
BAD MEDICINE
Sarah A. Whitt
Settler Colonialism and
the Institutionalization of
American Indians

*Bad Medicine*

# *Bad Medicine*

## SETTLER COLONIALISM AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF AMERICAN INDIANS

SARAH A. WHITT



DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS ⋮ *DURHAM AND LONDON* ⋮ 2025

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
∞
Project Editor: Bird Williams
Designed by David Rainey
Typeset in Arno Pro and TheSans C4s by
Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Whitt, Sarah A., [date] author.
Title: Bad medicine : settler colonialism and the institutionalization of American Indians / Sarah A. Whitt.
Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2025. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2024022129 (print)
LCCN 2024022130 (ebook)
ISBN 9781478031260 (paperback)
ISBN 9781478028048 (hardcover)
ISBN 9781478060253 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: United States Indian School (Carlisle, Pa.)—History. | Canton Asylum for Insane Indians—History. | Ford Motor Company—History. | House of the Good Shepherd—History. | Indians, Treatment of—United States—History. | Indians of North America—Crimes against—United States. | Inmates of institutions—Abuse of—United States. | Settler colonialism—United States. | BISAC: HISTORY / United States / 20th Century | SOCIAL SCIENCE / Ethnic Studies / American / Native American Studies
Classification: LCC E93 . W59 2025 (print) LCC E93 (ebook)
DCC 305.897/0730904—dc23/eng/20241216
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2024022129

Cover art: The piece featured on the front of this book is entitled *Jerry (after Horace Poolaw)*, created by artist Thomas Poolaw (Kiowa/Delaware), who holds a BFA in painting from the University of Oklahoma. Jerry, who is Horace Poolaw's son, served in the Navy and had returned home in 1942 when the original photograph was taken by Horace. I extend my sincere gratitude to Mr. Thomas Poolaw and the Poolaw family for allowing this piece to be featured on the cover of *Bad Medicine*. Yakoke.

FOR ALL INDIGENOUS PEOPLE IMPACTED BY INSTITUTIONALIZATION

# *table of contents*

# *acknowledgments*

*Bad Medicine* is a collective work; many people sustained the writing process and this book could not have been completed without their support. I think of my mother, Donna Akers; my grandmother, Mary Ellen Leftwich; and my great-grandmother, Ruth Dodd, each time I sit down to write—so I must first acknowledge that I would not be who or where I am today were it not for them. To my son, Asa Leflore, who grew inside me, was born, and grew before my eyes during the completion of this project: I have you to thank for so much. You served as a reminder—in more ways than I can count—to soften and smooth out the rough edges.

This book was with me through many challenging times, following me around like a comforting, familiar old friend. I am grateful to Shari Huhndorf, Tsianina Lomawaima, Juana María Rodríguez, and Raúl Coronado for the incisive feedback they gave on early iterations of the writing and framing of this research and the stories that emerged from it. The COVID-19 pandemic forced me to return to this work, revising it into the book it would eventually become. I am grateful to Cliff Trafzer for his support during that period of reflection, quietude, and revision, and for the many conversations we had about life, academia, and the perils and power of writing history during a time when the whole world was shut down. Thank you, Cliff, for your intellectual companionship and shared excitement over community-based histories and new lines of inquiry. Juliet Larkin-Gilmore's laughter buoyed me throughout the revision process, and Olivia Chilcote's priceless friendship and sense of humor saw me through the finish line (for reasons that I won't put down in print).

I met new colleagues, strengthened old bonds, and forged many friendships as I wrote and refined the book's central argument, which helped me to find the meaning at the heart of the colonial archive. To Fantasia Painter, Tiara Na'puti, Amy Lonetree, Ari Kelman, Brianna Theobald, Adria Imada, Susan Burch, Traci Voyles, Sharon Block, Vibhuti Ramachandran, my amazing editor Courtney Berger,

and many others: our conversations stretched and expanded the conceptualization of this work and the insights derived from it. To the incredible archivists who assisted me with this research, I thank you all sincerely. Stephen Spence offered invaluable expertise on the National Archive's holdings at Kansas City, and I am so thankful to have had the good fortune of getting to work with him on my many cherished trips to the archive. I am similarly grateful to Jim Gerencser at Dickinson College's Carlisle Indian School Digital Resource Center and to Richard Tritt of the Cumberland County Historical Society, both of whom offered valuable assistance. Thank you also to Paul Conrad, Martin Summers, Katherine O'Donnell, and Susan Burch, whose shared historical interests and generosity with archival and other materials helped to enhance this research and point to new threads to follow. Susan—thank you for your constant support, feedback, and incredible generosity of spirit, which has surely made me a better scholar and thinker. I am grateful, as well, for the generous support of the UC President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program and the American Council of Learned Societies, which enabled me to revise and finish this book.

Finally, I owe a debt of gratitude to the many community members, descendants, coconspirators, Native-led organizations, and Tribal Historic Preservation Officers who have contributed to this research and offered invaluable perspectives, experiences, expertise, feedback, and knowledge. In particular I would like to thank Anne Gregory, Thomas Biron, Megan Baker, Deidre Whiteman, Ian Thompson, Pemina Yellow Bird, Brad Angerman, Bed Rhodd, David Grignon, Tom Parker, Steven Curley, Rose Miron, the National Native American Boarding School Healing Coalition, the Native Justice Coalition, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma's Tribal Historic Preservation Office and School of Choctaw Language. May our collective work help strengthen Indigenous futures.

On December 17, 1916, a twenty-one-year-old Mescalero Apache man named Pablo H. wrote to the superintendent of the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, Oscar Lipps, to report some recent difficulties. Pablo was a former enrollee of Carlisle—the first federally funded off-reservation institution intended solely for American Indian people in the United States—and he had traveled from Pennsylvania where the school was located to the Greenville Indian School in Northern California, where he was employed as disciplinarian at the time of this letter's writing. As Pablo explained to Superintendent Lipps, "No doubt you will be rather surprised to hear that I intend to resign as Disciplinarian of this school. . . . I know you will think that I have been a failer [*sic*] as Disciplinarian but after you hear what I have to say you will think different."[1] He continued,

> The Superintendent [of Greenville] and I have been having some trouble of which no doubt he has already told you. This trouble started over the Assistant Matron, [who reported] me to the Superintendent, saying that she had seen me talking to certain girls out on the front porch. . . . Well this matron is always finding fault with every thing. . . . I have tried in every way to please her but have failed, she is always going to [the Superintendent] with things that do not amount to nothing.
>
> I have been treated very unjustly here. . . . I have done all in my power to put up with all that was said about me but cannot any longer. . . . I wrote to Washington for a transfer, but they wrote and said that there was no vacant places at present, so I wrote that if I could not get another place that I would resign.[2]

Pablo closed, "I think that after I quit here I am going to work up at the mines. . . . If I do not get another place [in the Indian Service] then I want to go to Haskell [Indian School] and take a Commercial Course. . . . I am only twenty one years old and feel that I need lots of schooling yet because it is very hard to get along when a fellow does not know very much."[3]

I quote Pablo's words at length because I think they capture something powerful about Indigenous people's experiences at Carlisle, and in the United States

more generally, at the turn of the twentieth century. For one, Pablo's letter registers the paternalism and influence that Carlisle officials like Superintendent Lipps continued to assert over former enrollees who lived and labored thousands of miles away from Pennsylvania. But Pablo's letter also illustrates how, although he was employed at an Indian school and thus ostensibly free of the kind of surveillance he experienced as a Carlisle enrollee, his behavior was still constantly under scrutiny by his white colleagues—a fact that showcases the pervasiveness of white supremacy and the malleability of settler institutions in maintaining power over Native people. As Pablo's experiences illustrate in stark relief, even though he was the person responsible for *administering* discipline to the students of Greenville, to his white colleagues, Pablo would *always* be a disciplinary subject.

