Our Democracy: Laura Cornelius Kellogg's Decolonial-Democracy

David Myer Temin

In recent years, a growing body of political science scholarship has shown how territorial expansion and Indigenous dispossession profoundly shaped American democratic ideas and institutions. However, scant attention has been paid to Indigenous thinkers and activists who have reshaped the colonial and imperial facets of democracy. I reconstruct the writings of the Oneida thinker and activist Laura Cornelius Kellogg (1880–1947). I contend that Kellogg offers a political theory of "decolonial-democracy," which challenged settler-imperial domination by bringing together a project of Indigenous self-determination with reimagined democratic narratives, values, and institutions. The first and second sections place Kellogg in pan-Indigenous debates within the Society of American Indians and among non-Indigenous Progressive reformers, in order to show how she brings together a pan-Indigenous and social-democratic critique of American democracy. The third section interprets her landmark 1920 pamphlet *Our Democracy and the American Indian* as a counter-narrative of the American founding read through the disavowed influence of the Haudenosaunee confederacy, a return to which she casts as a basis for democratic and Indigenous renewal. The final section outlines her vision of Indigenous self-government as "Indian communism" in the form of her "Lolomi Plan." In sum, I trace a counter-politics envisioning a form of relational self-determination within a confederated, multinational political order, as well as the difficulty of bringing decolonization together with democracy in practice.

In 1911, a new generation of Indigenous leaders from many nations assembled at the first meeting of the Society of American Indians (SAI) on the campus of Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio.[1] This diverse set of middle-class professionals formed a "race organization" committed to the "welfare of the race" and social justice (Society of American Indians 1912, 7; Parker 1916). In this essay, I explore the writings of a co-founder of the SAI, the Oneida thinker and activist Laura Cornelius Kellogg (1880–1947), and her contested political theory of decolonization from these early days of the "long red power movement" (Kiel 2014, 421).[2] I argue that Kellogg's political theory is rooted in a counter-narrative of—and, in complicated ways, a counter-narrative *to*—the democratic-republican tradition of American political thought.

Specifically, I read Kellogg as a thinker who challenges the way that U.S. democratic-republican thought has been realized through what Aziz Rana (2014) calls "settler empire." The post-revolutionary United States was a "postcolonial republic" in which the liberated "settler nation … assumed sovereign colonial rule over appropriated domestic territories" (Saler 2014, 1–2). In the context of democratic-republican ideologies of self-rule that foregrounded material economic independence via private property in land, many European settlers believed that the "preservation and enhancement of their own democratic institutions required Indian dispossession and the coercive use of dependent groups" (Rana 2014, 3).

Not simply a relic of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the notion that democracy politically necessitates the erasure of Indigenous peoples has enduring resonance: More than a form of government rooted in ideologies of popular self-rule and constitutional order, the "democratic polity," Theodore Roosevelt declared (1926, 212–13), was a "heritage for the white people." In Roosevelt's vision of democratic civilization at the turn of the twentieth century, the "Anglo-Saxon" had, through conquest, redeemed lands for democratic culture that non-Europeans left as "waste"; Indigenous peoples ("savage Indians") were "lesser" races fated to disappear or become assimilated through a long process of benevolent guidance towards U.S. citizenship (Roosevelt 1916; see

David Myer Temin is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor (dtemin@umich.edu). His publications have appeared in venues such as Political Theory, Political Research Quarterly, *and* European Journal of Political Theory. *He is currently completing a book on Indigenous political thought in the twentieth century.*

He would like to express gratitude to Adam Dahl, Yasmeen Daifallah, audiences at the 2019 Caribbean Philosophical Association and the 2019 Association for Political Theory, and to Dan O'Neill and four anonymous reviewers, all of whom provided immensely generous feedback on the paper.

doi:10.1017/S1537592720001358

© The Author(s), 2020. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of the American Political Science Association.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also Gerstle 1999; Lake and Reynolds 2008, 95–113). Later, figures critical to post-war U.S. political science's understanding of democratic thought such as Louis Hartz (1969), Hannah Arendt (2006, 167), and Samuel Huntington (2004, 40–41) more subtly attributed the ethos of American democratic self-rule and identity to practices of colonization whereby settlers emigrated from a metropolitan society to a new world. These "stories of peoplehood" elicit an interpretation of democratic freedoms that justified, or altogether disavowed, the dispossession of Indigenous peoples as the other side of the coin to colonial settlement processes (Smith 2009; 2015; Dahl 2018). In the settler imperial *memory* of democracy (Bruyneel 2016), European settlers have figured as the exclusive architects of ideologies of self-rule. It is from their perspective that the story of American democracy is usually told and American state power legitimated.

The core dilemma at stake here is that what modern democratic thought in the American context has largely taken as the stable foundation for consensual self-rule is, in turn, built upon coercive practices of colonial conquest. Some political theorists working through this dilemma have expressed skepticism that even *radical* democratic thought—especially when focused on inclusion into citizenship—can do justice to practices of decolonization (Singh 2019). I explore how Kellogg sought to challenge settler-imperial domination by bringing together a politics of Indigenous self-determination with reimagined democratic narratives, values, and institutions, a project most fully articulated in her 1920 pamphlet, *Our Democracy and the American Indian.* Attention to Kellogg's political thought and activism foregrounds important insights about the longstanding dilemmas Indigenous peoples have faced when dominant institutions explicitly license or tacitly disavow colonial genocide and erasure. Kellogg develops a political analysis that both exposes coercive settler foundations and authors counter-narratives to them. These counter-narratives dynamically intertwine multiple stories of peoplehood and vocabularies of critique to reimagine the contours of democratic identities, values, and practices that align with, or make space for, projects of Indigenous self-government.

Through a reading of *Our Democracy* as a multifaceted intervention into the contexts of Haudenosaunee and Oneida, pan-Indigenous, and American political thought in the Progressive Era United States, this article traces what I call Kellogg's political theory of decolonial-democracy. By decolonial, I mean a political and epistemological aspiration with two aims—first, to dismantle (settler-) colonial structures of domination and oppression and second, to engender political transformation accountable to the values and practices considered integral to the resurgence of Indigenous social, cultural, and political forms. By "decolonial-democracy," then, I mean a project that seeks to bring together decolonial and democratic practices and goals. Kellogg constructs a counter-politics grounded in a claim to belong to a confederated, multinational political order rooted in treaty relations among sovereign nations, a disavowed influence of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy upon American democratic thought. She translated these ideas into a political agenda that envisioned Indigenous self-determination in the particular form of quasi-socialist worker cooperatives based on reservation homelands.

My objective here is to recover Kellogg's work as but one important articulation of the relationship between democracy and (de)colonization in the U.S. context. I first deeply situate Kellogg's early writings of the 1910s within Progressive Era debates. The first and second sections contextualize her intellectual intervention in relation to three aims of pan-Indigenous politics during the Progressive Era: liberal-libertarian *self-help* via allotment of tribal lands and the abolition of the reservation system (Carlos Montezuma), constitutionalist individual *and* collective *self-defense* via citizenship (Zitkala-Ša, a.k.a. Gertrude Bonnin), and democratic Indigenous *self-government* via collective ownership of land and resources (Kellogg). This section then addresses Kellogg's adaptation of non-indigenous Progressive projects of social democracy. The subsequent sections turn to *Our Democracy* to reconstruct Kellogg's eclectic counter-narrative of America's democratic foundations, decline, and renewal in the form of her Lolomi Plan for "Indian communism."

Progressive Pan-Indigenous Political Theory

To situate Kellogg's *Our Democracy* as a work of political thought, it is first imperative to read her alongside the politics of her fellow members of the SAI cohort, sometimes nicknamed the "Red Progressives" or "New Indians." They were seeking to mobilize in the context of the nadir of Indigenous political life in the United States, when U.S. Indian policy and public discourse about Indigenous peoples rested on the premise that Indigenous peoples must necessarily "vanish" (Hoxie 2001a; Holm 2005). The Dawes Severalty Act of 1887 (General Allotment) authorized dismantling of commonly held reservation lands, with Indians to receive individual land allotments in fee-simple private property, and "surplus" land opened for settlers (Royster 1995; Genetin-Pilawa 2014). The Dawes Act and subsequent legislation led to the dispossession of 90 million acres of reserved lands. Where the Marshall Trilogy had established a precarious legal status of quasi-sovereignty for Indigenous peoples in the 1830s, the notion that they were "wards of the state" had been consolidated in key late-nineteenth century cases before the U.S. Supreme Court such as *Ex Parte Crow Dog* (1883), *U.S. v. Kagama* (1886), and *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock* (1903) (Harring 1994). In brief, Indigenous peoples were placed under the bureaucratic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

authority and unaccountable police power of the Indian Bureau and its agents. In line with the "tutelary" face of settler empire now extended to the insular empire of the Pacific (Heumann 2009), this authoritarian regime was justified as a form of benevolent paternalism that would ultimately guide Indians towards assimilation in the form of U.S. citizenship while offering few rights, privileges, or protections in the meantime.

