

# Racial-Settler Capitalism: Character Building and the Accumulation of Land and Labor in the Late Nineteenth Century

*Sarah E. K. Fong*

On the heels of the 1875 Red River War, Army Captain Richard Henry Pratt transported seventy-two Kiowa, Comanche, Cheyenne, and Arapaho prisoners from Fort Sill to St. Augustine, Florida. Pratt argued that sustained and close contact between these Native prisoners of war and US society would uplift and civilize “savage” Indians, and he arranged for the prisoners to receive basic English education, set them to work in local orange groves and packing houses, and allowed them to make periodic visits to town. Hoping to continue his educational experiment upon their release three years later but finding that no white school would take them, Pratt arranged for seventeen of these prisoners to enroll at the Hampton Institute. In the middle of the night on April 14, 1878, seventeen Indigenous prisoners of war arrived at the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute in Hampton, Virginia under Pratt’s supervision.<sup>1</sup>

Hampton teacher Helen Ludlow later described the arrival of these prisoners-turned-students as a “midnight raid of red men” which “the school forces quickly rallied to receive.” Rather than meet this invasion with “shot, powder, and ball,” however, Ludlow recalled that Hampton’s white authorities and Black students met the arriving prisoners with “welcome and hot coffee.” Ludlow’s narrative of this encounter hinges on the replacement of rifles with hot coffee, suggesting that in the tripartite contact between Native, Black, and white subjects, relations of enslavement and conquest could be replaced with the bonds of friendship.<sup>2</sup> Founded in the wake of the Civil War,

---

SARAH E. K. FONG is a PhD candidate in the Department of American Studies and Ethnicity at the University of Southern California. She received her BA in Ethnic Studies from the University of California, Berkeley. Her research interests include comparative racial formations, colonial schooling, and the history and ideology of social welfare in the United States.

the Hampton Institute formalized northern social reformers' belief that industrial education could prepare African Americans for proper and productive citizenship. A decade after the school's founding, the arrival of Kiowa, Cheyenne, and Arapaho prisoners of war evidenced social reformers' belief that assimilationist schooling could incorporate Native peoples into the body politic as well. The possibility of replacing violence with belonging, however, rested upon Black and Native peoples' willingness to craft themselves as proper liberal subjects and productive citizens. Toward these ends, the Hampton Institute constructed a model of industrial-moral education that pivoted on "character building" and the adoption of dominant social norms, ethics, and values.

Helen Ludlow's unpublished manuscript reflects larger shifts in late-nineteenth-century modes of capitalist development that sought to retain access to Black labor and Indigenous land without recourse to enslavement and war. As slavery gave way to nominal freedom and the close of the frontier loomed, social reformers and policy makers turned to industrial schooling as a key mechanism to manage the nation's sociogeographic boundaries and promote capitalist development. Schools for Black and Native students proliferated throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries at the behest of philanthropic and state agencies. Although the history of Black industrial education unfolded alongside the development of residential boarding schools for Native youth, the historical and ideological connections between the two have not been explored in depth. Instead, historians of African American and Native American schooling often frame institutions such as the Hampton Institute and the Haskell Indian Industrial Institute (located in Lawrence, Kansas) as discrete historical objects and analyze them through the frameworks of racialization and colonization, respectively. Placing these two institutions alongside one another, I theorize their shared contributions to US structures of racial capitalism and settler capitalism.

Relational study of Hampton Institute and Haskell Institute requires more than simply adding Native American schooling experiences to existing analyses of racially segregated and unequal schooling. Instead, the juxtaposition of Hampton and Haskell requires an attention to the ways in which US histories of racialization and colonization are both overlapping and incommensurate.<sup>3</sup> Challenging the tendency of race theorists to collapse Native peoples' struggles into a broad conception of antiracist activism, Jodi Byrd contends that racialization and colonization are, in fact, distinct processes. The conflation of the two, Byrd argues, "masks the territoriality of conquest" and limits our ability to perceive Native nations' assertions of autonomous peoplehood.<sup>4</sup> Thus, to fully account for US histories of colonization and Indigenous peoples' struggles for self-determination, we must attend to "territory as analytic."<sup>5</sup> That is, we must address the historical and ongoing processes of territorial dispossession that shape Indigenous and non-Indigenous lives in what is currently called the United States. In our efforts to untangle the histories of racialization and colonization in the United States, Byrd proposes that we conceive of the two as distinct, yet "concomitant global systems" of power that "secure white dominance through time, property, and notions of self."<sup>6</sup> Keeping in mind the distinct, yet imbricated nature of race and colonization, I adopt a relational approach to analyze how late-nineteenth-century social

