riley, Kansas, to honor the soldiers killed by friendly fire. A battle streamer was created to honor the event and added to other streamers that are displayed at the Pentagon, West Point, and army bases throughout the world. L. Frank Baum, a Dakota Territory settler later famous for writing *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, edited the *Aberdeen Saturday Pioneer* at the time. Five days after the sickening event at Wounded Knee, on

January 3, 1891, he wrote, "The Pioneer [*sic*] has before declared that our only safety depends upon the total extermination of the Indians. Having wronged them for centuries we had better, in order to protect our civilization, follow it up by one more wrong and wipe these untamed and untamable creatures from the face of the earth."³⁹

Three weeks before the massacre, General Sherman had made clear that he regretted nothing of his three decades of carrying out genocide. In a press conference he held in New York City, he said, "Injins must either work or starve. They never have worked; they won't work now, and they will never work." A reporter asked, "But should not the government supply them with enough to keep them from starvation?" "Why," Sherman asked in reply, "should the government support 260,000 able-bodied campers? No government that the world has ever seen has done such a thing."⁴⁰

The reaction of one young man to Wounded Knee is representative but also extraordinary. Plenty Horses attended the Carlisle school from 1883 to 1888, returning home stripped of his language, facing the dire reality of the genocide of his people, with no traditional or modern means to make a living. He said, "There was no chance to get employment, nothing for me to do whereby I could earn my board and clothes, no opportunity to learn more and remain with the whites. It disheartened me and I went back to live as I had before going to school."⁴¹ Historian Philip Deloria notes: "The greatest threat to the reservation program . . . was the disciplined Indian who refused the gift of civilization and went 'back to the blanket,' as Plenty Horses tried."⁴² But it wasn't simple for Plenty Horses to find his place. As Deloria points out, he had missed the essential period of Lakota education, which takes place between the ages of fourteen and nineteen. Due to his absence and Euro-American influence, he was suspect among his own people, and even that world was disrupted by colonialist chaos and violence. Still, Plenty Horses returned to traditional dress, grew his hair long, and participated in the Ghost Dance. He also joined a band of armed resisters, and they were present at Pine Ridge on December 29, 1890, when the bloody bodies were brought in from the Wounded Knee Massacre. A week later, he went out with forty other mounted warriors who accompanied Sioux leaders to meet Lieutenant Edward Casey for

possible negotiations. The young warriors were angry, none more than Plenty Horses, who pulled out from the group and got behind Casey and shot him in the back of his head.

Army officials had to think twice about charging Plenty Horses with murder. They were faced with the corollary of the recent army massacre at Wounded Knee, in which the soldiers received Congressional Medals of Honor for their deeds. At trial, Plenty Horses was acquitted due to the state of war that existed. Acknowledging a state of war was essential in order to give legal cover to the massacre.

As a late manifestation of military action against Indigenous peoples, Wounded Knee stands out. Deloria notes that in the preceding years, the Indian warrior imagery so prevalent in US American society was being replaced with "docile, pacified Indians started out on the road to civilization."

Luther Standing Bear, for example, recounts numerous occasions on which the Carlisle Indian Industrial School students were displayed as docile and educable Indians. The Carlisle band played at the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge in 1883 and then toured several churches. Students were carted around East Coast cities. Standing Bear himself was placed on display in Wanamaker's Philadelphia department store, locked in a glass cell in the center of the store and set to sorting and pricing jewelry.⁴³

GREED IS GOOD

During the final phase of military conquest of the continent, surviving Indigenous refugees were deposited in Indian Territory, piled on top of each other in smaller and smaller reservations. In 1883, the first of several conferences were held in Mohonk, New York, of a group of influential and wealthy advocates of the "manifest destiny" policy. These self-styled "friends of the Indians" developed a policy of assimilation soon formulated into an act of Congress written by one of their members, Senator Henry Dawes: the General Allotment Act of 1887. Arguing for allotment of collectively held Indigenous

lands, Dawes said: "The defect of the [reservation] system was apparent. It is [socialist] Henry George's system and under that there is no enterprise to make your home any better than that of your neighbors. There is no selfishness, which is at the bottom of civilization. Till this people will consent to give up their lands, and divide among their citizens so that each can own the land he cultivates they will not make much more progress." Although allotment did not create the desired selfishness, it did reduce the overall Indigenous land base by half and furthered both Indigenous impoverishment and US control. In 1889, a part of Indian Territory the federal government called the Unassigned Lands, left over after allotment, was opened to settler homesteading, triggering the "Oklahoma Run."

Oil had been discovered in Indian Territory, but the Dawes Allotment Act could not be applied to the five Indigenous nations removed from the South, because their territories were not technically reservations, rather sovereign nations. In contradiction to the terms of the removal treaties, Congress passed the Curtis Act in 1898, which unilaterally deposed the sovereignty of those nations and mandated allotment of their lands. Indigenous territories were larger than the sum of 160-acre allotments, so the remaining land after distribution was declared surplus and opened to homesteading.

