laudatory at times; there is scarce evidence that Wells had any enemies or even serious critics. Given Wells's long record of significant accomplishment, it might be expected that he would have faced strong resistance, especially when advancing often unpopular causes such as racial equality. As portrayed, however, Wells's genial character allowed him to effect even dramatic change with relative ease. Capshew clearly establishes that Wells's personality and ability to work with a wide variety of people were essential to his accomplishments, but more detail on precisely how he achieved so much would have been welcome.

Furthermore, because Wells's most notable successes occurred in the postwar era, a time of increased enrollment and resources and general confidence in higher education, his achievements were facilitated by his context. While Capshew does provide some contextual details, these are not always adequate to fully account for, and situate, Wells's accomplishments. At times, it reads as a "great man in history" narrative. Given this, those who are unfamiliar with the period may find it helpful to accompany a reading of *Herman B. Wells* with more general works on the era. Regardless of such criticism, it is nevertheless clear that Wells did indeed possess a level of greatness. Through his energy, vision, and skill he helped transform IU into a modern and comprehensive research university, one whose reach extended beyond Bloomington and its state. In this respect, Capshew's *Herman B. Wells*—university builder—contributes to the larger story of twentieth-century higher education.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE GARETT GIETZEN

John R. Gram. *Education at the Edge of Empire: Negotiating Pueblo Identity in New Mexico's Indian Boarding Schools*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2015. 242 pp. Cloth $45.00.

"[T]he Pueblos are still Pueblos" (p. 173). So concludes John R. Gram in his first book, *Education at the Edge of Empire*. Gram's claim might, at first read, seem simplistic and obvious, but it is neither of those things. Rather, it asserts that the United States government and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) lost their campaign to force and entice the wholesale conversion of American Indian children from the cultures of their home communities to that of Euroamericans. Gram evidences this assertion through his comparative analysis of the Albuquerque and Santa Fe Indian schools in New Mexico in the fifty years enveloping the turn of the twentieth century. He argues that the U.S. government

https://doi.org/10.1111/hoeq.12162 Published online by Cambridge University Press

landed well shy of its goal and that Pueblo Indian communities, in fact, fundamentally shaped the schools that were created to transform them. In other words, Pueblo Indian communities did not relinquish the right to educate their children.

Gram begins his analysis with a close look at the economics of the creation and maintenance of the Albuquerque and Santa Fe Indian schools. Much like Michael C. Coleman's studies of Presbyterian mission schools for American Indian children, Gram finds that the schools depended on the communities they hoped to convert, for two reasons: the schools' budgets depended upon their enrollments, which meant that the schools needed parental and community permission to school their children. The first finding is not necessarily unique, but the second finding is, as Pueblo Indians in the New Mexico Territory were considered full citizens of United States before 1913. This meant that parents had full say in whether their children would attend school, since New Mexico did not have a compulsory schooling law in the New Mexico Territory until much later in the twentieth century. The U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *US v. Sandoval* in 1913 might have appeared to have changed this acknowledgement of parental authority. The court concluded that Pueblo Indians were dependent nations, making them "Indians" in the legal ways that other tribal communities were "Indians" under U.S. law. Gram argues, though, that by this time, patterns of consilience between the two boarding schools and the Pueblo Indian communities from which they recruited had been well established. And with patterns of consilience came patterns of enrollment and governance that continued into the 1920s.

Unlike other boarding schools that were intentionally located far away from Indigenous communities, the Albuquerque and Santa Fe Indian schools were located within close proximity of Pueblo Indian communities. This had the effect of producing student enrollments and governance bodies that conveyed the will of those home communities in spite of superintendents' efforts to recruit Native students from other outlying tribes. As part of the negotiations with Pueblo Indian communities, superintendents ended up relying on quotas, wherein individual Pueblos would send an agreed upon number of students to the Albuquerque or Santa Fe Indian schools every year.

Among those students, boys outnumbered girls, and few attended school for more than a few years. As an enticement to retain students, who had been raised as Catholics, superintendents (1) specifically hired Catholics to work in the school, and (2) offered specific Catholic instruction as a countervailing strategy to the assumption that all BIA schools were strictly grounded in Protestant ideology. In fact, the BIA schools were direct competitors with the well-known Catholic St. Catherine school in Santa Fe. To mitigate the schools poaching students from

https://doi.org/10.1111/hoeq.12162 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one another, BIA superintendents sent support, such as diphtheria antitoxin, as well as students to St. Catherine when the BIA schools were oversubscribed. Even so, Pueblo Indian students enrolled in competing schools when they were dissatisfied with BIA schools, much to the superintendents' irritation.

Efforts to entice and keep students at BIA schools stood juxtaposed to Pueblo Indian conceptions of both the schooling system and students' knowledge of the deep histories of their places. Gram argues that Pueblo Indians viewed the schools as a new facet of a landscape with a long historical and cultural trajectory, unlike BIA officials, who positioned the school and its teachings in contrast and superior to those of Indigenous peoples. The imposition of a hierarchy in school manifested in a range of activities that included military drills for the boys, a guardhouse for solitary confinement for students who misbehaved or ran away, and eventually tribal councils within each school that were charged with enforcing behavioral expectations. Compared to other boarding schools, as documented in David Wallace Adams's *Education for Extinction* (1995) and K. Tsianina Lomawaima's *They Called It Prairie Light* (1994), students who attended the Albuquerque and Santa Fe Indian schools, Gram contends, did not experience those institutions as Native children at other institutions did. In part, this was because the Albuquerque and Santa Fe Indian schools selectively enforced BIA policies. For instance, students retained their Spanish given names when first enrolling in school, and they were not punished for speaking their home communities' languages. Students did, however, experience the haircuts, clothing, regimentation, and Euroamerican gender roles that the BIA promoted through its industrial curriculum and social activities.