*"It is very hard to get along when a fellow does not know very much."*

I often wonder why Pablo felt he didn't "know very much." If we take stock of the details contained in Pablo's letters—of all the things he *did* know—the apparent misalignment between his experiences and his sense that he didn't "know very much" becomes even more pronounced: Pablo knew, for example, that his colleagues at Greenville discriminated against him, perhaps on the basis of Indigeneity; he could also identify the source of his trouble—the boys' matron—who gossiped about him to his supervisor, and thereby wielded a subtle form of disciplinary power—a phenomenon discussed in greater detail in chapter 1. According to archival documents contained in his Carlisle file, Pablo was also a relatively educated man: he had attended Carlisle for six years before securing a coveted position with the Indian Service. When he made the decision to resign from Greenville, he had also devised several contingency plans, which illustrates his competence in negotiating available employment opportunities: he would work in the mines, earning three dollars and sixty-two cents a day, and try to get another position at an Indian school. If all else failed, he would attend business classes at the Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas—another large, off-reservation boarding school for American Indian people that existed alongside Carlisle in the early years of the twentieth century.

Given all of these details—all of the things Pablo *did* know—it seems surprising, then, that he expressed the sense that he didn't know very much. But in the context of an era in which Indigenous men like Pablo were often presumed by US officials to be always already in need of white oversight and management, his words register something more subtle: they speak to a broader awareness of the structures of supremacy—white hegemony, labor discrimination, criminaliza-

tion, and racialized punishment—he negotiated as a Mescalero man, as well as to his determination to direct the outcome of his life.

⋮

*Bad Medicine* places the experiences of Indian people like Pablo centrally within broader struggles over race, Indigeneity, power, and settler colonialism at the turn of the twentieth century. In so doing, the book reveals interconnected histories of Indigenous punishment, pathologization, and labor exploitation in Progressive Era facilities that claimed to educate, contain, reform, or punish Indian people in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century. The institutions examined in the following pages are seemingly discrete: they are public, private, federal, state, and religious facilities that professed to educate, employ, reform, "cure," or care for Indian people and, in some instances, other members of the general population, during a period of immense upheaval and reform. The Carlisle Indian Industrial School (1879–1918) in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, is the subject of the first chapter. Indigenous experiences in the private labor sector at the Ford Motor Company in Detroit and at a nurse training program at the General Hospital in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, form the basis of chapter 2. The Good Shepherd Home in Reading, Pennsylvania—a Catholic "reform" institution—is the subject of chapter 3. Chapter 4 turns to experiences of forced institutionalization at the Canton Asylum for Insane Indians in Canton, South Dakota, which was the United States' first and only federal facility intended solely for the "care" of Indian people declared incompetent or "insane." This book also analyzes the significance of other brick-and-mortar sites—such as local jails—through which Indian people moved, and *to* which they were often confined or disappeared.

At first glance, then, the institutions discussed in this work appear to be autonomous; yet as *Bad Medicine* argues, each played an important role in furthering colonial objectives, maintaining white hegemony, and fortifying settler-citizens' power over Indigenous people and their tribal nations. As philosopher Gilles Deleuze (thinking with Michel Foucault) has observed about the ways in which disciplinary power traverses institutions, "Discipline cannot be identified with any one institution or apparatus precisely because it is a type of power, a technology, that traverses every kind of apparatus . . . linking them, prolonging them, and making them converge and function in a new way."[4] Viewed in this way—from the vantage point of the institutions' effects on Indigenous people and the way they

facilitated settler empowerment—the discrete facilities discussed in the following pages are revealed to be interlocking and, in many ways, interchangeable in their objectives. Together, they comprised a formidable structure that functioned—sometimes exclusively—in the service of the settler society. Similarly, this book illustrates the mutually reinforcing relationship between institutions that maintained white citizens at the top of the racial hierarchy in the United States, in part, by enlisting them to participate in the punitive practices of the settler state.

In examining punitive connections between distinct spaces of American Indian education, labor, reform, and medicine, *Bad Medicine* demonstrates the interrelated nature of settler institutions and argues that the practice of confining Indian people helped concretize, maintain, and expand networks of white racial power. As illustrated by the dynamic between Superintendent Lipps and Pablo, this research reveals how diverse institutions deputized white American citizens as the disciplinary agents of Indian people and how Indian people uniquely experienced institutionalization as a tool of US settler colonialism. Building on extant scholarship in Native American history and settler-colonial studies, *Bad Medicine* argues that the intake or commitment of Indigenous people to settler facilities was inherent—rather than coincidental—to the broader work of US settler colonialism at the turn of the twentieth century.

Indigenous boarding school experiences continue to be an important subject of analysis in Native American and Indigenous studies scholarship, as well as for the tribal nations who continue to feel the effects of the "boarding school era" and its legacy. While previous boarding school scholarship has focused on the experiences of Indian children, however, my research finds that adult Indian women and men eighteen years of age and older were a significant proportion—and from 1912 to 1918, the majority—of Carlisle's institutional demographic.[5] In centering the experiences of this overlooked cohort of adult Carlisle enrollees, and the noneducational experiences of adult Indian people more broadly, the book argues that attempts to control, subordinate, and punish Indian women and men occurred across institutions that coexisted in the so-called Allotment and Assimilation Era of federal Indian policy—generally understood as the period stretching from 1879, when Carlisle was founded, until 1934, when Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier formally repealed much of the era's policies with the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act.

The punitive phenomena examined in this book occurred against a complex backdrop of political volatility, class struggle, philanthropy, and social reform.


**I.1** Society of the American Indian, 1911. Ohio State University, Inaugural Conference, Columbus, Ohio, 1911. Thompson Library Rare Books Stacks, Thompson Library Special Collections, Ohio State University Libraries.

Heterogeneous groups comprised of Indigenous people and white Americans, such as the Women's National Indian Association, the Society of the American Indian, the Indian Rights Association, and even the "Friends of the Indian," mobilized public sentiment to further the "Indian cause" (fig. I.1). Assuredly, there was good that came of these efforts; in other cases, however, organizational objectives were misguided and paternalistic, rooted in the belief that Indian people needed rescue, civilizing instruction, and oversight from those who knew what was best for them. The structures of discipline and power analyzed herein are anything but monolithic, just as the aims of the historical actors who participated in the institutional and social networks examined in this book were complex and varied. Indeed, Indian women and men, such as Wallace Denny (Oneida) and his wife, Nellie Denny (Sisseton; née Robertson), participated in Carlisle's institutional regime and the social milieus of other networks, and the fact of their presence and the presence of other Native employees in overwhelmingly non-Native spaces surely made a difference to the Native women, men, and children who navigated these complicated sociopolitical environments.

Yet as *Bad Medicine* argues, Indian people navigated a generally antagonistic stance in the so-called Assimilation Era—attitudes and ideologies that buttressed

and naturalized the institutionalized patterns of discipline, punishment, infantilization, and exploitation that seized on Indian people and their sovereign nations in complex ways. The presence of Indian Service employees who were also Indigenous—Wallace and Nellie Denny, Gertrude Bonnin (Dakota), and Charles Dagenett (Peoria), for example—within this broader settler and institutional regime thus would have had a limited impact on the inequitable power dynamics inherent to settler spaces like Carlisle or the Indian Office, which (unevenly) furthered the objectives of capital accumulation, land acquisition, and Indigenous cultural eradication. The punitive phenomena analyzed in the following chapters reflect the ways in which the institutions of the state enticed and enabled everyday citizens to participate in policing Indian people as a form of racial power, to obtain cheap labor through the Outing system, and to collaborate in an expansive network of Indigenous surveillance that reinforced white Americans' own national belonging. Yet, as illustrated by the many historical actors discussed in this work, one did not have to be a white American citizen to participate in and contribute to settler structures of empowerment, just as one did not have to be an Indian person to resist them. Still, in many ways, participation in the diverse institutions that claimed to improve the lives of Indian people furthered the interests of the settler state in subtle and not-so-subtle ways. In finite detail, *Bad Medicine* explores how settler power worked, and how settler institutions worked together.