Allotment did not proceed in Indian Territory without fierce resistance. Cherokee traditionalist Redbird Smith rallied his brethren to revive the Keetoowah secret society. Besides direct action, they also sent lawyers to argue before Congress. When they were overriden, they formed a community in the Cookson Hills, refusing to participate in privatization. Similarly, the Muskogee Creeks resisted, led by Chitto Harjo, who was lovingly nicknamed Crazy Snake. He led in the founding of an alternate government, with its capital a settlement they called Hickory Ground. More than five thousand Muskogees were involved. Captured and jailed, when freed Harjo led his people into the woods and carried on the fight for another decade. He was shot by federal troops in 1912, but the legacy of the Crazy Snake resistance remains a strong force in eastern Oklahoma. Muskogee historian Donald Fixico describes a contemporary enclave: "There is a small Creek town in Oklahoma which lies within the Creek Nation. The name of this town is Thlopthlocco. Thlopth-

locco is a small independent community which operates almost independently. They are not very much dependent on the federal government, nor are they dependent on the Creek Nation. So they're kind of a renegade group."⁴⁴

In 1907, Indian Territory was dissolved and the state of Oklahoma entered the Union. Under the Dawes and Curtis Acts, privatization of Indigenous territories was imposed on half of all federal reservations, with a loss of three-fourths of the Indigenous land base that still existed after decades of army attacks and wanton land grabs. Allotment continued until 1934, when it was halted by the Indian Reorganization Act, but the land taken was never restored and its former owners were never compensated for their losses, leaving all the Indigenous people of Oklahoma (except the Osage Nation) without effective collective territories and many families with no land at all.⁴⁵

The Hopi Nation resisted allotment with partial success. In 1894, they petitioned the federal government with a letter signed by every leader and chief of the Hopi villages:

To the Washington Chiefs:

During the last two years strangers have looked over our land with spy-glasses and made marks upon it, and we know but little of what it means. As we believe that you have no wish to disturb our Possessions we want to tell you something about this Hopi land.

None of us were asked that it should be measured into separate lots, and given to individuals for they would cause confusion.

The family, the dwelling house and the field are inseparable, because the woman is the heart of these, and they rest with her. Among us the family traces its kin from the mother, hence all its possessions are hers. The man builds the house but the woman is the owner, because she repairs and preserves it; the man cultivates the field, but he renders its harvest into the woman's keeping, because upon her it rests to prepare the food, and the surplus of stores for barter depends upon her thrift.

A man plants the fields of his wife, and the fields assigned to the children she bears, and informally he calls them his, although in fact they are not. Even of the field which he inherits from his mother, its harvests he may dispose of at will, but the field itself he may not.⁴⁶

The petition continues, explaining the matriarchal communal society and why dividing it up for private ownership would be unthinkable. Washington authorities never replied and the government continued to carve up the lands, finally giving up because of Hopi resistance. In the heart of New Mexico, the nineteen Indigenous city-states of the Pueblo Indians organized resistance under US occupation using the legal system as a means of survival, as they had under Spanish colonialism and in their relationship with the republic of Mexico. In the decades after they had lost their autonomous political status under Mexico and were counted as former Mexican citizens under US law, both Hispanos and Anglo squatters encroached upon the Pueblos' ancestral lands. The only avenue for the Pueblos was to use the US court of private land claims. The following report reflects their status in the eyes of the Anglo-American judiciary:

Occasionally the court room at Santa Fe would be enlivened by a squad of Indians who had journeyed thither from their distant Pueblos as witnesses for their grant. These delegations were usually headed by the governor of their tribe, who exhibited great pride in striding up to the witness stand and being sworn on the holy cross; wearing a badge on his breast, a broad red sash round his waist, and clad in a white shirt, the full tail of which hung about his Antarctic zone like the skirt of a ballet dancer, and underneath which depended his baggy white muslin trousers, a la Chinese washee-washee. The grave and imperturbable bow which the governor gave to the judges on the bench, in recognition of their equality with himself as official dignitaries, arrayed in that grotesque fashion, was enough to evoke a hilarious bray from a dead burro.⁴⁷

Without redress for their collective land rights under the claims court, the Pueblos had no choice but to seek federal Indian trust status. After they lost in their first attempt, finally in 1913 the US Supreme Court reversed the earlier decision and declared the Pueblos wards of the federal government with protected trust status, stating: "They are essentially a simple, uninformed, inferior people."⁴⁸

At the beginning of the twentieth century, sculptor James Earle Fraser unveiled the monumental and iconic sculpture *The End of the Trail*, which he had created exclusively for the triumphal 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco, California. The image of the near naked, exhausted, dying Indian mounted on his equally exhausted horse proclaimed the final solution, the elimination of the Indigenous peoples of the continent. The following year, Ishi, the California Yahi who had been held captive for five years by anthropologists who studied him, died and was proclaimed "the last Indian." Dozens of other popular images of "the vanishing Indian" were displayed during this period. The film industry soon kicked in, and Indians were killed over and over on screens viewed by millions of children, including Indian girls and boys.

