

laden with positive associations." She adds: "the concept works as a cultural glue" (p. 94). So does the conceptualization and rendering of this slender but rewarding volume.

CHARLES E. RANKIN is editor of *Montana: The Magazine of Western History*, Helena.

*Neither Wolf Nor Dog: American Indians, Environment, and Agrarian Change.* By David Rich Lewis. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. Pp. [xiii], 240. Maps, illustrations, notes, index. \$29.95.)

*Neither Wolf Nor Dog* is a story about maintenance of identity and tribal survival on the periphery of American society. Utilizing the Doris Duke American Indian Oral History Project Collection and the Tohono O'odham Oral History Collection, David Rich Lewis weaves relevant narrative with substantial primary material, creating a taut canvas on which to paint his thesis. The author casts his work as an investigation of "Native American responses to directed cultural change, particularly the social and environmental consequences of directed subsistence change" (p. 3). While the volume is modest in size, the presentation of three well-chosen and carefully researched case studies with equally carefully mapped methodology provide engaging reading. This is quintessential ethnohistory, combining well-developed perspectives and diverse sources of history with ethnological and ethnographic subtlety.

The three cases consist of two chapters each: one chapter of ethnographic and environmental background, with a second chapter describing the group's experiences with and responses to settled reservations and allotted agriculture. Lewis chose the three for their similarities as well as their differences, and he measures the range of responses the groups exhibit to the same change. In addition, the author wished to broaden tribal participation in scholarly literature by including three well-known but relatively little discussed tribes and their economies. The three groups chosen offered settled reservations, allotted agriculture, and differing environments: Northern Utes of the Great Basin and Rocky Mountain areas of Colorado, Utah, and northwestern New Mexico; the Hupas of the Trinity River area in northwest California; and the Tohono O'odhams of southern Arizona and northern Sonora, Mexico. In each case, the tribe adapted and interlocked cultural traditions with subsistence environments. This book considers the social and environmental result of attempting to solve an Anglo-perceived "Indian Problem" by implementing policies of directed subsistence change and tribal annexation meant to disengage the tradition-environment relationship.

Ultimately, each society studied became either marginally incorporated or abandoned at the edges of "American" society, because of impractical theories and unmet expectations. As the title of this book implies, the tribes' status was "neither wolf nor dog," a reference to Sitting Bull's observation of dependent nineteenth-century "agency Indians" (p. 4). Attempts with directive policies failed largely because each tribal case group reproduced its own cultural values in the changing and inexorably shrinking environment. Seen by the author as a forward extension of Richard White's work in *Roots of Dependency* (1983), this effort similarly considers environment, subsistence, and social changes in three tribes. Perhaps the main difference between the two works is that Lewis chose to study each group on the basis of matching chronologies, making this work useful when comparing and distinguishing across geographic boundaries. In Lewis's view, this study emerges not only as an expansion of work begun by White, but also as a part of a growing scholarship on Native Americans and agriculture. Indeed, he sees *Neither Wolf Nor Dog* as a partial answer to a call from anthropologists and historians for more scholarly research on the subject.

Lewis concludes that his study is but "part of the larger story of how agrarian-based policies, environmental change, and native cultural responses contributed to the ultimate dependency of previously self-sufficient peoples" (p. 170). Certainly Lewis's research provides an important contribution and at the least illuminates the way toward further investigation of Native Americans as active and reasonable participants in their own history, a possibility heretofore largely ignored yet ripe for theoretical and practical consideration.

KURT M. PETERS is assistant professor in the Ethnic Studies Center at California State University, Sacramento.

*Home on the Range: A Century on the High Plains.* By James R. Dickenson. (New York: Scribner, 1995. Pp. 304. Illustrations, index. \$24.00.)

For many Americans what passes as geographic knowledge of other places comes from driving the interstate highways or flying at 35,000 feet. From those vantage points the Great Plains collapses to miles of flat boredom or endless stretches of featureless space. But for countless generations of natives and newcomers the plains have been something more than "the big empty." North America's tableland has been variously called the sea of grass, the Garden of the World, the Great American Desert, and the Heartland. And for those who live there, it is often simply Home. Each of those names is a promise or a curse; each name an effort to impose human will on a place with an intractable being of its own.