Carlisle is often remembered as the flagship boarding institution for American Indian people in the United States. Many elements of its institutional regimen provided a model for the dozens of facilities that would be established in the decades following Carlisle's founding: enrollees received a rudimentary elementary education in English, reading, and writing; students were segregated by gender; and at the height of its operation, enrollment figures could top one thousand individuals in any given year. Carlisle is also often remembered as self-sustaining: enrollees lived at the institution across all years of its operation and were rarely permitted to leave or visit home; the labor they performed sustained the operations of the facility, helping keep overhead costs down; former enrollees and graduates returned to Carlisle as Indian Service employees; and siblings and children of former attendees also enrolled at the institution year after year, keeping alive the very real feelings of pride and sentimentality that many families felt toward their alma mater.

Inasmuch as Carlisle seemingly comprised its own self-contained universe, however, the school also maintained significant ties to other institutional spaces—

many of which were not under the oversight of the Office of Indian Affairs (OIA). These connections were sustained by white as well as Indigenous employees—Richard Henry Pratt, Oscar Lipps, Moses Friedman, John Francis Jr., Angel DeCora (Ho-Chunk), "Pop" Warner, and Dakota activist Gertrude Bonnin (Zitkala Ša), to name a few—who helped create and maintain lines of affinity between Carlisle, Indian reservations and communities, and other sites of contested settler power and oversight (fig. I.2). Additionally, because Carlisle enrollees hailed from disparate parts of the country as well as from other boarding schools, they too created and maintained connections between and among their diverse home communities and the institutions they traversed in this era. Examining the effects of these complicated networks of power, punishment, labor, and mobility, *Bad Medicine*'s attention to the noneducational experiences of adult Indian people in diverse spaces of Indigenous education, labor, "uplift," and reform exposes sites of Indian-white conflict that were as integral to the maintenance of settler power as were the theft and indoctrination of Indian children in boarding institutions. In analyzing the heterogeneous experiences of Indian people across a network of settler facilities—rather than in boarding schools alone—the book similarly reveals the central role of the institution as a colonial tool of Indigenous confinement, territorial dispossession, and white American empowerment.

Carlisle looms large in boarding school historiography. It was the first residential facility intended solely for the indoctrination of American Indian children during the Assimilation Era of federal Indian policy, and, as Akwesasne Mohawk historian Louellyn White has pointed out, the institution holds "dizzying" historical significance for the thousands of enrollees who traversed its grounds—as well as for families, tribes, and descendants of enrollees who continue to grapple with the impact of the school on their communities.[6] Carlisle's founding is infamous: Captain Richard Henry Pratt, an experienced military man, established the school in 1879 as a way to "civilize" Indigenous youth by divesting them of their lifeways. The institution's stated objective, as Pratt famously remarked, was to "Kill the Indian in him, and save the man." From 1879 to 1918, when Carlisle was repossessed by the US War Department, Native nations resisted this aim with varying degrees of success.[7]

Yet, while existing studies about Carlisle and other Indian residential schools have extensively documented the experiences of Indigenous children and youth and the impact of forced child removal on tribal nations, *Bad Medicine* focuses on a demographic that has received less sustained scholarly attention—Indigenous

**I.2** Hinook-Mahiwi-Kalinaka, or Angel DeCora (Ho-Chunk), ca. 1900. DeCora was a painter and employed as art instructor at the Carlisle Indian School from 1906 to 1915. Nebraska State Historical Society Photograph Collections.

**I.3** Quarterly Report, December 12, 1912. National Archives and Records Administration, RG 75, series 745, Carlisle Quarterly School Reports. Image courtesy of the Carlisle Indian School Digital Resource Center, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

women and men eighteen years of age and older—who enrolled at Carlisle in the early twentieth century, and who also often spent time in other institutions that were dedicated, ostensibly, to the "uplift" of Indian people in this era. Adult Indian women and men attended Carlisle in large numbers; as I discuss in greater detail in chapter 1, after 1900, adults who were eighteen years of age and older—all the way up to forty-five years old, in one instance—made up an increasingly large proportion of the institution's population. From 1912 to 1918, enrollment ledgers reflect that adults were the demographic majority (fig. I.3).

Some Indian women and men were sent to Carlisle as a form of punishment, as was the case with Justin R. H. (Apache), whose experience of parole under Carlisle's jurisdiction opens chapter 1. Others enrolled voluntarily, by making their own application. Many older enrollees sought entrance to Carlisle in order to learn a trade so they could better their circumstances in life (the subject of chapter 2), and they were often dismayed by the poor treatment they received upon passing through Carlisle's gates. Other Indian people, like Pablo, believed that a Carlisle education would increase their opportunities in life and left the institution believing they had secured meaningful work—only to be greeted by

intense forms of class discrimination and racism that jeopardized their employment status or their physical, mental, or spiritual well-being.

In oral testimonies recorded for posterity, some enrollees recount their former days at Carlisle fondly, while others articulate dissatisfaction with the institution's bland food, military-style daily regimen, and routinized subordination to white authority. Still others reveal complex feelings about their time at school, using humor as a vehicle for healing. In 1982, for example, James Garvie (Santee) was interviewed about his time at Carlisle, where he enrolled in 1912 at the age of nineteen.[8] In this interview, Garvie recounted a humorous story about Jim Thorpe, the famous Sac and Fox athlete and Olympic gold medalist whose accomplishments are often highlighted in connection with Carlisle's history. As Garvie explained,

> We would sing [hymns], you know. We stood up, and I stood with my hands folded behind my back and all of a sudden, I felt something in my hand. I thought someone had stuck their finger right there, so I said "I'll catch him," and I grabbed him. Here it was Jim Thorpe. He had put a prune in there, and when I squeezed it, the juice came out all over. . . . I didn't know who he was, so I asked [my friend], "Who is that guy?" "Why," he said, "that's an honor. That's Jim Thorpe who played that trick on you." And he said "That won't be the last one either." He was a prankster. Nothing that would hurt anybody's feelings, you know. He just liked to get into harmless mischief.[9]

I love this story because it illustrates how Native people found commonplace, clever, and subtle ways to cultivate connection in these austere settler institutions—the subject of much important literature on Indigenous boarding school experiences. For other boarding school enrollees, however, heartache, sickness, disconnection, and longing overshadow the archival record as well as their remembrances of their time at school. As I examine in chapter 1, the varied experiences reflected in archival records suggest that for many adults, Carlisle was not a school at all—it was a place where labor was performed continuously and where punishment was routine.