With utter military triumph on the continent, the United States then set out to dominate the world, but the Indigenous peoples remained and persisted as the "American Century" proceeded.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION: THIS LAND

Epigraph: Willie Johns, "A Seminole Perspective on Ponce de León and Florida History," *Forum Magazine* (Florida Humanities Council), Fall 2012, <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2013/04/08/seminole-perspective-ponce-de-leon-and-florida-history-148672> (accessed September 24, 2013).

1. The full refrain of Woody Guthrie's most popular song: "This land is your land / This land is my land / From California to the New York island / From the redwood forest to the Gulf Stream waters / This land was made for you and me."
2. Henry Crow Dog, testimony at the 1974 Sioux Treaty hearing, in Dunbar-Ortiz, *Great Sioux Nation*, 54.
3. Chang, *Color of the Land*, 7.
4. Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism," 387.
5. See Watson, *Buying America from the Indians*, and Robertson, *Conquest by Law*. For a list and description of each papal bull, see *The Doctrine of Discovery*, <http://www.doctrineofdiscovery.org> (accessed November 5, 2013).
6. Williams, *American Indian in Western Legal Thought*, 59.
7. Stewart, *Names on the Land*, 169–73, 233, 302.
8. Sheehan, "Indian-White Relations in Early America," 267–96.
9. Killback, "Indigenous Perceptions of Time," 131.
10. Turner, *Frontier in American History*, 127.
11. "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Paris, 9 December 1948," Audiovisual Library of International Law, <http://untreaty.un.org/cod/avl/ha/cppcg/cppcg.html> (accessed December 6, 2012). See also Kunz, "United Nations Convention on Genocide."
12. O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting*.
13. April 17, 1873, quoted in Marszalek, *Sherman*, 379.
14. Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism," 393.
15. 18 U.S.C. § 1151 (2001).
16. Echo-Hawk, *In the Courts of the Conqueror*, 77–78.
17. "Tribes," US Department of the Interior website, <http://www.doi.gov/tribes/index.cfm> (accessed September 24, 2013); "Indian Reservation,"

New World Encyclopedia, http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Indian_reservation (accessed September 24, 2013). See also Frantz, *Indian Reservations in the United States*.

CHAPTER ONE: FOLLOW THE CORN

Epigraph: Mann, 1491, 252.

1. Ibid., 264.
2. Dobyns, *Native American Historical Demography*, 1; Dobyns, "Estimating Aboriginal American Population," and "Reply," 440–44. See also Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival*.
3. Quoted in Vogel, *American Indian Medicine*, 253–55. Vogel's classic text deals with every aspect of Indigenous medicine from shamanistic practices and pharmaceuticals to hygiene, surgery, and dentistry, applied to specific diseases and ailments.
4. Fiedel, *Prehistory of the Americas*, 305.
5. DiPeso, "Casas Grandes and the Gran Chichimeca," 50; Snow, "Prehistoric Southwestern Turquoise Industry," 33. DiPeso calls the area in the north "Gran Chichimeca," a term used by precolonial Mesoamericans and adopted by early Spanish explorers. Another term used in precolonial times in the south to describe the former homeland of the Aztecs is "Aztlán."
6. DiPeso, "Casas Grandes and the Gran Chichimeca," 52; Snow, "Prehistoric Southwestern Turquoise Industry," 35, 38, 43–44, 47.
7. Cox, *The Red Land to the South*, 8–12.
8. For further reading on the precolonial Southwest, see Crown and Judge, *Chaco & Hohokam*.
9. Ortiz, *Roots of Resistance*, 18–30. See also Forbes, *Apache, Navaho, and Spaniard*; Carter, *Indian Alliances and the Spanish in the Southwest*.
10. Davidson, "Black Carib Habitats in Central America."
11. Mann, 1491, 254–57.
12. The material that follows is based on Denevan, "The Pristine Myth."
13. For the influence of the Iroquois Confederacy on the architects of the US Constitution, see Johansen, *The Forgotten Founders*.
14. Lyons, a professor at the State University of New York at Buffalo, says that when the American colonists borrowed from the Haudenosaunee system in forming the US government, they neglected to include the spirit world, and thus began the problems that beset US government today.
15. See Miller, *Coacoochee's Bones*, 1–12.
16. Mann, 1491, 332.
17. Thomas Morton, quoted in *ibid.*, 250.
18. *Ibid.*, 251–52.
19. See David Wade Chambers, "Native American Road Systems and Trails," Udemy, <http://www.udemy.com/lectures/unit-4-native-american-road->