Despite the best efforts of the SAI's *American Indian Magazine* journal editor and later SAI president Arthur C. Parker (Seneca) to offer a unifying platform (Hertzberg 1981, 176), SAI members proved divided over how best to challenge these immiserating structures, and even disagreed over the ends to pursue: Should they reform the Bureau from within or mount a vigorous external critique, excluding (even Indigenous) Bureau employees from membership? Should they emphasize the achievement of U.S. citizenship as a cure-all to the pathologies of wardship, while maintaining some sense of Indigenous cultural identity, or instead focus on Indigenous sovereignty outside of U.S. citizenship? Should they lean into allotment and seek better protections of private land ownership, or reject allotment as an assault on collective ownership and existence?

On these questions, contemporaneous newspaper reports described the SAI as having split at its first conference between a "government party" and a diffuse party of radicals ("Indian Conference Splits on Politics" 1911). The "government party" comprised those who believed that collaboration with the Indian Bureau could secure greater protections of Indian rights, such as Sherman Coolidge (Arapaho), Charles Daganett (Peoria), and Parker. Kellogg and the famed Santee Dakota intellectual Dr. Charles Eastman—the key opposition figures—countered with a demand for autonomy from the Indian Bureau.

In order to contextualize Kellogg's position in the longer arc of these pan-Indigenous debates of the 1910s, I trace the ideas and advocacy of two highly influential Progressive Era Indigenous political theorists who were not present at this first conference: Dr. Carlos Montezuma with his politics of *self-help*, and Zitkala-Ša with her politics of *self-defense.* These two thinker-activists shared with Kellogg the radical orientation on display at that first conference, yet they also diverged in key ways that clarify what is distinct about Kellogg's politics of *self-government.* Though they all produced radical critiques of the Indian Bureau, they offered differing interpretations both of the substantive meaning of Indigenous freedom from settler tyranny and the mechanics of setting about to achieve it.

From the beginning, Montezuma (Yavapai) had a complicated relation to the SAI: He attended early organizational meetings but refused to go to the first conference because he viewed members of the aforementioned "government party" as far too cozy with—even co-opted by—the Bureau. Montezuma specifically challenged Parker, for example, who supported collaboration with the Bureau, and a more gradualist advocacy of a "road to competent citizenship" (1914). In contrast to Parker, Montezuma's 1905 review of a book by former Commissioner of Indian Affairs Francis Leupp reflects his early commitment to "the complete abolition of the reservation system, including, of course, the Indian Bureau" (Newmark 2013, 156). In his address to the fourth meeting of the SAI, "The Reservation—Fatal to the Development of Citizenship" (1914), Montezuma advocated the total and immediate "abolition" of the Indian Bureau along with immediate U.S. citizenship for Indigenous peoples on the grounds that wardship constituted a form of imprisonment and bondage akin to slavery. In 1916, he split with the SAI and began his own journal, *Wassaja* ("beckoning") (Montezuma 1916), to preach a more radical rejection of the Bureau as a form of antidemocratic authoritarianism (Montezuma 2015). In the lead-up to World War I, he ran articles in *Wassaja* declaring that, without the protections due to citizens, Indian men should refuse to register for Selective Service for the war (Montezuma 1917).

Montezuma's opposition to what he labeled "Bureauism" led him to a specific vision of what Bureau abolition entailed (Martinez 2013). As an admirer of Richard Henry Pratt's theory that Indians must immediately be removed from the environment of the reservation, educated in off-reservation boarding schools, and de-tribalized through exposure to white social norms, Montezuma believed that the gradualist efforts to "prepare" Indians for citizenship that the moderate reformers entertained actually stifled independence and initiative (Montezuma 1916). Moreover, the legal status of wardship intrinsically entailed the violability of one's rights under an unaccountable authority: The reservation, by nature, "imprisoned … the Indian … in a fixed state of helplessness to resist encroachments upon his rights" (qtd. in Newmark 2013, 156). Montezuma recognized the value of pre-colonial Indigenous societies, but he believed that Indigenous peoples had no future as polities: "a law for each nationality in America would be very much un-American" (Montezuma 1918, 1). Montezuma demanded immediate fee-simple property and American citizenship rights for individuals as keys to freedom.

Montezuma's program differed from that of his one-time fiancée, Zitkala-Ša, considered the greatest Indigenous literary figure in her time. Zitkala-Ša (Yankton Dakota) became more active in the SAI later on: She became its secretary in 1916 and succeeded Parker as the editor of its *American Indian Magazine* from 1918 to 1919. Zitkala-Ša compared the reservation system under the Bureau to a form of collective bondage and "absolute tyranny" under the guise of "sham protection," taking up the abolition of the Bureau as a goal (Zitkala-Ša 2003e,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

210; 2003c, 159). Her abolitionist commitments led in two directions: First, she was keen to promote the inherent value of some elements of indigenous cultures, including on the reservation. She explicitly rejected the civilization-savagery antithesis, which posed a "reluctance to cast aside our culture" against "untethered American citizenship" (Zitkala-Ša 2018a, 198). She primarily saw U.S. citizenship as a matter of advancing constitutional rights, not a developmental process of transforming backwards Indians into civilized subjects.

Second, she readily connected citizenship rights as a form of *individual* rights to *collective* self-defense, a position closer to supporting the "mutuality of [U.S.] citizenship and sovereignty" (Lomawaima 2013; see also Bruyneel 2007, 97–122; Deloria 2015). In this sense, she treated the goal of U.S. citizenship as one key link between individual and collective freedoms rather than as the means to personal liberty alone. Specifically, she argued that citizenship would enable the pursuit of some collective Indigenous treaty-based claims for restitution. For example, the 1851 and 1868 Fort Laramie treaties had long been litigated *within* communities through grassroots treaty councils, but were denied a hearing in the U.S. Court of Claims because the Lakota were non-citizens (Zitkala-Ša 2003b). She argued that citizenship would enable self-defense, such as the pursuit of the Lakota land claims cases to receive restitution for "mutilated treaties" (Zitkala-Ša 2003a).

As she tracked debates over representation of oppressed peoples and minority nations at the Versailles Conference in the aftermath of World War I as editor of the *American Indian Magazine*, she linked this collective dimension to a future-oriented demand for the "little peoples … to be granted the right of self-determination." By the latter, she meant primarily "full American citizenship and the protection of law under our constitution!" (Zitkala-Ša 2003f). Two of her posthumously published essays written in 1923, however, show her support for a more robust political basis of Indigenous "sovereignty" (Zitkala-Ša 2018b; 2018a).

In 1926, she organized the National Council of American Indians (NCAI), a lobbying organization imagined on a wheel-and-spoke ("democracy hub") model of grassroots, reservation communities tied to a national organization (Zitkala-Ša 2003d). The primary aim of the NCAI was to improve upon the 1924 Indian Citizenship Act, an act which granted citizenship to all Indians but did nothing to eliminate their wardship status, which had been re-asserted in the 1916 Supreme Court case *U.S. v. Nice* (Wilkins 1997, 118; Lewandowski 2016, 176). When in 1934 John Collier's administration sought to implement the Indian New Deal, packaged as "Indian self-government" (Deloria and Lytle 1998; Deloria 2002), she fought against the remaining veto power the Bureau retained on decisions made at the community level. She successfully lobbied her home reservation at Yankton to reject the IRA constitution in favor of a more democratic one (Lewandowski 2016, 182).

Kellogg in Contexts

Kellogg offered the most systematic project aimed at Indigenous *self-government* in the founding years of the SAI. To introduce Kellogg biographically, she was born outside of Green Bay, Wisconsin, on September 10, 1880, in one of the three Oneida communities of the larger Haudenosaunee Confederacy, about sixty years after her well-known grandfather Daniel Bread (Dehowyadilou, "Great Eagle") secured Menominee land for a reservation in 1821 after removing from New York State. [3] Her focus on self-government may have stemmed from the catastrophic results of allotment at home: Already in the 1910s, federally induced land cessions; timber stripping and soil erosion; and collusive schemes to force land sales of individual fee patents from Oneida citizens had contributed to near-complete loss of the reserved land base and declining economic independence (Hauptman and McLester 2006, xiv; Hauptman 2008, 146; Tiro 2011; Kiel 2014, 420, 423)

Attending university at institutions including Barnard, Stanford, and the University of Wisconsin, she studied law, political science, and social work, a background that exposed her to Franz Boas, William James, and Progressive economic analyses. After she played a pivotal role in its founding, the SAI, under Arthur C. Parker's watch, kicked her out in 1913 when she and her husband were accused of impersonating government officials; in fact, they were staging an undercover investigation of the widespread graft of Osage oil leases then only starting to become public knowledge (*El Paso Herald* 1913; Maddox 2005, 193n). She continued, however, to agitate independently for her self-government proposal, which she began to call the "Lolomi plan," in appearances before Congress and interviews.[4] After she published *Our Democracy and the American Indian* in 1920,[5] she turned her attention to efforts to renew the Wisconsin Oneida's attenuated relationship with the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. She also joined with the St. Regis Mohawk lawyer James Deere in unsuccessful litigation efforts to recover lands reserved in the 1784 Treaty of Fort Stanwix. The latter attempts formed a foundation of later Haudenosaunee "land rights strategy" (Ackley and Stanciu 2015a, xxvii; Ackley 2008). However, accusations of fraud in fundraising and several arrests dogged her reputation. She remains a controversial figure.[6]