reformers constructed discourses of race and indigeneity in relation to land, labor, and “notions of self.”<sup>7</sup>

Bridging scholarship on racialization and colonization, this article theorizes the concept of racial-settler capitalism as an intervention into prevailing approaches to racial capitalism and settler capitalism. My conception of racial-settler capitalism emphasizes, first, that the development of capitalist relations in the United States depended upon both the exploitation of racialized labor and the accumulation of Indigenous lands. Second, I emphasize how the violent relations of racial-settler capitalism are remade through attempts to cultivate consent and desire among African-descended and Indigenous peoples. Racial capitalism and settler capitalism are often approached as analytically and temporally distinct processes. Prevailing conceptions of racial capitalism (exemplified by chattel slavery and its legacies) prioritize the devaluation of racialized life and the subordination of racialized labor.

Theories of settler capitalism, on the other hand, foreground the ways in which Indigenous peoples have experienced territorial dispossession and genocide in the interest of land accumulation and exploitation. Rather than hold these analytics apart, I bring them together to consider how racial capitalism and settler capitalism converge and diverge under the rubrics of industrial schooling and self making.<sup>8</sup> A relational approach to Black and Native schooling experiences reveals that racialized labor exploitation and territorial accumulation are imbricated processes that do not exist apart from one another.

Helen Ludlow’s description of industrial schooling as an alternative to racial and colonial violence obscures the forms of coercion inherent to the cultivation of the liberal, individual self. Like other school officials, Ludlow described character building and the cultivation of the self as a departure from earlier practices of enslavement and genocide. Through the development of good character, they argued, Black and Native people could become proper liberal subjects worthy of freedom and citizenship. Scholars such as Saidiya Hartman and Thomas Biolsi have shown, however, that the liberal self is both an object and method of racial-colonial subjugation. Theorizing the continuities between slavery and freedom, Hartman examines the “strategies of individuation” that constitute liberal individualism and the rights-bearing subject.<sup>9</sup> The modes of individualization that rose to prominence in the wake of emancipation at once recognized Black personhood (albeit in a highly limited manner) and sought to regulate freed peoples’ expressions of human subjectivity. Through pedagogical manuals, employment contracts, and agricultural reports on labor productivity, Reconstruction-era social reformers encouraged freed people to internalize the once-external forms of compulsion and discipline that structured chattel slavery. In place of literal ownership and spectacular forms of violence, reformers insisted that cultivation of conscience and personal responsibility would drive freed people to labor through the force of their own morals, ethics, and desires. In this way, Hartman argues, “the emancipatory discourses of rights, liberty, and equality” associated with liberal personhood are not, in fact, liberatory. Instead, they “instigate, transmit, and effect forms of racial domination” through the internalization of discipline and subjection.<sup>10</sup>

In related fashion, late-nineteenth-century federal Indian policy appeared to turn away from military campaigns to focus instead on “civilization” policies and the cultivation of modern subjects. Rather than inaugurate democratic relations between Native people(s) and settler governments, however, civilization policies targeted Indigenous peoples’ conceptions of self in efforts to unravel tribal governance and collective land-holding. By 1885, for instance, the Indian Wars were over and the Lakota people had been relocated to the Great Sioux Reservation. Despite the apparent end of military conflict, however, the Lakota people remained incompletely colonized. They were, Thomas Biolsi contends, pacified militarily but not internally.<sup>11</sup> Lakota peoples’ self-conceptions and social relations continued to operate outside of normative US forms of individualism. As a result, Lakota people could not easily be inscribed into the government’s administrative structures or the market economy. In order to exercise greater control over the Lakota people, the federal government devised administrative techniques that aimed to construct individuals with “specific practical, recordable, and predictable identities and self-interests.”<sup>12</sup> These administrative policies included property ownership, competency status, blood quantum, and recorded genealogy. By enforcing new ways of knowing oneself and others, the federal government aimed to produce what Biolsi calls “bureaucratically knowable and recordable individuals” whose self-interest could be predicted and manipulated by officials.<sup>13</sup>