What do we gain from focusing on the punitive experiences of adults who spent time at Carlisle in the early twentieth century? Why does it matter that older enrollees increasingly populated Carlisle after 1900? At the turn of the twentieth century, new metrics were emerging by which to measure adult maturation, defined in opposition to childhood and adolescence. By 1920, Progressive Era

reformers in many states had succeeded in increasing the age at which an individual could consent to sexual relations from ten or twelve to between sixteen and eighteen, the time at which puberty had been completed and childhood ostensibly concluded.[10] With these rulings, citizens debated the changing meanings of childhood against a backdrop of concern over the protection and control of young women's sexuality.[11] The early years of the twentieth century also ushered in child labor laws that mandated schooling until the age of sixteen, at which point Americans could enter the workforce.[12] According to psychologist Jaana Juvonen and colleagues, only one-third of American pupils transitioned from eighth to ninth grade between 1907 and 1911, a fact they attribute in part to the "irrelevance of the curriculum to the lives of everyday youths."[13] This meant that most of the American population left school in late adolescence, before society considered them to be fully mature adults. Emerging views about normative psychological development were embedded in these societal shifts, as reformers, citizens, and politicians debated the point at which an individual could adequately assume the activities associated with adulthood and generally agreed that sixteen marked the threshold of "adult" maturity.[14]

Many of the public debates about the duration, characteristics, and sanctity of childhood did not apply to Native nations, however. As historian Marylin Lake has observed of this chimerical era, "Progressive reforms could have profoundly undemocratic outcomes. . . . Indigenous societies were supplanted by settler communities, who resolved to bring into being new kinds of race-based polities that were not simply 'facsimiles' of the old but self-consciously innovative pioneering democracies."[15] Land was thus at the heart of emergent (and past) federal Indian policies; following on the heels of the passage of the General Allotment Act (or Dawes Act) of 1887, surveyors enumerated each male head-of-household and assigned Native families approximately 160 acres to live on and cultivate. "Surplus" land was thrown open to white settlement. In this way, over ninety million acres of Indigenous landholdings were lost.[16] Alongside the allotment of tribal lands in severalty, in 1891, Congress passed a mandatory school attendance law that compelled Indian parents to relinquish their children (whom the OIA defined as youth between the ages of six and eighteen) to boarding facilities like Carlisle, where they would perform manual labor for half of the day or more and be indoctrinated into a rudimentary English-only education.[17] Together, allotment and assimilation-via-indoctrination in boarding schools comprised the twin engines

of an ostensibly "benevolent" era of OIA policy that stretched from the mid-1800s to 1934, when Allotment Era policies were repealed and the Indian "New Deal," as Reorganization was also colloquially known, was passed under Commissioner Collier.[18] US politicians believed that if subsequent generations of Indian people were to achieve "civilization," they would need to learn the value of hard work by performing manual labor—an inversion of reformers' hard-won fight for more stringent child labor laws for the general American public. In later years, however, curricular changes led to transformations in boarding school objectives and institutional demographics. After 1900, the OIA became increasingly skeptical of the efficacy of the boarding school system and encouraged the education of Indian children and youth in day-schools and American public schools closer to home.[19] Older enrollees, including adults eighteen years of age and older, thus increasingly filled Carlisle's enrollment ledgers. Despite this demographic shift, however, Carlisle officials retained the educational regimen and rules intended for school-aged children, and the institution's stated objectives remained largely the same.

US officials' promotion of a substandard curriculum for Native women and men who sought enrollment at Carlisle often meant that adults had fewer opportunities for economic or social advancement than did their white counterparts. In Carlisle's early years, founder Richard Henry Pratt was adamant that Indian people could compete with white Americans, and he stressed the importance of immersing them within Euro-American environments so that they might be better equipped to do so.[20] But with a change in OIA personnel that brought Estelle Reel's appointment as Superintendent of the Indian School Service in 1898, a new course of study for Indian schools gained traction. Reel's revised curriculum promoted expanded instruction in all manner of industrial work, domestic service, and menial labor, and this curriculum, circulated to all federal Indian schools after 1901, served as a template for Carlisle's course of study as well. Because Reel's views on Indian education were informed by a racial philosophy that asserted the inherent inferiority of Indian people, the training available to Carlisle enrollees was intentionally substandard to that which white Americans could expect to receive, thus offering little hope for Indian people—already adults upon "graduation" from Carlisle, in many cases—who aspired to obtain work outside of the routine management of the allotment farm and household.[21] In many ways, the limited nature of educational opportunities for Indian people was strategic; as Commissioner of Indian Affairs Francis E. Leupp remarked in 1905,

> Of the 30,000 or 40,000 Indian children of school age in the United States, probably at least three-fourths will settle down in that part of the West which we still style the frontier. Most . . . will try to draw a living out of the soil; a less—though, let us hope, an ever increasing—part will enter the general labor market as lumbermen, ditchers, miners, railroad hands, or what not. Now, if anyone can show me what advantage will come to this large body of manual workers from being able to reel off the names of the mountains in Asia, or extract the cube root of 123456789, I shall be deeply grateful.[22]

US Census records reflect the efficacy of this limited plan of education; in 1920, for example, decades after the federal Indian policy of allotment had been established, 35.79 percent of the Indigenous population ten years of age and older was enumerated as being gainfully employed. Of the 63,326 Indian people engaged in labor for that year, 43,584, or 68.82 percent, were in the Agriculture, Forestry, and Animal Husbandry sector, which included general farming of the kind encouraged by policymakers. By comparison, 31.14 percent of the "native white" population was similarly engaged, thus illustrating the overrepresentation of Indian people among the agricultural and farming sector as well as the relative lack of heterogeneity in the occupations of Indian people in this era.[23] As these statistics reflect, while Indian people were fast-tracked into menial labor and farming, they were simultaneously being dispossessed of the land base necessary to assume this work successfully—to say nothing of the quality of the land and soil they were allotted, which was often inarable. The following chapters further examine how settler institutions limited educational and occupational opportunities for Indian people and, in some instances, eased the transfer of Indigenous land to white ownership—patterns and processes that illustrate the tensions, contradictions, and shadow projects inherent to the policies and institutions of the settler state.

For Indian women and men who had already attained self-sufficiency upon *enrollment* at Carlisle (and who, in some cases, had already married), Carlisle's curriculum and subjection to rules intended for children may have been rather disappointing. As disciplinary records reflect, the seeming misalignment between adult Indian enrollees' expectations and hopes and those of Carlisle employees created widespread problems at the institution. Indian women and men often refused compliance with the school's disciplinary regime, and records of conflict at the institution similarly show that Carlisle officials attempted to maintain control over adults by denying them, paradoxically, the rights and responsibilities

associated with American citizenship and individual autonomy—both of which were held out as a reward for successfully graduating from Carlisle.[24]

In critiquing entwined processes of white American deputization and attempted Indigenous subordination, a process I refer to as *making children out of women and men*, this book stresses the importance of acknowledging that many of the "boys and girls" to whom Carlisle superintendents and US officials referred in correspondence were legal adults. In some ways, the issue is one of nomenclature: for many Carlisle women and men, designation as "adults" would have aligned with their own understandings of the roles they assumed within their communities or with their identities back home as wage earners, caretakers, cultural stewards, husbands, wives, siblings, knowledge bearers, and protectors.

Yet, the issue is also a political one, for the concept of Indigenous adulthood has historically held potentially threatening legal and social implications for the state. As K. Tsianina Lomawaima (Mvskoke) and Teresa McCarty have argued, Indigenous nations comprised of "self-determining adults exercising dual or multiple citizenships have been perceived as much more threatening than groups defined as wards, marked by the mental, moral, and legal deficiencies linked to the status of children."[25] To grant Indian people status as "self-governing adults" would challenge Chief Justice John Marshall's landmark 1832 ruling in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* that tribes were domestic dependent nations comprised of federal wards. Similarly, granting Carlisle enrollees adult status equal to their white counterparts would challenge the US government's assumption of federal guardianship over all Indian boarding school enrollees, regardless of age, and paternalistic authority over tribal nations and their children.[26] Indigenous cosmologies reckon with the responsibilities required of tribal members at various stages of physical, intellectual, and spiritual development in ways specific to each worldview.[27] Yet, at Carlisle, school authorities and Indian Office officials alike presumed that all enrollees were incapable of acting as their own agents—a view that actively undermined tribal sovereignty, as well as adult enrollees' self-determination, by disallowing them from transacting their own affairs, denying them autonomy over their allotments or annuities, and preventing them from tending to their responsibilities back home.