5. See Zacks, *Pirate Coast*; and Boot, *Savage Wars of Peace*, 3–29.
6. Blackhawk, *Violence over the Land*, 145–75.
7. Pike, *Expeditions of Zebulon Montgomery Pike*. Coues, Pike's editor, characterized the expedition's straying into Spanish territory and his arrest as "a particular accident of a general design" (499). See also Owsley and Smith, *Filibusters and Expansionists*.
8. See Unrau, *Indians, Alcohol, and the Roads to Taos and Santa Fe*.
9. Pike, *Expeditions*, 499; Blackhawk, *Violence over the Land*, 117.
10. See Weber, *Taos Trappers*.
11. Dunbar-Ortiz, *Roots of Resistance*, 80; see also Hall, *Laws of Mexico*.
12. See Sides, *Blood and Thunder*, 92–101; Chaffin, *Pathfinder*, 33–35.
13. Holton, *Unruly Americans and the Origins of the Constitution*, 14.
14. Lamar, *Far Southwest*, 7–10.
15. See Vlasich, *Pueblo Indian Agriculture*.
16. See Sando and Agoyo, *Po'Pay*; Wilcox, *Pueblo Revolt and the Mythology of Conquest*; Dunbar-Ortiz, *Roots of Resistance*, 31–45; Carter, *Indian Alliances and the Spanish in the Southwest*.
17. Anderson, *Conquest of Texas*, 4, 18–29. See also "4th Largest Tribe in US? Mexicans Who Call Themselves American Indian," *Indian Country Today*, August 5, 2013, <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/> (accessed September 27, 2013).
18. Anderson, *Conquest of Texas*, 18–29. For a fascinating and historically accurate fictional account of Texas's independence from Mexico, see Russell, *Escape from Texas*.
19. See Anderson, *Conquest of Texas*. For the Texas Rangers' continuation of their counterinsurgent role in the twentieth century, see Johnson, *Revolution in Texas*; Harris and Sadler, *Texas Rangers and the Mexican Revolution*.
20. Tinker, *Missionary Conquest*, 42.
21. For documentation of California Indian resistance, see Jackson and Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization*, 73–86.
22. Murguía, *Medicine of Memory*, 40–41.
23. See Heizer, *Destruction of California Indians*. See also Cook, *Population of the California Indians*.
24. See Johannsen, *To the Halls of the Montezumas*.
25. See Kiser, *Dragoons in Apacheland*.

CHAPTER EIGHT: "INDIAN COUNTRY"

Epigraph: Ortiz, *from Sand Creek*, 20.

1. "Selected Statistics on Slavery in the United States," *Causes of the Civil War*, <http://www.civilwarcauses.org/stat.htm> (accessed December 10, 2013).

2. Chang, *Color of the Land*, 36.
3. See Confer, *Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*; Spencer, *American Civil War in the Indian Territory*; McLoughlin, *After the Trail of Tears*.
4. See Katz, *Black Indians*; Duvall, Jacob, and Murray, *Secret History of the Cherokees*.
5. See Wilson and Schommer, *Remember This!*; Wilson, *In the Footsteps of Our Ancestors*; Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 261–81; Anderson, *Little Crow*.
6. From Charles Eastman, *Indian Boyhood* (1902), quoted in Nabokov, *Native American Testimony*, 22.
7. West, *Contested Plains*, 300–301.
8. Ortiz, *from Sand Creek*, 41.
9. See Kelman, *Misplaced Massacre*.
10. From A. N. Ellis, “Reflections of an Interview with Cochise,” *Kansas State Historical Society* 13 (1913–14), quoted in Nabokov, *Native American Testimony*, 177.
11. Uteley, *Indian Frontier of the American West*, 82. Also see Carleton, *Prairie Logbooks*, 3–152.
12. From *Condition of the Indian Tribes*, Senate Report no. 156, 39th Cong., 2nd sess. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1867), quoted in Nabokov, *Native American Testimony*, 197–98.
13. See Denetdale, *Long Walk*; and Denetdale, *Reclaiming Diné History*.
14. See Gates, *History of Public Land Law Development*.
15. For a booster version of the relationship between the land acts and colonization, see Hyman, *American Singularity*.
16. White, “*It’s Your Misfortune and None of My Own*,” 139.
17. Westphall, *Public Domain in New Mexico*, 43.
18. See White, *Railroaded*.
19. This is the total number of treaties signed by both parties, ratified by the US Congress, and proclaimed by US presidents. Many more treaties negotiated between the United States and Indigenous nations and signed by the president were not ratified by Congress, or if ratified were not proclaimed, the California Indigenous peoples’ treaties being the most numerous, so there are actually around six hundred treaties that are considered legitimate by the Indigenous nations concerned. See Deloria, *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties*; Deloria and DeMallie, *Documents of American Indian Diplomacy*; Johansen, *Enduring Legacies*.
20. See 16 Stat. 566, Rev. Stat. Sec. 2079; 25 U.S. Code Sec. 71.
21. Hanson, *Memory and Vision*, 211.
22. From Marriott and Rachlin, *American Indian Mythology*, quoted in Nabokov, *Native American Testimony*, 174–75.
23. Parish, *Charles Ilfeld Company*, 35.