Hartman’s and Biolsi’s insights into the violence and coercion of liberal individualism reveal the continues between industrial-moral schooling and the violence of enslavement and genocide. Rather than a pedagogy oriented towards radical freedom, autonomy, and self-determination, character building was one among a range of strategies that aimed to internalize racial and colonial relations of force. Through course materials, manual labor, and ritual activity, character building sought to direct the morals, desires, and behaviors of Black and Native students towards productive labor, extraction, and accumulation. Advocates of industrial-moral schooling proposed that character building would compel Black laborers to work not by the threat of the lash, but rather through the force of their own will. Additionally, study of the Mohonk Conference proceedings reveals that school authorities suggested that reforming Indigenous subjectivities through capitalist ethics of labor and liberal regimes of private property might make Indigenous territories available for sale and settlement.

Through a relational analysis of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute in Virginia and the Haskell Indian Industrial Institute in Kansas, I argue that the notion of “character building” reflected an evolution of US racial-settler capitalism that increasingly relied upon the apparent consent or acquiescence of racialized and colonized subjects in the processes of labor exploitation and territorial acquisition. An analysis of school newspapers and the proceedings of philanthropic conferences attended by school authorities indicates that Northern social reformers turned to the cultivation of self-governing Black and Native subjects as a method of racial and colonial governance that simultaneously sought to suspend state violence and preclude Black and Native resistance to racial subordination and territorial occupation within the structures of industrial capitalism.

I first develop the concept of racial-settler capitalism by reading Indigenous perspectives on capitalist development into prevailing conceptions of racial capitalism. Second, I locate the histories of Hampton and Haskell within the larger historiographies of African American and Native American schooling, respectively. Next, I detail the ways in which character building deployed the cultivation of the individual to accrue racialized labor. Finally, I explore how character building proposed to make Indigenous territories available for settlement and sale.

## RACIAL-SETTLER CAPITALISM

I use the term *racial-settler capitalism* to name the ensemble of economic and ideological structures which work to accumulate both racialized labor and Indigenous territories for the profits of the dominant classes in the Americas. In the United States, the historical processes that inaugurated the accumulation of labor and land followed divergent, if often entangled, trajectories. Chattel slavery facilitated the violent accumulation of Black labor through the middle of the nineteenth century only to be replaced by sharecropping, convict leasing, and tenant farming in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. On the other hand, policies of extermination, unlimited war, forcible removal, and allotment worked to accumulate Indigenous territories and undermine Indigenous socialities.<sup>14</sup> Rather than position land and labor as analytically distinct, however, I suggest that industrial school authorities enforced an ethical framework that sought to make both labor and land available for accumulation and exploitation through the cultivation of good character and the production of “social separateness.”<sup>15</sup>

Jodi Melamed argues that racial capitalism works to “invalidate the terms of relationality” and “separate forms of humanity so that they may be connected in terms that feed capital.”<sup>16</sup> In the context of late-nineteenth-century industrial schools, social separateness and integration into the processes of industrial capitalism were arranged along multiple lines. First, school authorities advised Black students to accept Jim Crow segregation as inevitable. They counseled students to refrain from protesting segregation and instead patiently await a future in which Black and white people would be social and political equals. Second, the organization of Hampton’s social fabric and the speeches of authorities associated with both schools reveal a racial imaginary that positions Black and Native peoples as racially distinct populations. Hampton’s Black and Indigenous students were housed in separate dormitories and taught in separate classrooms. More broadly, the speeches and publications of social reformers tended to omit any significant historical or contemporary exchanges between African-descended and Indigenous peoples in the Americas.