This hierarchical structure of settler power threatened the security of Indigenous resources as well. Archival records reflect that multiple Carlisle enrollees owned their allotments outright and made decisions about their resources while at the institution; other enrollees leased out their allotments for mining or other

extractive purposes and garnered royalties from these activities. In many cases, archival records reflect Carlisle superintendents' and reservation officials' intimate involvement in the affairs of Indian enrollees: officials regularly conducted land transactions and facilitated annuity payments on behalf of Indian women and men enrolled at the institution.

In one example of the ways in which this structure of guardianship produced fraught circumstances for adult enrollees who were also landowners, in 1913, the field clerk at the Union Agency at Muskogee (later referred to as the Five Civilized Tribes Agency), George McDaniel, wrote Carlisle superintendent Oscar Lipps in regard to Walter A. (not to be confused with Walter S., discussed in chapter 1), a twenty-one-year-old Creek (Mvskoke) enrollee who held an allotment plus surplus land on the reservation. According to this letter, McDaniel and Walter's mother together had determined that it would be best for Walter to sign over the deed to his land to his mother, to prevent the allotment from being lost to grafters. As McDaniel explained to Lipps, "If Walter should once leave the school on account of his past habits and his tendency for drink, he would be an easy prey for any designing persons, and could be induced to sign a deed to all of his land for the proverbial 'mess of pottage.' It was, therefore, deemed advisable, as a matter of protection to Walter, that his lands be conveyed to his mother as a check against the contingency as above contemplated."[28] Evidently, this was done. As I document in chapter 4, similar kinds of conflicted interests and state intervention into Indigenous homelife complicated familial dynamics, and sometimes directly resulted in forced confinement. At Carlisle as well, US officials' interference into the affairs of adult enrollees underscored the power of the state to alter the lives of Indian women and men away "at school." These land transactions add another dimension to our understanding of Carlisle's legacy.

Seminal studies by K. Tsianina Lomawaima (1993), Brenda Child (1998), David Wallace Adams (1995), and Clifford Trafzer (2006) have focused on multiple aspects of student experience across a federal system that was comprised of dozens of large, off-reservation boarding institutions, including Chilocco in Oklahoma, Sherman Institute in Southern California, Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas, and Flandreau Indian School in South Dakota, as well as smaller reservation day schools where Indian children and youth increasingly received an elementary education closer to home, especially after 1900. Newer work in this subfield, such as that by Kevin Whalen (2016), Myriam Vuckovič (2008), Mikäela Adams (2020), Sarah Klotz (2021), Natalee Bauer (2022), Maile Arvin (2019),

Caitlin Keliiaa (2024), and others, continues to nuance scholarly and public understandings of Indigenous boarding school experiences by addressing topics that range from the Office of Indian Affairs' power to shape the rhythm of enrollees' daily lives to the quotidian and extraordinary forms of physical, intellectual, and even linguistic resistance that Indigenous enrollees wielded with varying degrees of efficacy.[29]

While existing literature often examines the legacy of this system by analyzing boarding schools in isolation or comparative relief, *Bad Medicine* focuses on the ways in which white hegemony and supremacist notions seized on Indigenous people *across* the diverse institutions of the settler state. Indian people who attended off-reservation boarding schools are often regarded as being "away from home"—located in a place far away from their kin and communities.[30] But enrollees also recall experiences of moving from place to place and institution to institution—a phenomenon that disability studies scholars refer to as *transinstitutionalization*, or the movement from one institution to another, oftentimes forcibly. In addition to examining Indigenous punishment across institutions that existed contemporaneously in the boarding school era, a secondary goal of this book is thus also to demonstrate the significance of this particular pattern of transinstitutionalization for Indigenous people within the context of US settler colonialism. As the following chapters reveal, entrance into one settler institution was often entrance into a rhizomatic network of settler institutions. *Bad Medicine* extends boarding school scholarship by focusing on an underexamined cohort of older Carlisle enrollees and on elements of Indigenous experience that have received less attention in existing literature: transinstitutionalization, incarceration, punishment, sexuality, labor, mobility, and the ways in which white supremacy came to bear on the daily lives of those who lived and labored in and across settler institutions in the Progressive Era. While these and similar experiences are often acknowledged in Native communities as being part of our shared historical past, they have not been the subject of much sustained scholarly discourse. *Bad Medicine* thus seeks to denude the unspoken dynamics of white supremacy in this era while documenting and affirming what many Indigenous community members already recognize as being the commonly experienced legacies of state intervention into Indigenous lives, communities, and sovereignties.

The settler-colonial objectives of Indigenous elimination and territorial dispossession also figure centrally in the stories that unfold in the following pages. Building upon the work of scholars such as Lorenzo Veracini, Marylin Lake, and

Patrick Wolfe, *Bad Medicine* reframes interconnected histories of Indigenous punishment, pathologization, and racialization as experiences that reveal the inherently rhizomatic nature of settler institutions and the agents that oversaw them. In particular, this research draws on three of Wolfe's foundational insights: (1) settler colonialism is a structure and not an event; (2) settler colonialism has negative dimensions—elimination, for one—as well as positive outcomes, which include "erecting a new colonial society on the expropriated land base"; and (3) "race" is not a given, but is "made in the targeting."[31] Building on these key tenets, *Bad Medicine* reads across the grain of the colonial archive—in addition to reading against it—in order to deconstruct its "organizing grammar of race" and to examine the material realities and affinities of the settler institutions that impacted the lives of Indian people in this era.

Walter Benjamin, Lisa Lowe, Estelle Freedman, and others have described the methodology of reading "against the grain." In his famous essay, Benjamin observed that "empathy with the victor invariably benefits the rulers" and implored historians to "brush history against the grain."[32] Lowe notes that to her, the practice suggests reading "things in their contexts differently . . . to reconstellate a world that neither assumes the history of global capitalism to be even and inevitable, nor conceives of empire as a monolithic project."[33] I am inspired by these calls to action while recognizing that reading uncritically with the grain or skeptically against it does not always capture the productive capacity of the colonial archive and the attitudes and ideologies contained therein. In what follows, I thus often read across the grain of archival materials to expose the spoken and unspoken hopes, desires, assumptions, beliefs, and practices of the historical actors—many of whom were white American citizens—who authored them. In so doing, new patterns emerge from engaging with challenging institutional records about Indigenous people not as "true," but as truthful; a cross-grain analysis permits the historian to read seemingly familiar stories and events anew for what they might say about those who participated in the act of their creation.

This book's theoretical orientation has also been particularly inspired by Kelly Lytle Hernández's *City of Inmates* (2017), which reframes the history of human caging in Los Angeles and incarceration more broadly as a settler-colonial project of mass elimination. Similarly, I draw from the insights of Margaret Jacobs's influential *White Mother to a Dark Race* (2009), which examines the reach and scope of settler objectives through the lens of Indigenous child removal in the United States and Australia and, in so doing, crafts a historical narrative that

traverses national identities, settler objectives, and continental boundaries. This book engages these works and other paradigm-shifting scholarship to contribute a view of Indigenous institutionalization as another "pillar" of US settler colonialism, as Hernández has described the centrality of incarceration to the creation of the state. *Bad Medicine* applies a settler-colonial framework to quotidian conflicts between white Americans and Indigenous people and goes further, to showcase how American citizens seized everyday opportunities to exercise punitive power on behalf of the settler state.