Before turning to *Our Democracy*, I first trace Kellogg's available speeches and writings of the 1910s, which feature her early efforts to critique and transform liberal-democratic institutions and ideals through a synthesis of Indigenous and social-democratic thought. In her 1911 speech, "Industrial Organization for the Indian," she

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

argued that confronting "our national problem," entailed more "critical" evaluation of "Caucasian institutions": The "[Indian] cannot copy *everything* the white man does with advantage" (Kellogg 2015a, 140–41). She protested what she perceived as her colleagues' "undue worship of Paleface ways," an inclination of which she accused both the moderates *and* radicals like Montezuma enamored of the "Pratt ideal." She observed that they failed to appreciate how "capital is such a terrific power in the hands of the civilized but unenlightened … in this democratic country of ours where they shout, 'equal opportunity for all,' and then thieve it" (Kellogg 2015a, 144). The "general conditions" the entire Indian affairs apparatus theoretically aimed at "putting the Indian into"—here, she cites tenements, sweatshops, tuberculosis, and poverty—ought themselves to be questioned as insufficiently democratic and enlightened "for any race of people under the sun" (Kellogg 2015a, 145–47). White society's "intense individualism," she sought to show, meant that "the average white man in the white labor markets lives a miserable existence" (Kellogg 2015a, 145). "My plea," she put it, referring to sanitary conditions in tenements, "is that we avoid the things that are killing off the majority of the laboring population in the country among the whites" (Kellogg 2015a, 147). "I cannot see the economy," she wrote in 1913, "in introducing the deteriorated Indian into the ranks of the civilized oppressed" (Kellogg 2015g, 185).

Channeling the uplift-oriented mission of the SAI, she argued that any "self-respecting Indian and educator" embraced "opportunity" and stood against "Paternalism and Wardship and Reservations as a regime." However, such a task meant refuting the fantasy that posed the viable alternatives as those between a democratic civilization of individual independence and social mobility against a supposedly stagnant tribalism (Kellogg 2015a, 142). Allotment and the Bureau system as a whole, she declared in a 1914 letter to Bureau secretary Lane, had turned Indians into "vagabonds begging at the door of a sham civilization" (*Washington Post* 1914). The practice had not rendered them independent American citizens, as promised; it instead made them "a target for exploitation," by which she meant land dispossession, exploitation of their labor, and the general degradation of their social and political conditions (Kellogg 2015a, 140, 142; 2015g, 187).

Accordingly, Kellogg proposed that Indigenous peoples' "permanent independence" would depend on collective "industrial organization." Putting aside the issue of individual citizenship status as a secondary matter, she believed that collective flourishing hinged instead upon Indigenous peoples' "possibilities … on the reservation," that is, their ability to create a collective economic future based on the effort to "convert [their] wastes into industrial centers" (Kellogg 2015a, 142). She drew inspiration in her self-government plan from Mormon cooperatives, European garden villages, and socialist ideals. Her idea was to form a kind of collectively-owned joint stock company, with restrictions on any one party gaining a controlling interest, and with all sharing in the profits (Kellogg 2015g, 189). She believed such a plan would allow Indigenous peoples to enter markets and compete on the basis of the current state of development of a given people, but organize production so that "the work and the advantages are communistic" (Kellogg 2015a, 151).

Kellogg's original 1911 speech was not discussed in the subsequent planned SAI proceedings (Ackley and Stanciu 2015b, 29). Though archival evidence is limited on the matter, it is likely that Parker and most other SAI colleagues took little interest in a proposal that saw the reservation as a permanent homeland, let alone as the basis for a distinct political community that embraced the "natural clannishness" of the "real Indian" (Kellogg 2015a, 142). As the historian Hazel Hertzberg speculates, they may have "shied away from a plan" that treated the reservation "as a permanent rather than a transitional stage in Indian development" (Hertzberg 1981, 61).[7]

In these early speeches, Kellogg brought together a sense of the value of the reservation as a reimagined space of Indigenous futures with the ideas of Progressive intellectuals and movements who embraced a social-democratic turn in American politics. Such thinkers as Walter Weyl—and, later, colleagues such as John Dewey (1922; 1924) writing in the *New Republic*—were convinced that such a politics demanded that American democracy shift away from its mythological foundations in frontier individualism. In 1893, Frederick Jackson Turner (1996; see also Grandin 2019, 1–2, 76–82) had set off an historiographic revolution when he argued that the frontier was key to understanding how the egalitarian, individualist energies of American democracy had laid the foundations of American progress. Weyl and Dewey turned Turner on his head: They argued that the political experience of the frontier (rendered sometimes as myth, sometimes as social-scientific explanation) had actually stifled progress because it mystified the basic interdependence and reliance of people on social and political community.

For Weyl, the "conquest of the wide-stretching continent" had, contra Turner, "hinder[ed] the development of a socialized democracy … it dwarfed the common spirit": It momentarily relieved class conflict by projecting such contradictions "outwards" through the promise of free land (Weyl 1912, 22, 35). Such practices "fashion[ed] … a man to conquer [the continent], and the creation of a state which would aid … the conquest," making normative a form of citizenship that was "acquisitive, imaginative and starkly individualistic." This mythology now prevented honestly addressing the concentrated oligarchic power and mass immiseration characteristic of early twentieth-century industrial capitalism. Only by overcoming the frontier orientation of state and citizen

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

would the United States be able to "develop … her democracy" as a project for the common good at "home" (Weyl 1912, 22).

Kellogg likewise argued that the "money despotism" that influenced American policy-making restrained the democratization of the economy (Kellogg 2015a, 144–45). "White institutions … are neither as economic nor as equitable as they hope to be," she argued, citing Progressive economists (Kellogg 2015a, 152; Adams and Sumner 1905). She attributed the inability to confront concentrated wealth and staggering poverty to a "selfishness" due to "intense individualism" and the age of "unprecedented prosperity" (Kellogg 2015a, 143). In contrast to the "exploitation" endemic to the "factory system," a "new socialism" would instead aim to use worker-owned cooperative communities to meet the material needs of workers while retaining the economic productivity of the corporate firm (Kellogg 2015a, 151).

Kellogg also diverged from Progressive thinkers, however, in accounting for the specificity of the Indigenous experience of democracy, and the differences the latter would entail for her Indigenous vantage point on efforts to socialize American democracy. In a July 1911 public speech upon the dedication to a Lorado Taft statue of Black Hawk, a quintessential vanishing Indian image, she adopted an historical and normative backdrop that shifted the meaning of the frontier idiom. She acknowledged the "influence" of the "hazardous frontier" as a former source of "common purpose": the "dangers of the wilderness beyond the Alleghanies gave birth to the real American nation." She averred, however, that "today is not war … . War and frontier are gone. The sentiments are growing out of other things: out of interests that, maybe, are more universal in their appeal" (Kellogg 2015c, 168). In contrast to the sanitized Turnerian idiom of the past "civilizing" of a "continent," she describes the statue as representative of Indigenous peoples' "national tragedy" of material conquest and land theft, and not simply metaphorical grist to theorize the experiential horizon of the American nation (Kellogg 2015c, 168, 171). She hopes that the statue—"mute for that which has no defense"—will stand "defying injustice" and for "each, as ye pass, swell out the monstrous truth" of conquest (Kellogg 2015c, 171–72).

In her 1912 speech to the SAI and congressional testimony in 1913, she supplemented Progressive accounts of the effects of child labor and poverty on human development with an analysis that contested the subjection of Indigenous children to boarding school education: "I want to add to labor and poverty this other determination of the Indian service to kill the Indian into an ordinary paleface" (Kellogg 2015d, 156; Patten 1907, 41). Her statement repurposed the admonition of General Richard Henry Pratt, founder of Carlisle Indian School, that Indian education aimed to "kill the Indian in him, and save the man" (Pratt 1973, 261); instead, Kellogg argued that the Indian education apparatus enabled cultural decimation that *reinforced* material hierarchies rather than equal, democratic inclusion. She observed that pervasive "discrimination [exists] against the race in educational advantages" because "we are the 'easiest marks' for exploitation as a class" (Kellogg 2015d, 165). Stretching and adapting such Progressive accounts of "class struggle" enabled her to criticize both Indigenous and non-indigenous supporters of off-reservation, Indian boarding schools, who aim to "take away the child's set of Indian notions altogether" and "tell the Indian child [that] everything Indian is to be despised" (Kellogg 2015d, 156; 2015g, 182).