Most importantly for the purposes of this article, however, are the ways that character building sought to invalidate forms of human relationality that exceeded the foundational terms of capitalism. Character-building discourses encouraged Hampton and Haskell students to understand themselves and relate to others primarily as laborers and (aspiring) property owners. Defining good character, in part, as the performance of industrious labor and the desire to own land as property, industrial

school officials endeavored to narrow Black and Indigenous students' conceptions of self, as well as their relationship to their peers and the land. Insisting that students cultivate themselves through dominant conceptions of citizenship, labor, and property, Hampton and Haskell directed students to relate to themselves and others "in terms that feed capital."<sup>17</sup>

My conception of land and labor exploitation is indebted to theories of racial capitalism, which identify the fundamentally racial nature of labor exploitation, and Indigenous studies scholarship, which brings into relief the centrality of land to capitalist processes. According to Cedric Robinson, stratifications between labor and capital are organized by racial difference such that racialized lower classes provide the labor and resources necessary for the accumulation of wealth by the ruling classes.<sup>18</sup> For Robinson, the term *racial capitalism* identifies the imbrication of capitalist production and the differential valorization of racialized life. Dating back to feudal Europe, these patterns of racial differentiation achieved global scope through European exploration and colonization.<sup>19</sup> In this way, racial capitalism is inherently a colonial and imperial project. The enslavement of captive Africans played a vital role in the proliferation of such racialized labor relations, forming what W. E. B. Du Bois characterized as the foundation of "modern commerce and industry."<sup>20</sup> Even beyond the abolition of slavery, however, racial capitalism relies upon the continued accumulation of labor through both violent and seemingly democratic means.<sup>21</sup> According to Nikhil Pal Singh, "in no period has racial domination not been woven into the management of capitalist society."<sup>22</sup>

In addition to devaluing racialized life so as to reduce it to a labor resource, capitalist development in the Americas has consistently relied upon the accumulation and dispossession of Indigenous territories. By joining accumulation and dispossession, I call attention to the historic and ongoing relations between Indigenous peoples and the territories of what is currently the United States. To speak of the accumulation of land which made possible the expansion of the nation and the growth of the capitalist economy without accounting for the dispossession of Indigenous peoples is to enact a *terra nullius* argument; that is, to erase the fact of Indigenous life prior to settlement.<sup>23</sup> Indeed, as Jodi Melamed argues, capitalism "seeks to expropriate for capital the entire field of social provision," including land, work, education, and health.<sup>24</sup> According to Glen Coulthard, Indigenous peoples in the United States and Canada have experienced capitalist development primarily through the dispossession of territory, rather than through proletarianization.<sup>25</sup> Like the exploitation of racialized labor, the accumulation and dispossession of territory is best understood as a structuring element of racial-settler capitalism, rather than as a discrete and time-limited event. As Jodi Byrd, Alyosha Goldstein, Jodi Melamed, and Chandan Reddy argue, dispossession plays a "constitutive and continuing" role in the formations of US capitalism and colonization.<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, as Joanne Barker makes clear in her analysis of imperialism, racism, and debt, "dispossession is not anecdotal but formative" in the development of US capitalism.<sup>27</sup> The accumulation and dispossession of Indigenous territories provides the ground on which to develop extractive and racialized economies in the Americas.<sup>28</sup>

Attending to Hampton and Haskell's character-building curricula reveals how Northern social reformers' conception of self making sought to ensure the accumulation of land and labor in the aftermath of slavery and removal. Suggesting that "good character" hinged upon diligent labor and the acknowledgment of property relations, Hampton and Haskell sought to cultivate Black and Native subjects who would fill their prescribed role as laborers, and, in the case of Indigenous peoples, would forego their collective relations to land. Approaching industrial boarding schools as drivers of racial-settler capitalism requires us to explore the histories of African American and Native American education—not as discrete historical threads, but as imbricated, related processes.