24. Sherman to Grant, May 28, 1867, quoted in Fellman, *Citizen Sherman*, 264.
25. Sherman to Herbert A. Preston, April 17, 1873, quoted in Marszalek, *Sherman*, 379.
26. See Utley, *Cavalier in Buckskin*, 57–103.
27. See Hahn, *Nation under Our Feet*.
28. See Enloe, *Ethnic Soldiers*.
29. Stanford L. Davis, “Buffalo Soldiers & Indian Wars,” Buffalosoldier.net, <http://www.buffalosoldier.net/index.htm> (accessed September 30, 2013).
30. Jace Weaver, “A Lantern to See By,” 315; see also Enloe, *Ethnic Soldiers*.
31. Bob Marley, “Buffalo Soldier,” by Bob Marley and Noel G. Williams, recorded 1980, on *Confrontation*, Island Records, 90085-1, 1983.
32. See Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native.”
33. Sandoz, *Cheyenne Autumn*.
34. See Williams, *Empire as a Way of Life*.
35. Child, *Boarding School Seasons*; also see Christine Lesiak, director, “In the White Man’s Image,” *The American Experience*, season four, episode twelve (PBS, 1992).
36. Deloria, *Custer Died for Your Sins*.
37. From Deloria, *Speaking of Indians*, quoted in Nabokov, *Native American Testimony*, 253–55.
38. See Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*; Coleman, *Voices of Wounded Knee*.
39. L. F. Baum, “Editorials on the Sioux Nation,” University of Oxford History of Science, Medicine, and Technology website, http://hsmt.history.ox.ac.uk/courses_reading/undergraduate/authority_of_nature/week_7/baum.pdf.
40. Quoted in Vizenor, *Native Liberty*, 143–44.
41. Quoted in Utley, “The Ordeal of Plenty Horses,” 16.
42. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places*, 28.
43. *Ibid.*, 35–36.
44. From *New Directions in Indian Purpose*, quoted in Nabokov, *Native American Testimony*, 421.
45. See Chang, *Color of the Land*. For well-documented details on widespread corruption involved in using allotment to dispose of the lands of the Native nations and individual Indian allotment holders in Oklahoma, see Debo, *And Still the Waters Run*.
46. From Deloria, *Speaking of Indians*, quoted in Nabokov, *Native American Testimony*, 249.
47. Stone, “Report on the Court of Private Land Claims.”
48. “United States v. Sandoval,” 28. See also Dunbar-Ortiz, *Roots of Resistance*, 114–18.

CHAPTER NINE: US TRIUMPHALISM AND PEACETIME COLONIALISM

Epigraph 1: Theodore Roosevelt, “The Expansion of the White Races,” address at the Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, DC, January 18, 1909, in “Two Essays by Theodore Roosevelt,” *Modern American Poetry*, English Department, University of Illinois, http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/a_f/espada/roosevelt.htm (accessed December 10, 2013), from Roosevelt, *American Problems*. See also *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*, memorial ed., *North American Review* 15 (1890).

Epigraph 2: Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*, 419. See also Black Elk and Neihardt, *Black Elk Speaks*.

1. Williams, *Empire as a Way of Life*, 73–76, 102–10. Marshall Islands regained full sovereignty in 1986.
2. See Kinzer, *Overthrow*.
3. For photographs and documents, see Arnaldo Dumindin, *Philippine-American War, 1899–1902*, <http://philippineamericanwar.webs.com> (accessed October 1, 2013).
4. Kaplan, *Imperial Grunts*, 138. On early US imperialism overseas, see Immerman, *Empire for Liberty*; Zacks, *Pirate Coast*.
5. From *Condition of the Indian Tribes*, quoted in Nabokov, *Native American Testimony*, 194–95.
6. Silbey, *War of Frontier and Empire*, 211.
7. Williams, “United States Indian Policy and the Debate over Philippine Annexation.”
8. See Kuzmarov, *Modernizing Repression*.
9. See Womack and Dunbar-Ortiz, “Dreams of Revolution: Oklahoma, 1917.”
10. See Eisenhower, *Intervention!*
11. Miner, *Corporation and the Indian*, xi.
12. *Ibid.*, xiv.
13. *Ibid.*, 10.
14. *Ibid.*, 19.
15. From “Address of Robert Spott,” *Commonwealth* 21, no. 3 (1926), quoted in Nabokov, *Native American Testimony*, 315–16.
16. See Ifill, *On the Courthouse Lawn*.
17. McGerr, *Fierce Discontent*, 305.
18. See Philip, *John Collier’s Crusade for Indian Reform*; Kelly, *Assault on Assimilation*.
19. Blackman, *Oklahoma’s Indian New Deal*.
20. Aberle, *Peyote Religion Among the Navaho*, 53.
21. See Lamphere, *To Run After Them*.
22. Navajo Community College, *Navajo Livestock Reduction*, 47.

23. See Drinnon, *Keeper of Concentration Camps*. Some of the Japanese concentration camps were built on Native reservations.
24. Myer quoted in *ibid.*, 235.
25. See Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America*.
26. House Concurrent Resolution 108, 1953, *Digital History*, http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/dispatch_textbook.cfm?smtid=3&psid=726 (accessed October 1, 2013). See also Getches, Wilkinson, and Williams, *Cases and Materials on Federal Indian Law*; Wilkinson, *Blood Struggle*. For a survey of federal Indian policy, see O'Brien, *American Indian Tribal Governments*, 84–85.
27. See Zinn, *People's History of the United States*, 420–28.
28. Kinzer, *Overthrow*, 111–47.

