

Book Review

Adrea Lawrence. *Lessons from an Indian Day School: Negotiating Colonization in Northern New Mexico, 1902–1907*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2011. 309 pp. Cloth \$34.95.

Adrea Lawrence's book engages two main bodies of scholarship: federal Indian school histories, which are too numerous to mention here; and histories of federal Indian service administration, which are fewer in number but published recently, including Donald L. Fixico's 2012 *Bureau of Indian Affairs* and Cathleen Cahill's 2011 *Federal Fathers and Mothers: A Social History of the United States Indian Service, 1869–1933*. Lawrence's book bridges these two groups of studies to some extent. While emphasizing that Indian "day schools are untapped settings" (p. 209) for exploring the history of colonization and socialization of American Indians, she explains that her study is not focused on the school itself but on the many places outside the classroom where learning occurred, not only among Pueblo Indians of northern New Mexico, but also federal bureaucrats charged with "civilizing" them via federal land and education programs. The book examines this subject via two Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) administrators—Clara D. True, the primary teacher of the Santa Clara Pueblo Indian Day School, and Clinton J. Crandall, a regional BIA administrator as well as superintendent of the Santa Fe Indian School. Focusing on their correspondence between 1902 and 1907, Lawrence finds that True and Crandall shared not only the paternalist mentalities of their time, but also, given what they learned about Indian ways and mores, sought to protect Pueblo interests, and thus they complicated the government's mission of assimilation.

Lawrence, an associate professor in the School of Education, Teaching, and Health at American University, contests mainstream interpretations of "education" and "learning." She employs the methodologies of historian Bernard Bailyn, who argued that education is "the entire process by which a culture transmits itself across a generation," and historian Richard Storr, who called for scholars to, in Lawrence's words, "search broadly and inductively for evidence of learning, avoiding a cogent definition of 'education.'" (pp. 172, 11) And she embraces John Dewey's idea that "educative" processes generate learning skills in elaborating a "multigenerational construction of an educational toolkit" that Pueblos employed to understand and navigate the politics and pressures of colonization (p. 195).

She elucidates the lessons colonizers and colonized learned in five thematic chapters: Land, Disease, Citizenship, Institutions, and

Education. Only the last two cover specific educational practices in the federal Indian school system. But each of the chapters illustrate the ways in which True and Crandall came to learn about the Pueblo social, cultural, and political world and Pueblos learned to contest BIA authority; although principally interested in the years 1902–1907, Lawrence provides historical background on Pueblo relationships with Spanish authorities, land disputes, and cultural resistance from the 1600s to the early twentieth century to help explain how the Pueblo learned, across generations, to mediate the coercive assimilation campaigns that culminated in the United States “civilization program” of the late nineteenth century. Lawrence argues that such learning found expression in the “savvy negotiations” of leaders in the All Pueblos Council, which defended the Pueblos’ land base in fighting an important delinquent tax case and in pushing for a federally recognized reservation that Congress approved in 1905 (p. 191).

Lawrence acknowledges that her sources for Pueblo perspectives were very limited. She had to glean their views from the True and Crandall correspondence that serves as her primary source base. Given such limitations, she offers what she calls “glances” and “glimpses” of Pueblo attitudes; her employment of photos, however, supports the text well and gives us a portrait of the Pueblo people in various guises. The book has other weaknesses, structural and stylistic. Her tendency to go back and forth between explaining Pueblo history and her main subject (Pueblo–federal relations between 1902 and 1907) creates a jumpy narrative that repeats previously covered topics such as the establishment of the Pueblo reservation. She also repeats various phrases and titles: “By the time Crandall was superintendent;” “superintendent of the Santa Fe Indian School and acting agent for the Northern Pueblos District” (pp. 108–9); and others. In her final chapter, Lawrence repeats several passages from the introduction, including this lengthy one characterizing learning for Anglos, Hispanos, and Pueblos: “it was social and communicative; it was structured through individuals’ and groups’ interactive experiences and the meaning they created around them” (pp. 12, 173). This repetition is one problem with the writing, the other being her use of too many block quotes of long passages from correspondence and official reports. In addition, she excessively cites the work of other scholars, especially historians and anthropologists; although it is valuable to draw on other scholars’ work, her constant references to Historian X or Anthropologist Y disrupts her narrative and qualifies her analytical voice. I also found that her “Conclusion” section in each chapter summarized key issues rather than offered new insights. And at times, Lawrence’s “microhistory” approach bogs down with too much detail; several tangential sections add nothing to

the book, in particular “Travels to the Land of the Turquoise Sky” (pp. 186–95).

Lawrence is right to claim that histories of Indian day schools are needed to complement the numerous studies of off-reservation boarding schools. Because Lawrence “leav[es] classroom learning and behavior in the shadows,” scholars interested in Indian students’ experiences and perspectives will find this study of little value (p. 11); the book’s title seems misplaced, even as it points to her theme of how the school produced “lessons” to non-Indians as well as to Indians. But the book does offer some interesting coverage of Indian–white relations, at a particular place and time, and will benefit scholars of the Indian service and of Pueblo history and politics. It considers the work and words of federal bureaucrats who did not blindly follow BIA education policies codified in its *Course of Study for the Indian Schools of the United States* and who defended, at times, the interests of the Pueblo people as a result of those “lessons” learned. And she emphasizes the expansive and creative ways in which the Pueblo people adapted to colonization across centuries of Spanish and American attempts to eliminate customs tied to sacred Pueblo geographies. The book will also appeal to education scholars interested in the use of ideas of Storr, Dewey, and Bailyn within an ethnohistorical frame.

VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY

PAUL C. ROSIER