## AFRICAN AMERICAN AND NATIVE AMERICAN SCHOOLING

Educational historians frequently position the Carlisle Indian Industrial Institute in Pennsylvania as the first site of what became a nationwide network of off-reservation residential boarding schools funded by the federal government. Although some histories of off-reservation boarding schools nod to the Hampton school as a short-lived precursor to this federal system, few have substantively analyzed the ideological affinities between African American and Native American schooling in the late nineteenth century.<sup>29</sup> Complicating this historiography, I locate the beginnings of federal Indian education in both the legacies of slavery and US wars of expansion. That is, rather than assume that Hampton was a forerunner of off-reservation boarding schools for Native students, I ask how Hampton's ideological and curricular models conditioned the formation of federal Indian boarding schools as they were expanding across the West. I suggest that holding African American and Native American schooling in tension with one another illuminates the mutual constitution of state efforts to manage both Black and Indigenous populations; juxtaposing Hampton (founded in 1868) and Haskell allows us to perceive the relationship between anti-blackness and settler colonialism anew, as they were refracted through late-nineteenth-century educational projects.

Hampton Institute's postwar curriculum reflects various tensions identified by historians of African-American schooling in the United States. Although education played a key role in defining freedom for both enslaved and freed people, in this era friction between the ideologies of Southern elites, Northern philanthropists, and Southern Black communities would mark many leading Black schools. Demonstrating a profound commitment to education, enslaved people and their descendants taught themselves to read despite laws against slave literacy; despite violent opposition, began a sustained project of establishing Black schools; and, as Reconstruction policies collapsed, they fought to maintain these schools.<sup>30</sup> Northern social reformers, presenting themselves as benevolent supporters of Black education, marshalled their economic and political resources and redirected African American education in ways that served their own interests.<sup>31</sup> With the influence of Northern philanthropists, industrial boarding schools adopted an accommodationist position that did not challenge the social and political structures of the South. Rather, they sought to normalize

Southern economic structures, harmonize race relations, and, in turn, create the conditions for industrial growth and maximal profits.

Like many of his peers, Hampton founder Samuel Chapman Armstrong believed not in radical reform of Southern racial and economic structures, but rather in training freed men and women to take their place in Southern society as subordinated free laborers.<sup>32</sup> Hampton school proposed to prepare freed people for proper citizenship with teacher training, manual labor, and moral education—what Armstrong often referred to as the education of “the head, the hand, and the heart.” Towards these ends, Hampton offered courses such as bricklaying, carpentry, horseshoe making, and numerous other forms of agricultural and domestic labor. It is important to remember, however, that Black students continued to imbue the school with their own wide dreams of freedom, regardless of the narrow aims of Northern reformers and industrial school authorities.

A technique of racial and colonial governance suited to the post-slavery and post-frontier era in the South, the Hampton model of industrial education became a blueprint for Black and Native schools throughout the nation. First crafted in response to a newly freed Black population, Hampton school entered the arena of Indian affairs when it enrolled the prisoners held by Captain Pratt in 1878. Hampton’s model of industrial and moral training fit well with the emerging consensus that federal Indian policy should prioritize education and assimilation as nonmilitary measures to subdue Native nations.<sup>33</sup> Indigenous students enrolled in colonial schools were subjected to lessons and rituals that aimed to replace their cultural practices with those of dominant US society. In studies detailing the curricula and daily routine of industrial boarding schools, Native American studies scholars have cogently argued that this schooling functioned as a type of cultural warfare intended to dissolve Native nations as political, social, and landed entities.<sup>34</sup> Upon arrival at school, for example, Native students were forced to dress in “citizens’ clothing” and cut their hair. School authorities prohibited students from speaking Native languages or practicing their religious traditions. Ultimately, off-reservation boarding schools failed to achieve their mission of entirely erasing students’ cultural practices, languages, religious beliefs, and tribal affiliations; as at Hampton, these students arrived with their own aspirations. They refused, resisted, and reappropriated that which did not serve them; they nurtured intertribal solidarities and pan-Indian affiliations which then would sustain many twentieth-century Indigenous political movements.<sup>35</sup>