Recent scholarship in American studies similarly reframes master historical narratives of Progressive Era reform by placing the experiences of marginalized populations (women, people with disabilities, or nonwhite communities) centrally in analyses of familiar topics in US history—labor relations, the history of psychiatry—some of which are also examined in this work. Discussions about race and processes of racialization have increasingly dominated this kind of scholarship, as in Elizabeth Esch's *The Color Line and the Assembly Line* (2018), which revisits the history of the Ford Motor Company as one of race-making. Indigenous Brazilians are discussed in Esch's study, but the experiences of American Indian men who worked at the Ford factory in Detroit are omitted from her analysis and from other studies that focus on nonwhite populations at Ford, an oversight that *Bad Medicine* seeks to address. Similarly, Martin Summers's *Madness in the City of Magnificent Intentions* (2019) examines the history of St. Elizabeths, the United States' first federal psychiatric institution, from the perspective of Black Americans forcibly confined there. Like *Madness* in the context of African American history, *Bad Medicine* produces a counternarrative—one that focuses on the coarticulation of settler colonialism and ableism (or *settler ableism*, as discussed in chapter 4) in the administration of Indian Affairs to reveal the white-supremacist overtones of the history of Indigenous institutionalization in the United States.[34] Chapter 1 of this book also draws on Jacqueline Fear-Segal's insights in *White Man's Club* (2007), which investigates US boarding schools such as Carlisle (for Indian people) and the Hampton Institute in Virginia (for Freedmen and Indian people) as sites of white racial power, analyzing two schools in relation to one another but largely in isolation from other institutions. Building on this important scholarship, *Bad Medicine* highlights the transfer of white Americans' punitive power *between* and *among* the labor, medicine, and educational settings that Indian people traversed at the turn of the twentieth century. Indigeneity is distinct from "race," yet Indigenous people have been racialized alongside other

nonwhite peoples in the United States; their histories are entwined. *Bad Medicine* thus argues for a broader view of divergent and intersecting forms of racialization, as well as the critical role of white supremacy—and specifically a phenomenon I refer to as *status-whiteness*—in the history of Indigenous institutionalization in the United States.

Although many of the settler institutions examined in this work promoted white supremacy, or the belief in the superiority of the white race, this does not entirely account for the "positional superiority," to borrow from Māori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith, that many white historical actors experienced over nonwhite people in this era. As such, I employ the concept of *status-whiteness* to demarcate a social role that many of the white Americans (and occasionally nonwhite people) discussed in this book adopted, were granted, or occupied—sometimes unwittingly. Not all white Americans held racial power in the same way, nor did they apply it evenly. But the many archival records examined in *Bad Medicine* illustrate how "whiteness" was a status that could be assumed and relied on in instances of interracial, gendered, and even class conflict. *Bad Medicine* contributes a new paradigm to Native American history and expands settler-colonial frameworks by demonstrating how white Americans assumed punitive functions over Indian people as a natural right—a pattern of deputization that heightened the efficacy of settler institutions, but one that has not been thoroughly explored in extant literature.

Chapter 1, "'An Ordinary Case of Discipline': Surveillance and Punishment at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, 1879–1918," analyzes the deputization of white Americans as the disciplinary agents of older Indigenous enrollees who were punished at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, before the institution's 1918 closure. In so doing, this chapter departs from existing boarding school literature to argue that patterns of white American deputization are most visible when we acknowledge the behavioral, physical, intellectual, and sexual distinctions between childhood and adulthood—as well as the messiness of these categories—that created racial conflict between historical actors in this institutional setting. After 1900, adult Indian women and men increasingly enrolled at Carlisle of their own accord and, once there, continued to exert autonomy and agency over their lives. They moved around, as they did back home, to greater or lesser degrees; they wanted to be able to come and go from Carlisle as dictated by the needs of their families and communities; and they often sought out romantic relationships with one another and with others in the

Carlisle vicinity.[35] As I explore in greater detail in this chapter, however, freedom of mobility often broke along racial lines of affinity—real or perceived—in the Carlisle region. This fact made the institution's immediate vicinity a dangerous place for Indian people, who devised creative ways of negotiating the class, race, and power dynamics they encountered in that time and place.

Drawing upon records held in Dickinson College's Carlisle Indian School Digital Resource Center (CISDRC), "An Ordinary Case of Discipline" reveals how Indigenous punishment figured centrally as an "ordinary" fact of everyday life at the institution. This chapter closely analyzes disciplinary files that document quotidian, punitive interactions between Indian women and men and white American citizens—interactions that range from explicit experiences of arrest and incarceration in the local jail, in the case of many Indian men, to Indian women's experiences of surveillance, gossip, and domestic discipline in Carlisle's "Outing" program, an exploitative system that placed Indian "students" in the homes of white Americans to perform menial labor. In addition to discussing instances of Indigenous punishment and resistance, however, this chapter also reveals the purpose Carlisle served for the settler society: it demonstrates how US officials deputized American civilians as the disciplinary agents of Indian enrollees and enlisted them to surveil and apprehend Indian people in the Carlisle vicinity—actions that curtailed Indigenous mobility throughout the Carlisle region and benefited the settler society by increasing its reach over tribal nations. These dynamics illustrate how, for many adults, Carlisle was not a "school" at all; it was a place where labor was performed continuously and where punishment was routine. Taken together, these experiences demonstrate how diverse historical actors worked together as part of the same system of white empowerment that spanned an entire region. These experiences also showcase the powerful methods of resistance that Indigenous people employed to resist this regime at Carlisle, and beyond.

A parable entitled "Hoe Handle Medicine," published in Carlisle's official student newspaper, provides the opening to the eponymous second chapter. This story introduces the concept of *medicinal labor*, which I use as an ideological lens through which to analyze the gendered experiences of Indian workers in the private labor sector. This chapter reads across the grain of archival records held in Dickinson College's CISDRC and, in so doing, centers the experiences of Indian men and women who trained to become automotive mechanics and nurses at the Ford Motor Company in Detroit and the General Hospital in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, two vocational "partnerships" facilitated by the Carlisle Indian School. At the

turn of the twentieth century, US officials were confronted with addressing increasingly dire health crises on Indian reservations and in boarding schools, and often prescribed labor and remedial action—before medicine—as the cure for Indigenous ailments. This prescription dovetailed with dominant discourses that construed Indianness as pathological and underscored the Office of Indian Affairs' efforts to encourage Indian people to take up farm work and other menial occupations—objectives that were reflected at Carlisle and in white-dominated spaces of Indigenous employment as well.

Viewed through the prism of medicinal labor, "Hoe Handle Medicine: Medicinal Labor at the Ford Motor Company and Lancaster General Hospital" demonstrates how ostensibly new avenues of employment held out to Indian people in the private labor sector had profound medical, moral, and punitive connotations. The first section of the chapter begins with an overview of entwined histories of health crises and shifting labor opportunities in Indian communities and on Indian reservations—the paradoxical outcomes of an era of Indigenous "uplift." This discussion then shifts to close readings of disciplinary materials about Indian men at Ford and Indian women at the General Hospital, which reveal the prevalence of the ideology of medicinal labor—as well as profound instances of Indigenous resistance to the pathologization of their bodies, nations, and lifeways. In considering these contested experiences of employment training, pathologization, and punishment, this chapter argues that *hoe handle medicine* is an apt metaphor for diffuse settler labor that "cured" by attempting to exploit adult Indian women and men in the homes, factories, and fields of white America.

Chapter 3, "Sisters Magdalene: Entwined Histories of 'Reform' at Good Shepherd Homes," turns to another site of Indigenous punishment and forced institutionalization: the House of the Good Shepherd in Reading, Pennsylvania—a facility described in Carlisle correspondence as a convent or reform school administered by the Catholic order of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. In 1914, at least three young Indian women were sent from Carlisle to the Reading home as punishment for various perceived behavioral infractions. Their experiences bear marked similarities to, and important distinctions from, the experiences of Irish women confined in Good Shepherd Magdalene laundries thousands of miles away across the world. The history of Magdalene laundries in Ireland and their impact on Irish women who were forcibly confined to these facilities between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries are well-documented; Magdalene laundries also existed contemporaneously in the United States, but their existence is less

widely known. Placing these histories of forced confinement into conversation with one another, this chapter makes the case for expanding our understanding of the way the federal Indian boarding school system worked in tandem with other noneducational facilities in the Unites States to encompass and accommodate institutions that do not neatly fit the definition of a "school."