CHAPTER TEN: GHOST DANCE PROPHECY

Epigraph 1: “Sioux Ghost Dance Song Lyrics,” documented and translated by James Mooney in 1894, *Ghost Dance*, <http://www.ghostdance.com/songs/songs-lyricssioux.html> (accessed December 10, 2013).

Epigraph 2: Quoted in Zinn, *People's History of the United States*, 525.

1. Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation*, 1–2.
2. *Ibid.*, 3.
3. “Blue Lake,” *Taos Pueblo*, <http://www.taospueblo.com/blue-lake> (accessed October 2, 2013).
4. From the statement of James E. Snead, president of the Santa Fe Wildlife and Conservation Association, “Taos Indians—Blue Lake,” in “Hearings before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, 91st Congress, 2nd Session (September 19–20, 1968),” in *Primitive Law—United States Congressional Documents*, vol. 9, pt. 1 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1968), 216.
5. For the senators’ arguments against the return of Blue Lake, see “Pueblo de Taos Indians Cultural and Ceremonial Shrine Protection Act of 1970,” *Proceedings and Debates of the 91st Congress, 2nd Session (December 2, 1970)*, *Congressional Record* 116, pt. 29, 39, 587, 589–90, 594. Nielson, “American Indian Land Claims,” 324. The senators on the subcommittee were concerned about the Alianza Federal de Mercedes (later renamed the Alianza Federal de Pueblos Libres), formed in 1963 to pressure the federal government for reconsideration of land-grant settlements and the loss of the commons. The organization claimed that colonialism had robbed resources, depopulated communities in northern New Mexico, and impoverished the people. The Alianza was composed of many poor land-grant heirs and was identified primarily with a Texas-born Mexican, Reies López Tijerina. In June 1967, the National Guard was dispatched with tanks, helicopters, and infantry to Rio Arriba County in search of the agrarian Mexican rebels who had participated in the “Courthouse Raid” at Tierra Amarilla.

The incident and the government's response briefly focused national and international attention on northern New Mexico, and the land-grant issue, which had been resolved in the courts over sixty years before, once again became a live issue.

Several federal Spanish and Mexican land-grant cases have been brought in federal courts, one to the Supreme Court in 1952 that was denied a hearing: *Martínez v. Rivera*, 196 Fed. 2nd 192 (Circuit Court of Appeals, 10th Circuit, April 16, 1952). In 2001, following more than a century of struggle by Hispanic land grantees who were deprived of most of their landholdings after the United States occupied New Mexico in 1848, the US General Accounting Office began a study of the New Mexico land grants. The GAO issued its final report in 2004, but no action has yet ensued. US General Accounting Office, *Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo*.

6. Cobb, *Native American Activism in Cold War America*, 58–61. For a full history of the NIYC, which still thrives, see Shreve, *Red Power Rising*.
7. Quoted in Zinn, *People's History of the United States*, 516–17.
8. Cobb, *Native American Activism in Cold War America*, 157.
9. Mantler, *Power of the Poor*.
10. Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane*, 28–29.
11. *Ibid.*, 29–30.
12. On the founding of the American Indian Movement, see *ibid.*, 114–15, and Waterman and Bancroft, *We Are Still Here*.
13. Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane*, 111.
14. “Trail of Broken Treaties 20-Point Position Paper,” *American Indian Movement*, <http://www.aimovement.org/ggc/trailofbrokentreaties.html> (accessed December 10, 2013).
15. Robert A. Trennert, *Alternative to Extinction: Federal Indian Policy and the Beginnings of the Reservation System, 1846–51* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1975), 166.
16. See testimony of Pat McLaughlin, chairman of the Standing Rock Sioux government, Fort Yates, ND (May 8, 1976), at hearings of the American Indian Policy Review Commission, established by Congress in the act of January 3, 1975.
17. See Philip, *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform*.
18. King quoted in Dunbar-Ortiz, *The Great Sioux Nation*, 156.
19. For a lucid discussion of neocolonialism in relation to American Indians and the reservation system, see Jorgensen, *Sun Dance Religion*, 89–146.
20. There is continuous migration from reservations to cities and border towns and back to the reservations, so that half the Indian population at any time is away from the reservation. Generally, however, relocation is not permanent and resembles migratory labor more than permanent relocation. This conclusion is based on my personal observations and on unpublished studies of the Indigenous populations in the San Francisco Bay area and Los Angeles.