Within a year of Pratt’s arrival at Hampton, he received federal approval to open the Carlisle Institute in Pennsylvania, a school that focused exclusively on the education and assimilation of Native American youth. By 1884, based on the apparent success of Hampton and Carlisle, Congress had appropriated funds to open three additional boarding schools for Native American youth: Genoa in Nebraska, Chilocco in Oklahoma, and Haskell in Kansas. The Haskell Institute was one of the largest off-reservation federal boarding schools. Although its first students arrived from the Ponca and Ottawa agencies, the school later enrolled Native youth from Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin.<sup>36</sup> Drawing on the Hampton model, Haskell’s curriculum emphasized industrial and

moral education: in addition to taking English language classes, students worked in the school kitchen, laundry, workshops, and fields.<sup>37</sup>

Although Haskell did not follow Hampton in enrolling both Black and Indigenous students, both the towns of Lawrence, Kansas and Hampton, Virginia operated in comparable political and cultural environments shaped by histories of slavery, abolition, and forcible removal of Indigenous peoples.<sup>38</sup> Hampton, for example, was once the location of an Algonquian village, and, later, of Civil War contraband camps.<sup>39</sup> The town of Lawrence—founded by New England abolitionists as a bulwark against proslavery forces in the West—figures centrally in the violent conflicts over the extent of slavery and the nature of freedom that occurred in Kansas before, during, and after the Civil War.<sup>40</sup> The region was also the site of a series of battles during the Plains Wars, as Native nations and the US government fought for control of territory in the 1850s and 1860s.<sup>41</sup>

The close relationship between Hampton and Haskell was also forged by the regular attendance of authorities from both schools at two annual philanthropic conferences that discussed the apparent problems of African American and Native American life in and alongside the United States. Attendees of the Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian (MCFI), first convened in 1883, debated the causes, consequences, and potential solutions to the so-called “Indian Problem.” Delegates to the MCFI included current and former US politicians, philanthropists, religious leaders, scholars, and boarding school officials. The MCFI inspired the formation of the Mohonk Conference on the Negro Question (MCNQ) in 1890. This second conference similarly addressed itself to the resolution of the political and social tensions arising from Emancipation and the apparent shortcomings of Reconstruction. The proceedings of the Mohonk conferences make clear that Northern social reformers saw the “Indian Problem” and the “Negro Question” as comparable social issues which could be resolved by cultivating dominant ideologies of liberal individual subjectivity. Moreover, because school officials from Hampton and Haskell drew on the arguments made at the Mohonk Conferences in overseeing their respective institutions, these conference papers illuminate their conceptions of the Negro Problem, the Indian Problem, and industrial-moral education as the best means to resolve both.

## CHARACTER BUILDING AND THE EXPLOITATION OF RACIALIZED LABOR

Rather than point to questions of citizenship, economic stratification, or sovereignty, attendees of the Mohonk conferences emphasized poor character as the cause of the so-called Negro and Indian problems. In their view, the political and economic struggles of Black and Native peoples were primarily the result of their moral constitution rather than enduring racial and colonial relationships. Former US President Rutherford B. Hayes argued, for example, that the degraded character of freed people caused them to live in conditions “compounded of ignorance, superstition, shiftlessness, vulgarity, and vice.”<sup>42</sup> Likewise, the impoverished conditions of reservations were attributed to the allegedly damaged character of Native people themselves. MCFI delegates suggested that federal Indian policy had fundamentally altered the internal constitution

of Native people. An excerpt of proposed allotment legislation, for instance, contended that by issuing rations, the federal government deprived Native people of “the ordinary necessity for self-support.”<sup>43</sup> In this way, the reservation and allotment systems seemingly made “a pauper and a beggar” of the Native person.<sup>44</sup> In their descriptions of the Indian Problem and the Negro Question as matters of flawed character, Northern social reformers figured the cultivation of an individual’s will to labor as the solution to the large-scale social dislocations of the late nineteenth century.