Indigenous adaptations of a Progressive, social democratic project would, then, need to acknowledge and advance the "goods … of [the Indian's] own heritage," and challenge settler colonialism in the political situation of that moment (Kellogg 2015d, 156). Kellogg's "industrial village" self-government plan would retain "common ownership of the tribe" and aim to "citizenize the possibilities and to reorganize the opportunities of the Indian *at home*" (Kellogg 2015a, 142; Stovey 2006). It would support the "common ownership of tribes" beginning with reservation lands, in line with socialist and communal ideals *and* the aim of "keeping an Indian an Indian" (Kellogg 2015e, 199–200). The project entailed federal support for a "protected autonomous government," and thus embraced differentiated Indigenous political structures as integral to a re-envisioned American democracy (Kellogg 2015g, 187).

"Our Democracy": A Counter-Narrative of the "Foundations of American Liberty"

Kellogg's 1920 *Our Democracy and the American Indian*, subtitled *A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today*, represented her most ambitious and detailed effort to win advocates to her Lolomi Plan. She buttressed her account of radical reform and the obstacles to it by presenting a counter-narrative of American democracy that reframed the standard settler-imperial assumptions about the contours of American democratic identity and ideals. In the opening chapter of *Our Democracy and the American Indian*, "To the American People," Kellogg begins her address by narrating the origin story of the Confederacy of the Six Nations. For Kellogg, the "American Continent" birthed both "the idea of the League of Nations and Democracy." But not in 1776 or 1783. Instead, this was "about 600 years ago. It came from an American Indian" (Kellogg 2015b, 71). The Confederacy of the Six Nations already practiced "our democracy" *as* free peoples having possessed a tradition of self-rule long before the existence of the United States. Hence, in addition to its more obvious referent to U.S. democracy, the title "our democracy" can be read as an expression of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Six Nations' ongoing possession of a kind of democracy, albeit one distinct in its internal structures.

Kellogg goes on to tell the story of Sagoyewatha, "the Awakener of the people," credited in her compressed narrative as the helper of Deganawidah, the Peacemaker/founder of the Iroquois Confederacy. In the midst of chaotic disorder, the Awakener places "his ear close to Mother Earth" and hears a message of peace. After extensive deliberation in council, the Confederacy "marked out the territory of each separate nation" and established conditions of internal peace and prosperity. The Five Nations created a modern system of confederal power that bound them together as the Haudenosaunee Confederacy through shared decision-making procedures under the Great Law of Peace (Kayenren'kowa). Outside, "they began offensive warfare," and in classic imperial fashion resembling the Roman empire, "exacted the learning of the Iroquois language, and tribute for their protection" (Hauptman 2008, 147).[8] After they "expanded westward…as far as the Carolinas, "they dreamed of finally allying themselves with the Aztecs and subduing the Great Island into a peaceful empire." Drawing on neo-classical tropes to describe their disciplined ("Epictecan") liberty, Kellogg narrates the establishment of the Five Nations as the enlightened birth of a westward-expanding empire committed to "organization, confederacy, government, order, [and] progress" (Kellogg 2015b, 72). The Confederacy thereby resolved the ancient contradiction between free political rule and vast political space long before the United States did so via its own "extended" republic (Madison 1787).

In explicit counterpoint to settler accounts of the origins of constitutional government and the formative influence of frontier conquest, she narrated how American democracy originated with the Iroquois Confederacy. More than a rhetorical flourish, Kellogg was drawing here upon a longstanding Haudenosaunee oral history and trope in Anglo-American political thought and ethnology that narrated the Iroquois Confederacy as the first republic on the continent, and an influence upon the United States' own constitutional republic.[9] "From my infancy," she recalls, "I had been taught that we Oneidas had contributed to American liberty and civilization" (Kellogg 2015b, 80). Kellogg retells the influential story in a typical way, through the words of the Onondoga diplomat Canastego, who spoke in treaty councils such as the 1744 Treaty of Lancaster that Benjamin Franklin is said to have witnessed (see Fenton 1998, 416–35). Sending for a delegation from the Six Nations at Albany in 1754 during negotiations for the Albany Plan of Union, Franklin asked for an explanation of their constitution.

Kellogg describes Canestago's explanation of one of the fundamental tenets of the Great Law, their "constitution," as recorded in a "strand" of wampum: The delegate "took their wampum," with its "five figures holding hands" and explained "how each Nation is free unto himself like a man. But when the eagle … gives the cry, then are they, one heart, one head, one man." As Kellogg writes, "Tradition [i.e., Iroquois *and* American tradition] says Franklin brought his hand down on the table and said: 'That's the greatest wisdom I have heard among the nations of men.'" Franklin "admitted elsewhere that the idea of a separate states government within the Federal [government] was an inspiration he received from the Five Nations." "This is the fact," she insists, "that makes the Constitution of the United States different from another in history" (Kellogg 2015b, 72–74; Grinde and Johansen 1991, 104, 107–8).

More subtly, however, Kellogg takes this argument beyond Haudenosaunee influence on the federative shape of the U.S. government by narrating the U.S. democratic-republic itself as a confederacy in certain key respects. Once one takes Indigenous peoples and the treaties the United States signed with them into account, Kellogg suggests, the United States is better understood as a multinational democracy in the form of a confederate union of republics. Accordingly, she writes that the historical basis of the "great democratic principles" that animate the "foundations of American liberty" are "freedom and equal opportunity to each nation, under the protection of a Confederate Government" (Kellogg 2015b, 73). Notice here that it is *nations*—not individuals in the first instance—that are endowed with "freedom and equal opportunity" under the umbrella of a confederate system of allied, self-governing republics (Kellogg 2015b, 73). She cites treaties with Indigenous peoples as separate sovereignties, "98 percent" of which the United States has since reduced to "scraps of paper" (Kellogg 2015b, 74). Kellogg's reference to "confederation upon qualification"—what she calls "the great note in the Iroquois constitution"—serves as a reminder of these original Indigenous foundations.

This counter-interpretation of American foundations presents a continued expectation that what she calls "self-determination" for Indigenous "nations" remains fundamental to their and to *all* Americans' conceptions of liberty (Kellogg 2015b, 74). In 1919, while writing *Our Democracy*, Kellogg had planned—like Zitkala-Ša—to take her defense of the self-determination of Indigenous peoples to the newly formed League of Nations (*Milwaukee Sentinel* 1919). She asks whether it "shall become necessary to beg a Supreme Court of Justice of the League of Nations to settle the most disgraceful and low-browed state of affairs ever enacted in a democracy" (Kellogg 2015b, 98). Kellogg's argument was an early iteration of Haudenosaunee politics pursued in international arenas in the 1920s and 1930s in part conducted to enforce the terms of violated treaties (Epstein 2012, 81–117). Levi General of the Six Nations, under the Cayuga hereditary title of Deskaheh, appealed to the League of Nations against the Canadian state's policy of compulsory enfranchisement. His claim was based on

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

allied statehood with the British Crown secured through the Covenant Chain of treaties (Deskaheh 1924).

Instead of deconstructing U.S. conquest, as she does elsewhere, Kellogg reconceives of the core tenets of the American founding in an effort to frame U.S. democratic principles as indebted to Indigenous frameworks—"the spirit which promoted the first Awakener of the people to lay the foundations of American liberty" (Kellogg 2015b, 73). This shared, founding "spirit," the "bases for a commonwealth," ought to sustain all peoples on the continent in "the ideals which made her a republic." She proclaims that "I love my country … I love the ideals of her enlightenment, just as my fathers, who planted the first seed of civilization in the land—just as my fathers who first dreamed of democracy on this continent—just as my fathers who bled for the liberty of the land" (Kellogg 2015b, 73). Such a proclamation represents the Oneida in particular as exemplary citizens and loyal defenders of democratic ideals since before the inception of the United States, and even originators of these ideals: "When the colonists were struggling for liberty [during the American Revolution], the Oneidas stayed true to the dream of Sagoyewhata, and they sent every fighting man they had to the front." She frames the Six Nations as active creators of democratic foundations: original agriculturalists, when Indigenous peoples were represented as nomadic hunter-gatherers ("who planted"); original democratic framers, when it was thought that they had no political governance ("who first dreamed of democracy"); and co-original defenders of freedom ("who bled for the liberty"). Her love of her "country," its "enlightenment," and the very "land" for which her "fathers bled" may *also* refer—more subversively—to a love of the *specific* lands from which the Oneida and Haudenosaunee had been torn, or of the subsequent theft of reservation lands. She refers to her love of the "valleys" (perhaps a reference to the Oneida homelands stretching between the St. Lawrence and Susquehanna rivers) and "every rock and stream and tree." In essence, she posits this shared, multinational founding—one that has been disavowed and continually violated—as a source of contemporary political obligation and renewal.

Democratic Decline and Bureau Despotism

Kellogg's original, preferred title for the book was *The Death of Democracy*. Her account of these shared, "enlightened," foundations sets up her claim that Indigenous dispossession is a key litmus test and material dimension of the corruption and decline of American democracy into "despotism": "Without these bases for a commonwealth, Liberty is impossible. Without the spirit which promoted the first Awakener of the People to lay the foundations of American liberty, democracy is dead" (Kellogg 2015b, 73). Kellogg first describes the "awakening" of democratic modernity, then exhorts her reader to recognize the oligarchic corruption that requires re-awakening: "But what shall I say to you now, Americans of my America?" She asks whether "we departed so far from the truths of our [Haudenosaunee and U.S.] fathers that we cannot now face the facts? Have you so soon forgotten the spectacle you have created of my people, whose shortcomings were that they were rich and primitive—the spectacle indeed of Belgium and Russia [i.e., symbols of anti-democratic tyranny] in the United States?" (Kellogg 2015b, 73).