21. The American Indian Movement convened a meeting in June 1974 that founded the International Indian Treaty Council (IITC), receiving consultative status in the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in February 1977. The IITC participated in the UN Conference on Desertification in Buenos Aires, March 1977, and made presentations to the UN Human Rights Commission in August 1977 and in February and August 1978. It also led the organizing for the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) Conference on Indigenous Peoples of the Americas, held at UN headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, in September 1977; participated in the World Conference on Racism in Basel, Switzerland, in May 1978; and participated in establishing the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations, the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, and the 2007 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. See Echo-Hawk, *In The Light of Justice*; see also Deloria, *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties*.
22. Herr, *Dispatches*, 45.
23. Zinn, *People's History of the United States*, 521.
24. Ellen Knickmeyer, "Troops Have Pre-Combat Meal, War Dance," Associated Press, March 19, 2003, http://www.myplainview.com/article_9c595368-42db-50b3-9647-a8d4486bff28.html.
25. Grenier, *First Way of War*, 223–24.

CHAPTER 11: THE DOCTRINE OF DISCOVERY

Epigraph 1: McNickle, *The Surrounded*, 49.

Epigraph 2: Vizenor, "Constitutional Consent," 11.

1. The author was present at the proceedings.
2. See Watson, *Buying America from the Indians*; and Robertson, *Conquest by Law*.
3. Miller, "International Law of Colonialism." See also Deloria, *Of Utmost Good Faith*, 6–39; Newcomb, *Pagans in the Promised Land*.
4. Eleventh Session, United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, <http://social.un.org/index/IndigenousPeoples/UNPFIIISessions/Eleventh.aspx> (accessed October 3, 2013).
5. "International: Quakers Repudiate the Doctrine of Discovery," August 17, 2012, Indigenous Peoples Issues and Resources, <http://indigenouspeoplesissues.com/> (accessed October 3, 2013). See also "The Doctrine of Discovery," <http://www.doctrineofdiscovery.org/> (accessed October 3, 2013).
6. "The Doctrine of Discovery: 2012 Responsive Resolution," Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, <http://www.uua.org/statements/statements/209123.shtml> (accessed October 3, 2013).
7. Vincent Warren, "Government Calls Native American Resistance of 1800s 'Much Like Modern-Day Al-Qaeda,'" *Truthout*, April 11, 2011, <http://truth-out.org/news/item/330-government-calls-native-american-resistance-of-1800s-much-like-modern-day-alqaeda> (accessed October 3, 2013).

8. Sharon H. Venne, "What Is the Meaning of Sovereignty," Indigenous Women's Network, June 18, 2007, <http://indigenouswomen.org/> (accessed November 11, 2013).
9. Sanchez, *Treaty Council News*, 12.
10. See Dunbar-Ortiz, *Indians of the Americas*; Dunbar-Ortiz, *Roots of Resistance*, chapter 7, "Land, Indigenousness, Identity, and Self-Determination."
11. Killsback, "Indigenous Perceptions of Time," 150–51.
12. UN Commission on Human Rights, Sub-commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, 51st sess., *Human Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Study on Treaties, Agreements and Other Constructive Arrangements between States and Indigenous Populations: Final Report*, by Miguel Alfonso Martínez, special rapporteur, June 22, 1999, UN Document E/CN.4/Sub.2/1999/20. See also *Report of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations on Its Seventeenth Session, 26–30 July 1999*, UN Document E/CN.4/Sub.2/1999/20, August 12, 1999.
13. Rob Capriccioso, "Cobell Concludes with the Rich Getting Richer," *Indian Country Today*, June 27, 2011, <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/> (accessed October 3, 2013). See also "Indian Trust Settlement" (the *Cobell v. Salazar* settlement website), <http://www.indiantrust.com/> (accessed October 3, 2013); and Jodi Rave, "Milestone in Cobell Indian Trust Case," *High Country News*, July 25, 2011, <http://www.hcn.org/issues/43.12/milestone-in-cobell-indian-trust-case> (accessed October 3, 2013).
14. Wilkinson, "Afterword," 468–69.
15. For the history of the establishment of Mount Rushmore as a national monument in the illegally taken Black Hills, see Larner, *Mount Rushmore*; and Taliaferro, *Great White Fathers*. For a history of the American Indian Movement, see Smith and Warrior, *Like a Hurricane*; and Wittstock and Bancroft, *We Are Still Here*. See also AIM-WEST, <http://aimwest.info/> (accessed October 3, 2013). On the International Indian Treaty Council, see Dunbar-Ortiz, *Indians of the Americas*; Dunbar-Ortiz, *Blood on the Border*; and the IITC website, <http://www.treatycouncil.org/> (accessed October 3, 2013).
16. "For Great Sioux Nation, Black Hills Can't Be Bought for \$1.3 Billion," PBS *NewsHour*, August 24, 2011, video and transcript at http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/social_issues/july-dec11/blackhills_08-24.html (accessed October 3, 2013).
17. See Dunbar-Ortiz, *Economic Development in American Indian Reservations*.
18. See Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development, *State of the Native Nations*.
19. See Light and Rand, *Indian Gaming and Tribal Sovereignty*.
20. Hedges, *Days of Destruction, Days of Revolt*, 1–58.