At the heart of the scope of students' experiences between school and their home communities was the superintendent. Paradoxically, the BIA superintendents of the Albuquerque and Santa Fe Indian schools functioned as both intruders and advocates. On the one hand, superintendents were outsiders who imposed their authority on Pueblo Indian communities and made many decisions that were attempts to regulate marriage, ceremonies, and childhood. On the other hand, superintendents offered significant political and financial assistance when questions about property taxes or a shortfall in community supplies arose. Superintendents recognized these twin roles, and they often aligned themselves with powerful community members. Likewise, superintendents assisted graduates who applied to work at BIA schools, particularly in times of economic hardship. Gram notes that many Pueblo Indians who worked in BIA schools ended up becoming leaders in their home communities. What New Mexico experienced, then, as Pueblo Indian communities and BIA schools intersected and entwined, was a complex, syncretic web that has persisted to the present day.

https://doi.org/10.1111/hoeq.12162 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The story Gram tells is grounded in a wealth of archival material. In addition to BIA records housed at the National Archives and Records Administration repositories in Denver and Fort Worth, the personal papers of several agents, newspaper articles, and papers from the schools themselves are foundational in examining the perceptions as motivations of different parties. So too are the interview transcriptions that Sally Hyer conducted in the early 1990s with individuals who attended and/or worked at the Albuquerque and Santa Fe Indian schools. Without these interviews, Gram's story would largely have been one fastened in simultaneously direct and oblique readings of the written sources found in known repositories.

The sources consulted raise questions of how those interested in the histories that have been forgotten or assumed to have taken place in a particular way might be approached and reconstructed. One example is Clinton J. Crandall, the superintendent of the Santa Fe Indian School (SFIS) between 1900 and 1911, and between 1923 and 1927. Crandall, in Gram's reading, sought initially to ignore the patterns of consilience that Pueblo Indian communities had with the Santa Fe Indian School. Crandall changed his position shortly into his first tenure, recognizing that his school would irreparably decline otherwise. Crandall thus appears to have bolstered the relationship he had with the St. Catherine School—he permitted the observation of Catholic mass at SFIS, and he hired Catholic teachers and workers. This is curious because Crandall was a committed Freemason who, according to his descendants, virulently disliked Catholics. His BIA record does not suggest this, however. And it is only the 1911 inspection report (which took me three years to find) on Crandall's unethical dealings that raises suspicion that he actively, and perhaps subversively, worked against the interests of the Pueblo Indian communities during his first tenure as superintendent.

Another area that would seem to merit further attention from scholars is the nature of the interplay between internal political crises and school attendance. This might seem like an odd query, but a number of Pueblo Indian as well as other American Indian communities experienced internal political fissures—if not rifts—in the 1890s. Did students (with their parents' permission or not) enroll at higher rates? Did children tend to remain in their communities as those communities attempted to work through or around internal divisions? How did these divisions reframe Native students' experiences of schooling, of leaving home, and of homecoming?

Scholars interested in Indian boarding schools, particularly as they compare to one another, will learn from this book, as will those who are interested in the intersecting ecologies of colonization and schooling. Gram's book, moreover, illustrates how education, particularly that

https://doi.org/10.1111/hoeq.12162 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of children, is a phenomenon that communities hold in a paramount position that need not be contained within the school itself.

University of Montana Adrea Lawrence

Marta Gutman. *A City for Children: Women, Architecture, and the Charitable Landscapes of Oakland, 1850–1950.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014. 454 pp. Cloth $45.00.

In this unique study crossing multiple subfields, historian Marta Gutman writes women and children into the history of the built environment of Oakland, California. The book reconstructs the history of what Gutman aptly describes as the "charitable landscape," a physical network or infrastructure of social provision in the modernizing city, which she offers as a point of "reference for building a just, plural society for children in our own troubled times" (p. 28). Employing an impressive range of historical sources and methods, Gutman's research illuminates how organized women spearheaded the development of this charitable landscape, which often operated in ways that were contested, inadequate, classist, and racist, but also won some meaningful benefits for poor children and mothers, and created new points of access to social and political power, especially for middle-class women. The book is a product of the author's multifaceted professional life, which began with a decade in architectural practice, included large-scale urban planning projects, and subsequently led to her decision to become a historian of urban space. She brings all of these experiences, as well as a deep curiosity about power and culture, to bear in this compelling new book.

The volume weaves rich, new evidence of California women's activism to improve childhood with more familiar historical narratives of benevolent reform, temperance, kindergartens, settlement houses, clubwomen's activism, and progressive urban politics, all narratives typically rooted in contexts further east. Gutman's approach enables readers to appreciate the multiple scholarly conversations into which she ventures, while it also calls attention to noteworthy regional differences in her findings. Following the interpretive direction of many recent feminist scholars, Gutman shows how middle-class women intervened in the politics of social welfare and found ways to supplement and improve upon public provision. Unlike many of those historians though, Gutman's focus is on the interventions women made in the built environment.

https://doi.org/10.1111/hoeq.12162 Published online by Cambridge University Press