Drawing again upon classical republican themes, Kellogg narrates democratic decline as a systemic process that tracks the corrupted decadence of the now "rich and powerful" American people. She calls upon the avowed "Christian Nation of the World!" to "Just look over the land, and count the billions that have gone to erect your temples of worship." Kellogg declares that these "billions" have been won by uprooting Indigenous peoples from their land. "These million 'golden calves' of hypocrisy" have "robbed my people of a real god," that is, of the land itself (Kellogg 2015b, 87). Kellogg uses the metaphor of "husks of corn" to symbolize the original democratic principles the American people have reduced to emptied creed and false idols, and, therefore, no longer feed the "hungry soul" (Kellogg 2015b, 74). The content of U.S. democratic practices have been hollowed out, which leaves only the form of dogma: "there is no corn in them." Here, she likely refers both to the Oneida's furnishing of corn to the American revolutionary army in time of need as a source of now-disavowed US obligations to them *and* corn's earlier and ongoing significance as one of three sisters (maize, beans, and squash) that constituted the original agriculture of the western hemisphere, which remained (and remains) central to Haudenosaunee cosmology and material self-sufficiency (Glatthaar and Martin 2006; Oneida Indian Nation 2016; Kellogg 2015h; Dunbar-Ortiz 2015, 15–31; Hill 2017, 48; Cornelius 1999).

Unlike the first chapter of *Our Democracy*, which targets a non-indigenous readership, chapter 2 is directed towards the "American Indian." There, she seeks to incite Indigenous peoples—"my red clan"—now in "Siberian exile" to "awaken" and "emancipate" themselves as a "fraternity of "patriots" from the despotic order to which they have been subjected. This order has "crushed spirits, broken hopes, plundered fortunes, wasted lives" and left the "young generation … intimidated into cowardice and vice" (Kellogg 2015b, 79). Speaking favorably of the older generations—figured as the "blanket Indian"—who condemn the "mind of this generation" as a "broken reed" incapable of challenging domination, she asks: "Has the blood of our clan turned to water that we can be bent and broken into paupers and puppets cringing before the insolent arrogance and arbitrary dictation of political bosses who rise to positions of absolute despots over us?"

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Kellogg 2015b, 77). Likely referring to Parker and others who leaned towards more assimilation-oriented measures, Kellogg (2015b, 76) indicts Indigenous leaders who "have been willing to let our enemy tell you our place in history." In 1911, she had rejected the popular term "new Indian" as "fake." She declared to loud applause at the first SAI convention, "I am the *old Indian*, adjusted to *new conditions*" (Society of American Indians 1912, 81; Hertzberg 1981, 65). Here, Kellogg likewise demands a return to "our ancestral standards" translated into modern conditions. Such a politics, she argues, requires that "we take the blame upon ourselves" to address the "cringing" or "fawning upon the Palefaces" that characterizes psychological dependence upon the "arbitrary dictation of political bosses" (Kellogg 2015b, 77).

Though such rhetorical indictments linking corruption and domination to obsequious psychology certainly aim to cajole her audience, they also set up a concrete political analysis of the Indian Bureau as an authoritarian continuation of settler-colonial conquest. Kellogg explicitly analogizes the Bureau to a form of "absolute despotism" that is the institutional locus of "oppression" and "subservience and demoralization" (Kellogg 2015b, 75–76). Repeatedly, she compares the Bureau with Russia—in the stylized form of criticism of *both* Czarism and Bolshevism: "The Bureau," she argues, "came into existence with the idea of centralizing all power unto itself. It has succeeded to such an extreme that Russia ten years before [World War I], when at the height of her despotic power, was not more depleting than the Indian Bureau" (Kellogg 2015b, 82). Noting the "very nature of its origin" in "control of property and person, through its Indian agents," she addresses the Bureau's function as the administrative side to militarized settler violence aimed at containing resistance: "when the tribes rebelled and there was a border [i.e. frontier] outbreak, the Bureau could call upon the United States troops to quell the rebellion" (Kellogg 2015b, 82).

Her analysis invokes several dimensions of this oppression: First, she refers to her own "persecution" when investigating the ripping-off and murders of the Osage for their oil-rich lands as part of the Bureau's "Reign of Terror" as an example of systematic attacks on "those Indians of the reservations who have been strong and who have tried to change the conditions of our life" (Kellogg 2015b, 82, 87). The term "reign of terror" circulated both as a generic label for Bureau mismanagement and malfeasance and for other forms of spectacular violence done in the name of a monolithic demos to expunge its purported enemies (Kellogg 2015g, 180). With the Bureau primed to quell "propaganda" against it, she argues, there is "no liberty of speech on the reservations" (Kellogg 2015b, 87). In other words, the Bureau literally "centralized" power and repressed resistance in classic authoritarian fashion, in violation of the spirit of "confederacy" and equal nationhood she lays out in chapter 1.

Second, the Bureau creates a "School of sycophants [as] a method of destroying natural leadership in the race": Referring to the common practice of grooming leaders as well as "pack[ing] tribal councils" to achieve voting outcomes desirable to the Bureau, she notes that "Our Lenins and our Trotskys are no accidents." "When, therefore, people ask me why we have no leaders," she wants to respond, "Why is Kerensky not leading the Russians today?" (Kellogg 2015b, 87). The "spirit-breaking Indian schools" and their "atmosphere of subservience"—in addition to the inherent harms of "indiscriminate herding of children," "destruction of individuality," and the violation of "child labor laws" (Kellogg 2015b, 105–7)—play a role in the creation of the mentality of those willing to become "warehouse Indians," who are the tools of the Bureau's divide-and-conquer politics (Kellogg 2015b, 81, 105). "When the Bureau wishes to create factions among the tribes," she argues, "the 'warehouse Indians' are its executors" (Kellogg 2015b, 76). She connects this problem to the long history of settler efforts to undermine pan-Indigenous unity among diverse Indigenous nations since European colonization: "These fellows were found when Tecumseh wanted to nationalize the race" (Kellogg 2015b, 76).

Finally, she argues, the problem with "Bureaucracy" in this setting goes beyond canonical objections to bureaucracies writ large as institutionally motivated to "augment official power" or as "lariat experts of red tape" (Bagehot 1915, 298; Kellogg 2015b, 87). Instead, she focuses on the material impoverishment that directly results in the denial of liberties "under the cover of benevolence," what she calls "starving out the man with an idea of Liberty" (Kellogg 2015b, 87). Ultimately, the Bureau "had made the richest people on the globe, a race of vagrants," evidenced by "the vast resources of timber, minerals, water power, lands, now owned by individuals in the United States and which constitutes the wealth of the country belonged to the Indian" (Kellogg 2015d, 88).

Despite her admiration for the staunch commitment of "my aunts and my grandfather and the old people" to tradition and wish that "the race restore itself to some of its traditional philosophy" (Kellogg 2015b, 77, 102), she nevertheless does not see a return to past forms of more absolute self-determination as a viable response to present despotism. In proposing her Lolomi Plan, she posits the pragmatic need to navigate between two extremes so as to "obtain, secure and maintain real independence in modern times" (Kellogg 2015b, 79). She first speaks of the "failure of that former independence to convince this age of its rights." She asks: "How far would any order succeed which did not take this modern day into its calculations?" (Kellogg 2015b, 80) She may be referring here to Six Nations traditionalists, such as the Tuscarora activist

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Clinton Rickard, who was "anti-[U.S.] citizenship" and believed that the only way forward was a strict return to treaty relations between fully sovereign nations (Rickard 1984, xxiii). However, she also rejects those who have "swung to the other extreme and not taken the man as its first consideration" (Kellogg 2015b, 79–80). Philosophically, then, the "Lolomi plan of self-government" aims to "combine [the] higher values" of "the red man" and "the Paleface and his civilization" and "then to weave them into the hardest-headed kind of Business." In other words, she bases the proposal in an attempt to synthesize these elements so as to ensure real material independence. Where the goal is to create a "social order which intends to rebuild a broken people," the "structure upon which all these things depend is the ECONOMIC one" (Kellogg 2015b, 81).

Foundations of Independence

Kellogg posits the Lolomi as a "uniform legislation" superior to two other systemic alternatives that go beyond "piecemeal legislation." The first systemic alternative, "Bureaucracy," is the current system. Where this system, like Indian boarding schools, purports to promote "civilization" via private property, its macro-effects are "dismembering the Indian domain and then creating individual titles out of it, piecemeal, for the Paleface" and the further decimation of Indigenous societies (Kellogg 2015b, 91–93). "No one seems to have known that the real nature and the real object of Bureaucracy is to make inefficient and dependent men and women," not to actually create productive members of society (Kellogg 2015b, 94). Her objection to the "boasts of the Indian Office" to train Indian women into "household labor," is that "they have trained a girl who might have become an instructor or manager of some business into being a servant of the race which has oppressed her people" (Kellogg 2015b, 96). She thus cites both the expropriation of land as an inherent harm and the (gendered) violence and "demoralization" of the resulting exploitation and "servitude" of the "landless laborer" (Kellogg 2015b, 96).