"Sisters Magdalene" begins with an overview of the purposes that Magdalene laundries served in Ireland and details important similarities and distinctions between Irish and US facilities. Drawing on oral testimonies of Irish survivors housed in the Digital Repository of Ireland, this section argues that the Good Shepherd home in Reading and other contemporaneous American "reform" institutions played an important role in the apparatus of the US settler state, akin to the role of Magdalene laundries in what historian James Smith refers to as Ireland's "architecture of containment."[36] Building on this discussion, I shift to an examination of archival records relating to the young Native women confined in the Reading facility, which illustrate how US officials used the Good Shepherd home as an alternative to the prison. The third and final section examines gendered distinctions in the punishment of Indian women and men, which further illustrates the use of carceral auxiliary institutions, such as "reform schools," as tools of US settler colonialism. As this chapter demonstrates, Indian women's experiences of confinement at the Good Shepherd home intersect with multiple histories of confinement, reform, and institutionalization; they also offer critical insight into the global impact of Magdalene laundries, while highlighting the ways in which the young Indian women sent to Reading uniquely experienced confinement as a tool of US settler colonialism. In light of the US Interior Department's federal investigation into the legacy of the boarding school system, it is critical that all institutions that intervened into tribal sovereignty be identified and come under scrutiny.

Following the policies of this era of bad medicine to their logical conclusion, chapter 4, "Care and Maintenance: Settler Ableism and Land Dispossession at the Canton Asylum for Insane Indians, 1902–1934," travels to Canton, South Dakota, to the Canton Asylum for Insane Indians—the first and only institution designed solely for the confinement of American Indian people on psychiatric grounds. Reading across and against the grain of medical association proceedings, boarding school publications, photographs, and Canton "inmate" case files held at the National Archives and Records Administration, this chapter shows how the medical confinement of landholding Indian people at Canton led to territo-

rial dispossession on a small-scale, case-by-case basis. Records reflect that over four hundred Indian people were forcibly confined to Canton—often as a result of disagreements with boarding school superintendents, reservation agents, and other white citizens—and show that some Indian people were dispossessed of their landholdings while incarcerated there. Despite these facts, Canton is the subject of few academic publications and historical works. To date, *Bad Medicine* is the first monograph-length text written from a Native perspective (Choctaw) about Canton, although Susan Burch's excellent study, *Committed*, draws upon extensive community work with descendants of those institutionalized at the facility. Similarly, existing literature has not examined the motivations among white authorities that led to the long-term confinement of Indigenous people at Canton or the role that the institution played in piecemeal US territorial acquisition.[37]

"Care and Maintenance" thus broadens current understandings of the institution's legacy by examining extralegal processes that led to the forced confinement of Indian people at Canton, often until death. It begins by tracing anti-Indian sentiment in law, medicine, and popular culture that contributed to dominant Western pseudoscientific beliefs about Indian people and the prevalence, or lack thereof, of "insanity" in Indian communities. These discourses helped shape the racial common sense and conditions of possibility necessary for the incarceration of Indian people on the basis of "insanity," while further fortifying expressions of settler ableism in the United States. Building on this discussion, the remainder of the chapter shifts to close readings of case materials and utilizes biographical sketches and vignettes throughout to center Indigenous voices and perspectives. Together, these records reveal how reservation agents, boarding school superintendents, legal guardians, and sometimes disgruntled spouses or family members leveraged extralegal processes of commitment to disappear Indian people to the facility. "Care and Maintenance" shows how Canton was "run like a boarding school" and situates processes of Indigenous institutionalization deep within the settler state on a historical continuum of US policies aimed at the eradication of Indigenous peoples. Although forced confinement at Canton was characterized by radical power disparities, Indigenous women and men held at the facility vehemently protested and resisted their institutionalization, as did their kin and communities. "Care and Maintenance" documents these intimate struggles in finite detail.

A word on methodology is in order. *Bad Medicine* draws on records that are housed at the National Archives and Records Administration; the Library of Congress; the Carlisle Indian School Digital Resource Center at Dickinson College; the Cumberland County Historical Society in Carlisle, Pennsylvania; and other nontribal organizations. In so doing, this work joins that of Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Eve Tuck, Lisa Lowe, Saidiya Hartman, Michel-Rolph Trouillot, and many others who have critiqued the colonial archive as always already imbalanced and who have devised radical ways of listening and responding to an archival record that reflects troubling disparities of power. My way of listening to the colonial archive is specific to my positionality as a Choctaw woman, mother, daughter, community member, and scholar who hails from a long line of educators and troublemakers, whose research has been facilitated by graduate-level training and access to institutional spaces often unavailable to those outside of academia. I owe a debt of gratitude to the Indigenous community members, activists, and leaders whose perspectives are reflected in the book, and which supplement the inherently limited and limiting nature of the archival records engaged in this work. Many of the materials examined in *Bad Medicine* offer distinctively non-Indigenous viewpoints on Indian Affairs in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; the stories of Indigenous struggle uncovered in the colonial archive suggest that US officials believed their institutions were "successful" not because they benefited Indigenous people but because they produced structures of power that fortified the settler society. Yet, Indian people were not passive bystanders in histories of forced or coerced institutionalization. In fact, as the following chapters reveal, the very opposite is true: they actively resisted subordination, infantilization, punishment, and white hegemony, along with the many other, myriad forms of bad medicine they encountered within institutions designed to further the interests of the settler state. *Bad Medicine* thus also illustrates how the Indigenous people who lived at the turn of the twentieth century and who were ensnared in the institutional apparatus of the settler state worked assiduously to maintain autonomy over their lives, relationships, and daily affairs; they used all of the resources at their disposal to achieve their goals or to seek out connection in these hostile institutional environments, and often, their very ingenuity was punished. Sometimes, they were able to successfully resist total subordination to white authority, as well as the most detrimental effects of these institutional regimes. In other cases, however, they could not. *Bad Medicine* finds that these behaviors, these resistance efforts, were historically significant because

they reveal punitive patterns that might otherwise go unnoticed—patterns that continue to play out in the America of today.

To further intervene in the colonial archive's propensity to exclude Indigenous viewpoints, I place Indigenous perspectives centrally within the following analyses, whenever possible. Narrative cohesion and the production of history requires the selective incorporation and arrangement of facts, a process that Trouillot has famously problematized; in an effort to challenge settler hegemony and tell these stories of Indigenous struggle in a good way, I have also included an appendix of fully reproduced letters of correspondence authored by some of the Indigenous historical actors engaged in this book. Moreover, I make the stylistic decision to redact the surnames of the Indigenous people mentioned in *Bad Medicine* unless their names appear in previously published work or repositories, and I do so out of respect for their descendants and communities who retain the right to narrate their histories in a way that aligns with their own community protocols. To that end, tribal or community affiliations are used first to identify the Indigenous people referred to in this work, and I make the decision to retain tribal affiliations the way they were originally described in archival materials, in the hopes that this continuity might assist descendants and tribes conducting independent research in locating their kin. I use the terms *American Indian* (and Indian), *Native American* (and Native), and *Indigenous* throughout the book to refer collectively to the First Peoples, or original inhabitants, of Turtle Island.

The stories of Indigenous struggle contained in the colonial archive are often difficult to encounter. But they also document the fortitude of the Indigenous women and men who lived in this era, and who fought assiduously and unrelentingly on behalf of themselves and their loved ones—and in so doing, on behalf of future generations of Indigenous people. As illustrated by the accomplishments of our tribes, collectives, and communities in the interceding years, the policies and practices of this era of bad medicine were not ultimately successful. Today, as in the past, we forge our own paths forward. Our nations have always been strong; together, we carry on.