21. Vine Deloria Jr. speaking in PBS *Frontline* documentary *In the Spirit of Crazy Horse* (1990).
22. Lurie, "World's Oldest On-Going Protest Demonstration."
23. Poverty and class analysis can be accomplished without obliterating the particular effects of colonialism, as Alyosha Goldstein brilliantly demonstrated in *Poverty in Common*, with a chapter titled "On the Internal Border: Colonial Difference and the Locations of Underdevelopment," in which he treats Native nations and Puerto Rico with reference to sovereignty status and collective experiences of colonialism in addition to capitalism. Goldstein, *Poverty in Common*, 77-110.
24. For an excellent summary of testimonies, see Smith, "Forever Changed," 57-82.
25. From Embree, *Indians of the Americas*, quoted in Nabokov, *Native American Testimony*, 222.
26. See McBeth, *Ethnic Identity and the Boarding School Experience*, 105. See also Broker, *Night Flying Woman*, 93-94.
27. Yvonne Leif, *All Things Considered*, National Public Radio, October 14, 1991.
28. Roger Buffalohead, *All Things Considered*, National Public Radio, October 14, 1991.
29. Haig-Brown, *Resistance and Renewal*, 75.
30. Knockwood, *Out of the Depths*, 138.
31. Alfred, *Peace, Power, and Righteousness*, xii.
32. Smith, "Native American Feminism, Sovereignty and Social Change," 132; Smith, *Conquest*. See also Erdrich, *The Round House*. In this 2012 National Book Award winner for fiction, Erdrich, who is Anishinaabe from North Dakota, writes of the circumstances on reservations that allow for extreme sexual violence.
33. Amnesty International USA, *Maze of Injustice*.
34. Wilkins, "Sovereignty, Democracy, Constitution," 7.
35. Dennison, *Colonial Entanglement*, 197.
36. Vizenor and Doerfler, *White Earth Nation*, 63.
37. *Ibid.*, 11.

CONCLUSION: THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Epigraph: Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, 122-23.

1. For a magisterial study, see Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation*.
2. Kaplan, *Imperial Grunts*.
3. Grenier, *First Way of War*, 10.
4. Kaplan, *Imperial Grunts*, 3-5.
5. *Ibid.*, 6.
6. *Ibid.*, 8, 10.

7. Ibid., 10.
8. Ibid., 7–8.
9. Hoxie, *Encyclopedia of North American Indians*, 319.
10. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, 226–28.
11. Agamben, *Homo Sacer*.
12. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, 226–27.
13. *The Modoc Indian Prisoners*, 14 Op. Att’y Gen. 252 (1873), quoted in John C. Yoo, *Memorandum for William J. Haynes II, General Counsel of the Department of Defense*, March 14, 2003, p. 7. Quoted in Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, 227.
14. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, 227.
15. Vine, *Island of Shame*, 2.
16. Kissinger quoted in *ibid.*, 15.
17. Ibid., 15–16.
18. LaDuke, *Militarization of Indian Country*, xvi.
19. Interview with Cynthia Enloe, “Militarization, Feminism, and the International Politics of Banana Boats,” *Theory Talk*, no. 48, May 22, 2012, <http://www.theory-talks.org/2012/05/theory-talk-48.html> (accessed October 4, 2013). See also Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases*.
20. Grenier, *First Way of War*, 222.
21. Price, *Weaponizing Anthropology*, 1, 11.
22. Stone and Kuznick, *Untold History of the United States*, xii; *The Untold History of the United States*, TV series, Showtime, 2012. An interesting aside to the question of lack of national health care is that only two sectors of US society actually have national health care, with no private insurer participating: war veterans and Native Americans.
23. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, xii–xiv.
24. Ibid., 123; Cook-Lynn, *New Indians, Old Wars*, 204.
25. Razack, *Dark Threats and White Knights*, 10.
26. For understanding the limitations of these initiatives regarding Indigenous self-determination, see Forbes, *Native Americans and Nixon*.
27. Hardt and Negri, *Commonwealth*; the first two volumes in their trilogy are *Empire* (2000) and *Multitude* (2005). Other writers calling for a “commons” include, most notably, Linebaugh, *Magna Carta Manifesto*, and theorists associated with the Midnight Notes Collective and the Retort Collective.
28. Sharma and Wright, “Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States.”
29. Lorraine Le Camp, unpublished paper, 1998, quoted in Bonita Lawrence and Enaskshi Dua, *Social Justice* 32, no. 4 (2005): 132.
30. Cook-Lynn, *Why I Can’t Read Wallace Stegner and Other Essays*, 88.
31. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, 205.
32. Johansen, *Debating Democracy*, 275.

33. See McKeown, *In the Smaller Scope of Conscience*.
34. Thomas, *Skull Wars*, 88.
35. Erik Davis, "Bodies Politic: Fetishization, Identity, and the Indigenous Dead," unpublished paper, 2010.
36. Asutru Folk Assembly statement, quoted in Downey, *Riddle of the Bones*, xxii.
37. *Ibid.*, 11.
38. Davis, "Bodies Politic."
39. Silverberg, *Mound Builders of Ancient America*, 57.
40. Gómez-Quiñones, *Indigenous Quotient*, 13.
41. Ortiz, *from Sand Creek*, 86.