The second alternative she considers, the solution of "Dr. Montezuma and his Carlisle followers," proposed "doing away with the Bureau without any substitution whatever, leaving the helpless Indian open to the exploitation of every grafter." This "point of view is to break up the Indian reservation—because of the environment." For Kellogg, this breaking up of the tribal estate will only make "the Indian lose every last possession he has" (Kellogg 2015b, 89). Montezuma's vision closely connected American freedom and individuality to private property, with the likelihood that the implementation of such a theory would place "the Indian into the white man's world of labor, after he has been stripped of his assets."

Though vague in details, her proposed reforms began instead from the starting point that "uniform legislation" should abolish the Bureau with the aim "to secure real protection." Such protection should first "stop the exploitation of assets, of health, of character." "We must save those remains of these things on which to build," meaning, at minimum, collectivizing reservation lands (Kellogg 2015b, 89). Such a demand for a (real) substitute for the Bureau's (theoretical) protections would come in the form of "federal incorporation of a self-governing body" (Kellogg 2015b, 89). Taking into account the sheer power of the federal state, this "protected autonomy" status sought to translate the founding *spirit of confederacy* as a flexible, inter-governmental relationship among separate nations into a *federalist* relation among entities, which accords with what Iris Young called a "more enduring and general set of procedures guiding their relations" (Young 2007, 193n). As a federal entity, Indigenous peoples would be shielded from state law and would exclude "white constituents of a state," since "whole states are eternally clamoring now for Indian possessions" (Kellogg 2015b, 90).

After these key measures of the abolition of the Indian Bureau and guaranteed federal incorporation, her Lolomi Plan featured five key planks: (1) Reservation lands would be recognized as the collective title of the tribe. (2) The people would pool assets to form a worker-run cooperative enterprise, with the aim of mitigating economic dependency and creating work meaningfully related to community needs and self-understandings. (3) Citizen-workers would hold shares, with decisions made on the principle of one person, one vote. (4) Property would be held in fee simple—with underlying title in the tribe—but could not be sold to anyone outside of tribe. (5) Profits from any enterprise would fund health care, education, housing, and cooperative stores.

She argued that through "combination"—the pooling of "assets"— Indigenous peoples could begin to develop "our natural resources by ourselves" (Kellogg 2015b, 94–95). Here, Kellogg cited Progressive criticisms of the power of corporations governed by their most powerful shareholders. This self-governing entity would instead make decisions democratically on the principle of one person, one vote "irrespective of the number of shares" each member "may hold" (Kellogg 2015b, 90). Land would be held in fee simple so as to allow for taking on credit for economic production, yet could only be sold to the corporation. This meant a "legal restriction on the dissipation of his property" in order to protect "against the scheming individual, white or Indian, against Bureaucracy, against politics, against himself." Borrowing from socialist and Haudenosaunee sources alike, she explicitly argued that such a system should aim for the separation of "personal liberty from property" in order to "free [each Indigenous citizen's] energies" (Kellogg 2015b, 98).

She regarded this type of self-government as a "modernized" version of "Indian Communism" that could account

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for the practical problems endemic to cooperative ventures, such as merit-based pay (Kellogg 2015b, 97; 2015a, 149). Moreover, communities would use profits to initiate self-governing health care, education, and housing, and would own cooperative stores to prevent the common practice of price-gouging by off-reservation merchants, since the "business and social problems of the Red Man" are "so interdependent" (Kellogg 2015b, 99). Though invoking communism, she took it for granted that such communistic entities would enter into a competitive marketplace: Thus, Kellogg concludes with the striking claim that "it looks like a long way between Wall Street and the Reservation, but it is not very far" (Kellogg 2015b, 108).

Conclusion

In his review of Kellogg's *Our Democracy*, Indian rights advocate Warren K. Moorehead hoped that "all good Americans who desire a square deal for the Indian may read Mrs. Kellogg's book" (1921). Neither fellow Indigenous readers nor other audiences rallied around her plans. Though Kellogg continued to advocate unsuccessfully for the Lolomi throughout the 1920s and into the 1930s (Kellogg 2015f), she turned her attention during this period towards land claims and a movement to revive the Wisconsin Oneida's traditional clan governance and place in the larger Haudenosaunee Confederacy (Ackley 2008; Herdman 1927; Hauptman 2008, 161–62).

Some have commented on the Lolomi Plan's resemblance to elements of the 1934 Indian New Deal, which ended allotment and adopted a tribal incorporation model (Kiel 2014, 434). Yet, one description of Kellogg's response has it that she refused accommodation to the New Deal state because it violated Indigenous sovereignty: "She is entirely dissatisfied with anything that John Collier [then Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs] may do, and does not want to discuss tribal affairs with him saying that they are not under his jurisdiction" (Hauptman 2008, 156n). Accordingly, Kellogg argued in 1929 that the 1784 Fort Stanwix Treaty and the 1794 Treaty of Canandaigua obliged the United States to ensure the Six Nations' "right of self-determination," which could be realized through "protected autonomy, with the title of the original territory vested in them, and United States protection absolutely guaranteed to them" (Kellogg 2015f, 204–7).

What follows from re-envisioning the history of modern democratic thought through Kellogg's theory of decolonial-democracy? Kellogg's work foregrounds how U.S. legal and constitutional norms are themselves the product of a disavowed process of *co-authorization*, most notably through the treaty-making practices that long preceded the American founding (Tully 1995; Williams 1999; Hsueh 2010). Without likely being aware of Kellogg, Iris Marion Young likewise wrote of the Iroquois influence thesis that it demonstrated how democracy was a "hybrid" product from its very beginnings. For Young, the idea of "hybrid democracy" can contribute to the model of a "decentered diverse democratic federalism" distinct from the image of legitimate political order based on unitary state-sovereignty. The type of federalist model that Young had in mind conceives of self-determination as relational: Self-determination is a prerequisite to the non-domination of Indigenous peoples, but it nevertheless requires joint decision-making on questions of overlapping concern (Young 2007). Young's notion of "relational self-determination" would countenance a range of practices that pluralize who can authorize democratic orders in accordance with treaty-like relationships.

Second, Kellogg's political analysis foregrounds how realizing this aspiration of "relational self-determination" amidst deep pluralism requires a profound challenge to the political-economic dependency and domination that currently characterize the relations between Indigenous peoples and settler-states. While seeking as a *thinker* to reshape our imaginary of democratic values and boundaries, Kellogg's trajectory as a political *actor* captures the sheer difficulty of bringing decolonization together with democracy in practice: Though state legitimation discourses have today shifted to idioms of self-determination and recognition, contemporary settler-colonial societies still engage in practices continuous with their coercive foundations by invoking both a unilateral claim to sovereignty over Indigenous peoples and—in conjunction with capital—the dispossessive imperative of designating Indigenous lands as "sacrifice zones" for fossil fuel extraction (Simpson 2014; Coulthard 2014; Whyte 2017; Estes 2019). Kellogg aligns herself with social-democratic projects because she regarded settler colonialism as a structure that ripped away the social-reproductive capacities of Indigenous societies to make their own choices as future-oriented, flourishing collectivities—thus, her appeal for new economic foundations. To be sure, Indigenous peoples, organizing under the banner of tribal sovereignty in the United States since the 1970s have in some ways successfully clawed back a form of recognized "self-government." Yet the choices that Indigenous nations today make about how to mitigate such dependency through "self-government" are strategies to minimize the harmful effects of oppression that work alongside movements for transformative justice and significant land restitution called for in anti-colonial critique. Kellogg's proposal of renewed conditions of material independence suggests how the prospects of decolonization today still depend on transforming these underlying material foundations for the social ecology and economy of democratic life.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Notes

1 On the SAI, see Hertzberg 1981; Warrior 1994; Hoxie 2001b; Maddox 2005; Holm 2005; Vigil 2015; Lomawaima 2015. See also "The Society of American Indians and Its Legacies," of *American Indian Quarterly* 37 (3)/*SAIL: Studies in American Indian Literatures* 25(2) based on a symposium on the 100-year anniversary of the SAI. See Chadwick Allen's 2013 introductory essay on the origins of the SAI and 1911 conference.

2 Kellogg does not use the term decolonization, popularized in the late 1950s; Shepard 2006, 56. However, I think it is a useful term because she fits the schema Kohn and McBride 2011, 50, outline for political theories of decolonization: an anti-colonial thinker accounts "for imperial subordination, provides a call to arms, establishes the terms of independence, and lays out a blueprint for the future."

3 The Five Nations, Iroquois, or Haudenosaunee (Mohawk for "people who build the long house") Confederacy first formed out of the Seneca, Mohawk, Oneida, Onondoga, and Cayuga. In 1722, they took in the Tuscarora as a member nation to become the Six Nations. On Haudenosaunee political history, see Richter 1992; Fenton 1998; Hauptman 1999; Parmenter 2010; Monture 2014; Simpson 2014; Hill 2017. The Oneida, or "people of the standing stone," are one of the five nations of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, whose traditional lands lie between the St. Lawrence and Susquehanna Rivers.