# *notes*

## INTRODUCTION

1. "Pablo H—. Student File," RG 75, series 1327, box 111, folder 4625, NARA, CISDRC.
2. "Pablo H—. Student File."
3. "Pablo H—. Student File."
4. Deleuze, *Foucault*, 26.
5. See Carlisle Quarterly School Reports, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, RG 75, series 745, NARA, CISDRC.
6. White, "Who Gets to Tell the Stories?" Days of remembrance, symposia, and other gatherings have been held to honor Carlisle enrollees and bring together descendants, families, and tribes impacted by Carlisle's legacy, as White discusses in this essay.
7. Carlisle's founding, history, operation, and legacy is the subject of a robust body of academic scholarship as well as novels and films; I have drawn upon the wisdom of boarding school historians and community members in this work. For information about Carlisle's founding and history, see Lomawaima and Ostler, "Reconsidering Richard Henry Pratt"; and Pratt, *Battlefield and Classroom*. For enrollee experiences at Carlisle, see especially Bell, "Telling Stories out of School"; and Fear-Segal and Rose, *Carlisle Indian Industrial School*.
8. Carlisle was located in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, and in 1980, the Cumberland County Historical Society (CCHS) received a grant to conduct oral interviews of former Carlisle students and local townspeople for posterity. These testimonies are invaluable, and Garvie's is included in this collection. See Carlisle Indian School History, Oral Histories, James Garvie, December 3, 1980, CCHS.
9. Carlisle Indian School History, Oral Histories, James Garvie, December 3, 1980, CCHS.
10. Robertson, "Age of Consent Law."
11. Gorman, "Maiden Tribute"; and Robertson, "Age of Consent Law."
12. Filter, *Child Labor in America*, 33.
13. Juvonen et al., *Focus on the Wonder Years*, 11.
14. Robertson, "Age of Consent Law." For more on the history of childhood in the West, see Aries, *Centuries of Childhood*; Brockliss, "Introduction"; Heywood, *History of Childhood*; and Fass, *Routledge History of Childhood*.
15. Lake, *Progressive New World*, 6.

16. Ellinghaus, *Blood Will Tell*, 82.
17. Lajimodiere, "Healing Journey."
18. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, known also as the Indian "New Deal," was touted by commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier as a radical departure from previous policies, designed to put a stop to allotment and restore tribal nations to self-government. The act fell short of its stated objectives and many tribes expressed strong opposition to the "New Deal" and voted against it. For more information, see Ellinghaus, *Blood Will Tell*, especially chapter 4, "The Same Old Deal: The 1934 Indian Reorganization Act."
19. Hoxie, *Final Promise*, 196–203. Frederick Hoxie points out that between 1905 and 1910, enrollment at off-reservation boarding schools declined by more than 10 percent, while attendance at day schools increased by more than 47 percent. He also notes that "under Reel the Indian school system continued to expand, but its curriculum and objectives changed. Although the number of students attending nonreservation boarding schools grew by more than one-third, admission was limited to graduates of other schools" (196–97).
20. For a nuanced discussion of Pratt's educational philosophy and relationship with Carlisle enrollees, see Lomawaima and Ostler, "Reconsidering Richard Henry Pratt." See also Prucha, *Americanizing the American Indians*.
21. For more information about Estelle Reel's impact on Indian education, see Lomawaima, "Estelle Reel, Superintendent of Indian Schools."
22. *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, 1905, 3.
23. See "Color or Race, Nativity, and Parentage of Occupied Persons," 343.
24. Few Indian people graduated from Carlisle. According to Fear-Segal and Rose, fewer than 750 individuals, or approximately 7.2 percent of over 10,500 enrollees, left with diploma in hand. See Fear-Segal and Rose, *Carlisle Indian Industrial School*, 2.
25. Lomawaima and McCarty, *"To Remain an Indian,"* 45–46.
26. Lomawaima and McCarty, *"To Remain an Indian,"* 45–46.
27. See, for example, Risling Baldy's *We Are Dancing for You*; Gilbert's study about the role of athleticism for the Hopi in *Hopi Runners*; and Bonnin's discussion of gender roles and kinship responsibilities in "The School Days of an Indian Girl," in Bonnin, *American Indian Stories*.
28. See "Walter A—. Student File," RG 75, series 1327, box 91, folder 4105, NARA, CISDRC.
29. Lomawaima's text *They Called It Prairie Light* is an early, groundbreaking study of the remembrances and recollections of students at Chilocco in 1930s Oklahoma, and it treats gendered distinctions in students' experiences with great care and precision. Child's early work *Boarding School Seasons* has been similarly foundational to the subfield of Native American boarding school studies. Analyzing letters of correspondence in finite detail, Child's work grapples with the legacies of Haskell and Flandreau from the perspective of Indigenous students and their families; the result is a powerful portrait of the ways in which Indigenous families and nations grappled with the changes to their lifeways wrought by the boarding school era. While Lomawaima's and Child's

texts are foundational examples of community-centered scholarship that helped to define the contours and direction of boarding school studies, and which inform this book as well, Adam's *Education for Extinction* offers a capacious overview of the development and implementation of OIA policy as related to Indigenous students and boarding schools across the United States. The Sherman Institute (previously known as Perris Indian School) in Riverside, California, also occupies a prominent place in boarding school scholarship and is the focus of much of Trafzer's work. Newer work extends these analyses, often by focusing on a single institution, or several boarding schools in comparative relief. For example, see Klotz, *Writing Their Bodies*; Whalen, *Native Students at Work*; Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*.

30. See, for example, Lomawaima, Child, and Archuleta's *Away from Home*, which resulted from a permanent exhibit at the Heard Museum in Phoenix, Arizona, entitled *Remembering Our Indian School Days: The Boarding School Experience*.
31. Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," 387–88.
32. Benjamin, *Illuminations*, 256–57.
33. Lowe, *Intimacies of Four Continents*, 84.
34. Chapter 2, "Hoe Handle Medicine," discusses the concept of settler ableism in greater depth, which refers to the coarticulation of settler colonialism with dominant, limited, and non-Indigenous understandings of disability that often center and reinforce the primacy of able-bodiedness as a prerequisite for normative personhood. See chapter 2 of this book for more on this topic. In addition, see Whitt, Voyles, and Burch, "Settler Ableism." See also Cowing, "Settler States of Ability."
35. For more on Indigenous mobility, see Miller, *Indians on the Move*.
36. Smith, *Ireland's Magdalen Laundries*.
37. Recent monograph-length publications about Canton's history and legacy include Joinson's *Vanished in Hiawatha*, as well as Burch's excellent community-centered study, *Committed*.

### CHAPTER 1. "AN ORDINARY CASE OF DISCIPLINE"

An earlier version of chapter 1 appeared in the *Western Historical Quarterly*. See Whitt, "'An Ordinary Case of Discipline.'"

1. I use first names and last initials only due to the nature of topics discussed and out of respect for the descendants of the Indigenous people included in this work.
2. "Justin H—. (R—. H—.) Student File," RG 75, series 1327, box 2, folder 82, NARA, CISDRC.
3. "Secretary Haaland Announces Federal Indian Boarding School Initiative."
4. According to the quarterly reports for years 1912–1918, all adults (women and men) eighteen and older constituted the following percentages of Carlisle's population: 56 percent in 1912; 58 percent in 1913; 57 percent in 1914; 56 percent in 1915; 57 percent in 1916; 50 percent in 1917; 55 percent in 1918. See Carlisle Quarterly School Reports, years 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, NARA, CISDRC.