4 "Lolomi" is a Hopi term meaning "perfect goodness be upon you"; Kellogg 2015a; Holm 2005, 77.

5 Aside from a few early poems and short stories, her other writings—at least one play and a novel mentioned in publicity materials—have been lost, likely along with papers from her personal collection; Ackley and Stanciu 2015b, 254 n.9.

6 For the mix of scorn and admiration for her brilliance from Oneida and Haudenosaunee who became wary of her fundraising methods during the 1920s, see McLester 1988; Stovey 2002; 53; 2006; Hauptman 2008; 2016.

7 There is more evidence on responses of fellow SAI members to Kellogg's personality, but it does not speak directly to ideological receptions of her political positions: Dagenett later cast Kellogg dismissively as a far-too utopian designer of "visionary schemes," questioning her fierce opposition to "Government employees" (including himself), whom she regarded as co-opted. Parker criticized her upon kicking her out of the SAI for accused fraud, describing her in highly sexist terms as "an ex-actress who danced in the nude"; "Letter from Charles Daganett to J.E. Shields" 1912; Maddox 2005, 193 n.

8 In her high school thesis, entitled "The Romans of America," Kellogg narrated "the analogy between the Iroquois Confederacy, or Six Nations, to the ancient Roman Empire," an argument that followed a common Anglo-American set of tropes, which she cannily deploys; Hauptman 2008; Colden 1964.

9 My aim here is not to ascertain the historical adequacy of the thesis but to ask how Kellogg *uses* this influence thesis to reshape democratic thought to forge a political theory responsive to structures of colonial conquest. The historians Donald Grinde and Bruce Johansen (1991) have the most systematic treatment of the influence thesis. Others such as Elisabeth Tooker (1988) have contested the depth of influence on the ratification debates of the federal constitution. See also Lyons and Mohawk 1998. Iris Marion Young (2000) has argued that the influence thesis helps to reimagine democracy as a "hybrid" product of multiple agents.

References

Ackley, Kristina. 2008. "Renewing Haudenosaunee Ties: Laura Cornelius Kellogg and the Idea of Unity in the Oneida Land Claim." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 32(1): 57–81.

Ackley, Kristina, and Cristina Stanciu. 2015a. "Chronology." In *Our Democracy and the American Indian and Other Works*, ed. Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu, xxiii–xxviii. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

———. 2015b. "Introduction: Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Haudenosaunee Thinker, Native Activist, American Writer." In *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian and Other Works*, ed. Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu, 154–66. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Adams, Thomas Sewell, and Helen L. Sumner. 1905. *Labor Problems: A Text Book*. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited.

Allen, Chadwick. 2013. "Introduction: Locating the Society of American Indians." *The Society of American Indians and Its Legacies, Special Double Issue of SAIL: Studies in American Indian Literatures 37.3 and American Indian Quarterly* 25.2, 3–22.

Arendt, Hannah. 2006. *On Revolution*. New York, NY: Penguin Classics.

Bagehot, Walter. 1915. *The Works and Life of Walter Bagehot, Volume 5*. London: Logmans, Green, and Co.

Bruyneel, Kevin. 2007. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.–Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2016. "Codename Geronimo: Settler Memory and the Production of American Statism." *Settler Colonial Studies* 6(4): 349–64.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Colden, Cadwallader. 1964. *The History of the Five Nations, Depending on the Province of New-York in America (1727, 1747)*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Cornelius, Carol. 1999. *Iroquois Corn in a Culture-Based Curriculum: A Framework for Respectfully Teaching about Cultures*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skins, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Dahl, Adam. 2018. *Empire of the People: Settler Colonialism and the Foundations of Modern Democratic Thought*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
Deloria, Vine, Jr., ,ed. 2002. "Minutes of the Plains Congress, Rapid City Indian School, Rapid City, South Dakota." In *The Indian Reorganization Act: Congresses and Bills*, 24–101. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Deloria, Vine, Jr., and Clifford M. Lytle. 1998. *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty*. Austin: University of Texas.
Deloria, Phillip J. 2015. "American Master Narratives and the Problem of Indian Citizenship in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era." *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 14(1): 3–12.
Deskaheh. 1924. *The Red Man's Appeal for Justice*. Brantford, ON: D. Wilson Moore, Ltd.
Dewey, John. 1922. "The American Intellectual Frontier." *New Republic*, May 10.
——. 1924. "Exit Frontier Morality." *New Republic*, January 2.
Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. 2015. *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Boston: Beacon Press.
El Paso Herald. 1913. "Princess of Oneida Indians Is Arrested," October 12.
Epstein, Andrew Bard. 2012. "Unsettled New York: Land, Law, and Haudenosaunee Nationalism in the Early Twentieth Century." Masters Thesis, Athens: University of Georgia.
Estes, Nick. 2019. *Our History Is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance*. New York: Verso.
Fenton, William N. 1998. *The Great Law and the Longhouse: A Political History of the Iroquois Confederacy*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Genetin-Pilawa, Joseph. 2014. *Crooked Paths to Allotment: The Fight over Federal Indian Policy after the Civil War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Gerstle, Gary. 1999. "Theodore Roosevelt and the Divided Character of American Nationalism." *Journal of American History* 86(3): 1280–307.
Glatthaar, Joseph T., and James Kirby Martin. 2006. *Forgotten Allies: The Oneida Indians and the American Revolution*. New York: Hill and Wang.
Grandin, Greg. 2019. *The End of the Myth: From the Frontier to the Border Wall in the Mind of America*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
Grinde, Donald A., Jr., and Bruce E. Johansen. 1991. *Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy*. Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center.
Harring, Sidney. 1994. *Crow Dog's Case: American Indian Sovereignty, Tribal Law, and United States Law in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Hartz, Louis. 1969. *The Founding of New Societies: Studies in the History of the United States, Latin America, South Africa, Canada, and Australia*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
Hauptman, Laurence M. 1999. *Conspiracy of Interests: Iroquois Dispossession and the Rise of New York State*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
——. 2008. "Designing Woman: Minnie Kellogg." In *Seven Generations of Iroquois Leadership: The Six Nations since 1800*, 143–63. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
——. 2016. *An Oneida Indian in Foreign Waters: The Life of Chief Chapman Scanandoah, 1870–1953*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
Hauptman, Laurence M., and L. Gordon McLester III, eds. 2006. *The Oneida Indians in the Age of Allotment, 1860–1920*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Herdman, Ramona. 1927. "A New Six Nations: Laura Cornelius Kellogg Sees the Old Iroquois Confederacy Established on a Modern Business Basis." *Syracuse Herald*, November 6.
Hertzberg, Hazel W. 1981. *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
Heumann, Stefan. 2009. "The Tutelary Empire: State- and Nation-Building in the 19th Century United States." Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
Hill, Susan M. 2017. *The Clay We Are Made Of: Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River*. Manitoba: University of Manitoba Press.
Holm, Tom. 2005. *The Great Confusion in Indian Affairs: Native Americans and Whites in the Progressive Era*. Austin: University of Texas.
Hoxie, Frederick E. 2001a. *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880–1920*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
——. ed. 2001b. *Talking Back to Civilization: Indian Voices from the Progressive Era*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.
Hsueh, Vicki. 2010. *Hybrid Constitutions: Challenging Legacies of Law, Privilege, and Culture in Colonial America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Huntington, Samuel. 2004. *Who are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
"Indian Conference Splits on Politics; Government Party in the Saddle." 1911. Part II, Series 3 - Newspaper Coverage. The Papers of the Society of American Indians, 1906–1946.
Iverson, Peter. 1982. *Carlos Montezuma and the Changing World of American Indians*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
Kellogg, Laura Cornelius. 2015a [1911]. "Industrial Organization for the Indian." In *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian and Other Works*, ed. Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu, 140–53. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
——. 2015b [1920]. "Our Democracy and the American Indian." In *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian and Other Works*, ed. Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu, 65–110. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
——. 2015c [1911]. "Presentation at the Dedication of Lorado Taft's Indian Statue Black Hawk." In *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian*, ed. Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu, 167–72. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
——. 2015d [1912]. "Some Facts and Figures on Indian Education." In *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian and Other Works*, ed. Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu, 154–66. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
——. 2015e [1916]. "Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs." In *Our Democracy and the American Indian and Other Writings*, ed. Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu, 197–201. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
——. 2015f [1929]. "Testimony before Senate Subcommittee on Senate Resolution 79: Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States." In *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian and Other Works*, ed. Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu, 202–48. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
——. 2015g [1913]. "Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917." In *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian*, ed. Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu, 173–96. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
——. 2015h [1902]. "The Legend of the Bean." In *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian and Other Works*, ed. Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu, 111–12. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
Kiel, Doug. 2014. "Competing Visions of Empowerment: Oneida Progressive-Era Politics and Writing Tribal Histories." *Ethnohistory* 61(3): 419–44.
Kohn, Margaret, and Keally McBride. 2011. *Political Theories of Decolonization: Postcolonialism and the Problem of Foundations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Lake, Marilyn, and Henry Reynolds. 2008. *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
"Letter from Charles Daganett to J.E. Shields." 1912. Part I Series I: Correspondence, 1911-1923 A.W. Cash-C. DeForest Davis. The Papers of the Society of American Indians, 1906-1946.
Lewandowski, Tadeusz. 2016. *Red Bird, Red Power: The Life and Legacy of Zitkala-Ša*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. 2013. "The Mutuality of Citizenship and Sovereignty: The Society of American Indians and the Battle to Inherit America." *American Indian Quarterly/The Society of American Indians and Its Legacies: A Special Combined Issue of SAIL and AIQ* 37(3): 333–51.
——. 2015. "Society of American Indians." In *American History: Oxford Research Encyclopedias*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Lyons, Oren, and John Mohawk, eds. 1998. *Exiled in the Land of the Free: Democracy, Indian Nations & the U.S. Constitution*. Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Books.
Maddox, Lucy. 2005. *Citizen Indians: Native American Intellectuals, Race, and Reform*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Madison, James. 1787. "Federalist 10." The Avalon Project. (http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fed10.asp).
Martinez, David. 2013. "Carlos Montezuma's Fight against 'Bureauism': An Unexpected Pima Hero." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 25(2): 311–30.
McLester, Thelma Cornelius. 1988. "Oneida Women Leaders." In *The Oneida Indian Experience: Two Perspectives*, ed. Jack Campisi and Laurence M. Hauptman, 108–25. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
Milwaukee Sentinel. 1919. "Would Plead Cause of Indians Before League of Nations: Wisconsin Woman of Wealth and Education, Grandaughter of Famous Chief, Has Devoted Her Life to Obtaining More Justice for Her People." August 17.
Montezuma, Carlos. 1914. "The Reservation--Fatal to the Development of Citizenship." *Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians* 2(1): 69–73.
——. 2015 [1918]. "Another Kaiser in America." In *Say We Are Nations: Documents of Politics and Protest in Indigenous America since 1887*, ed. Daniel Cobb, 32–35. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
——. 1916. "Preparing Indians for Freedom Is Foolishness." *Wassaja* 1(9): 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

——. 1917. "Drafting Indians and Justice." *Wassaja* 2(7): 3.
——. 1918. "The Truth Is Coming to Light." *Wassaja* 2 (12): 1–2.
Monture, Rick. 2014. *We Share Our Matters: Two Centuries of Writing and Resistance at Six Nations of the Grand River*. Manitoba: University of Manitoba Press.
Moorehead, Warren K. 1921. "Review of *Our Democracy and the American Indian*." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 8(3): 281.
Newmark, Julianne. 2013. "A Prescription for Freedom: Carlos Montezuma, Wassaja, and the Society of American Indians." *The Society of American Indians and Its Legacies 37(3)/ Special Double Issue of SAIL: Studies in American Indian Literatures and American Indian Quarterly* 25(2):139–58.
Oneida Indian Nation. 2016. "The Polly Cooper Shawl: Testimony to a Pact of the Revolutionary War." (http://www.oneidaindiannation.com/the-polly-cooper-shawl-testimony-to-a-pact-of-the-revolutionary-war/).
Ostler, Jeffrey. 2016. "'Just and Lawful War' as Genocidal War in the (United States) Northwest Ordinance and Northwest Territory, 1787–1832." *Journal of Genocide Research* 18(1): 1–20.
Parker, Arthur C. 1914. "The Road to Competent Citizenship." *Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians* 2(1): 178–82.
——. 1916. "Problems of Race Assimilation in America." *Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians* 4: 285–304.
Parmenter, Jon. 2010. *The Edge of the Woods: Iroquoia, 1534–1701*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
Patten, Simon Nelson. 1907. *The New Basis of Civilization*. New York: Macmillan.
Pratt, Richard Henry. 1973. "The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites: Paper Presented at the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction, Denver, Colorado." In *Americanizing the American Indian: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian," 1880–1900*, ed. Francis Paul Prucha, 260–71. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Rana, Aziz. 2014. *The Two Faces of American Freedom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Richter, Daniel K. 1992. *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization*. Chapel Hill: Omohundro Institute and University of North Carolina Press.
Rickard, Clinton. 1984. *Fighting Tuscarora: The Autobiography of Chief Clinton Rickard*. Edited by Barbara Graymont. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
Roosevelt, Theodore. 1916. "Indian Citizenship." *American Indian Magazine* IV(4): 326–27.
——. 1926. "National Life and Character." In *Works of Theodore Roosevelt*, ed. Hermann Hagedorn. Vol. XIII. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.
Royster, Judith V. 1995. "The Legacy of Allotment." *Arizona State Law Journal* 1:1–78.
Saler, Bethel. 2014. *The Settlers' Empire: Colonialism and State Formation in America's Old Northwest*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Shepard, Todd. 2006. *The Invention of Decolonization: The Algerian War and the Remaking of France*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Simpson, Audra. 2014. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler-States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Singh, Jakeet. 2019. "Decolonizing Radical Democracy." *Contemporary Political Theory* 18:331-56.
Smith, Rogers. 2009. *Stories of Peoplehood: The Politics and Morals of Political Membership*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
——. 2015. *Political Peoplehood: The Roles of Values, Interests, and Identities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Society of American Indians. 1912. *Report of the Executive Council on the Proceedings of the First Annual Society of American Indians Conference*. Washington, DC.
Stovey, Patricia Ann. 2002. "Parallel Souls: Studies on Early Twentieth-Century Native American Leaders in Relation to Black Activists W.E.B. Du Bois and Marcus Garvey, 1900-1934." MA Thesis, University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire.
——. 2006. "Opportunities at Home: Laura Cornelius Kellogg and Village Industrialization." In *The Oneida Indians in the Age of Allotment, 1860–1920*, ed. Laurence M. Hauptman, 143–78. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Tiro, Karim. 2011. *The People of the Standing Stone: The Oneida Nation from the Revolution through the Era of Removal*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
Tooker, Elisabeth. 1988. "The United States Constitution and the Iroquois League." *Ethnohistory* 35(4): 305–36.
Tully, James. 1995. *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Turner, Frederick Jackson. 1996. *The Frontier in American History*. New York: Dover.
Vigil, Kiara M. 2015. *Indigenous Intellectuals: Sovereignty, Citizenship, and the American Imagination, 1880–1930*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Warrior, Robert. 1994. *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Washington Post. 1914. "Critic of His Indian Plan: Laura Kellogg, Iroquois, Replies to Secretary Lane's Reform Statement," May 2, 1914.
Weyl, Walter. 1912. *The New Democracy: An Essay on Certain Political and Economic Tendencies in the United States*. New York: Macmillan Company.
Whyte, Kyle Pows. 2017. "The Dakota Access Pipeline, Environmental Injustice, and U.S. Colonialism." *Red Ink* 19(1): 154–69.
Wilkins, David E. 1997. *American Indian Sovereignty and the U.S Supreme Court: The Masking of Justice*. Austin: University of Texas.
Williams, Robert A., Jr., 1999. *Linking Arms Together: American Indian Treaty Visions of Law and Peace, 1600–1800*. New York: Routledge.
Young, Iris Marion. 2000. "Hybrid Democracy: Iroquois Federalism and the Postcolonial Project." In *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, 237–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
——. 2007. *Global Challenges: War, Self-Determination, and Responsibility for Justice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Zitkala-Ša [Gertrude Bonnin]. 2003a [1919]. "America, Home of the Red Man." In *American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Writings*, ed. Cathy N Davidson and Ada Norris, 193–95. New York: Penguin Classics.
——. 2003b [1921]. "Americanize the First American." In *American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Works*, ed. Cathy N Davidson and Ada Norris, 242–44. New York: Penguin Classics.
——. 2003c [1928]. "America's Indian Problem." In *American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Works*, ed. Cathy N Davidson and Ada Norris, 155–60. New York: Penguin Classics.
——. 2003d [1921]. "Bureaucracy vs Democracy." In *American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Works*, ed. Cathy N Davidson and Ada Norris, 245–47. New York: Penguin Classics.
——. 2003e [1919]. "Editorial Comment." In *American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Works*, ed. Cathy N Davidson and Ada Norris, 201–6. New York: Penguin Classics.
——. 2003f [1919]. "Editorial Comment." In *American Indian Stories, Legends, and Other Works*, ed. Cathy N Davidson and Ada Norris, 191–92. New York: Penguin Classics.
——. 2018a [1923]. "Our Sioux People." In *Zitkala-Ša: Letters, Speeches, and Unpublished Writings, 1898–1929*, ed. Tadeusz Lewandowski, 198–216. Leiden: Brill.
——. 2018b [1923]. "The Sioux Claims." In *Zitkala-Ša: Letters, Speeches, and Unpublished Writings, 1898–1929*, ed. Tadeusz Lewandowski, 187–97. Leiden: Brill.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001358 Published online by Cambridge University Press