Within the discursive field of social reform, allegations of shiftlessness and pauperism represented Black and Native people as something more than materially impoverished. According to historian Linda Gordon, late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century social reformers drew a distinction between poverty and pauperism. Poverty, a temporary lack of economic resources, might result from illness or lack of employment opportunities. Pauperism, on the other hand, described a “permanent, hereditary poverty caused by the loss of will, work ethic, thrift, responsibility, and honesty.”<sup>45</sup> An apparent unwillingness or refusal to work thus sat at the center of reformers’ conception of poor character. In turn, reformers understood good character to emerge alongside an enthusiasm for and commitment to industrious labor. Mohonk delegates feared that neither Black nor Native people were sufficiently oriented towards productive labor. “Without compulsion,” MCNQ delegate John Glen argued, “the love of idleness on the part of the Negro is so great that he will never work of his own will.”<sup>46</sup> Rather than coercing Black and Native people to work, however, advocates of industrial-moral education encouraged the “achievement of voluntary industry.”<sup>47</sup> Thus, the task of industrial boarding schools was to establish an internal compulsion to labor in both Black and Native students. The cultivation of an intrinsic orientation to labor appeared to at once fulfill the needs of US racial-settler capitalism and preclude the need for coercion to accrue land and labor.

Mohonk delegates and boarding school advocates proposed that industrial schooling was the most apt response to the problem of deficient character. They argued that a curriculum built around embodied labor would induce Black and Native students to develop the moral and ethical characteristics of normative citizens. Thus, Hampton and Haskell’s manual labor curricula performed utilitarian and ideological functions: at once organizing student labor and also appearing as the basis for moral transformation. In a literal sense, the labor of students built both schools and maintained their daily operation. All students spent a part of each day working in the schools’ workshops and fields. Students cleaned and repaired school facilities, ran the kitchens and laundries, tended to livestock and crops. They also manufactured leather goods, clothing, food stuffs, and woodwork for use by the school community and to be sold for profit. On its surface, manual labor fuels racial-settler capitalism by, first, providing embodied labor to maintain the operations of the institutions and, second, by funneling Black and Native students into the lower rungs of a racially stratified labor market.

Although training students in trades and industry was critical to establishing and sustaining both Hampton and Haskell, the purpose of the two schools’ manual labor regimes exceeded the mastery of technical skill. School authorities approached

manual labor as something more than a pragmatic practice. Instead, they insisted that embodied labor would catalyze the moral transformation of Black and Native students such that they would develop an amenable orientation towards capitalist production and accumulation. According to Samuel Chapman Armstrong, the purpose of industrial schooling was to create opportunities for agricultural, mechanical, and domestic labor which would, more importantly, provide students the means to “support themselves and to develop character.”<sup>48</sup> Haskell Superintendent Charles Meserve similarly argued that the economic rewards of manual labor were a secondary concern. The material results of student labor were, he argued, “by far less important than the grander results in development of character, moral fiber, and spiritual growth.”<sup>49</sup> The purpose of character building thus surpassed the fulfillment of late-nineteenth-century labor demands. Rather, school authorities sought to craft workers driven to labor by the force of their own wills; to train laborers who not only *could* work but also whose internal ethics told them they *must* work. Thus, even as good character is advanced by manual labor, it exceeds embodied labor itself. School authorities constructed good character as a sign that students had internalized a moral orientation towards labor that would oblige them to work without external compulsion.

To reinforce the embodied lessons of manual labor and industrial training, Hampton and Haskell relied on their respective school newspapers to articulate the moral lessons of industriousness and good character. First published in 1872, Hampton’s *Southern Workman* regularly printed short stories, prose, and editorial pieces reinforcing the notion that diligent labor was the foundation of a moral life. Haskell’s *Indian Leader*, inaugurated in 1897, also reinforced this philosophy by animating the lessons encountered in the classroom and workshop through short stories, parables, and poetry. In an analysis of the Carlisle Institute’s newspaper, Jacqueline Fear-Seagal suggests that the newspapers of residential boarding schools played a crucial role in providing students with interpretive frameworks for their experiences inside and outside of the institution. Living away from kin and community, and thus at some distance from the people who would have otherwise contributed to the development of students’ belief systems, the school newspaper offered students a set of values through which to interpret their lives.<sup>50</sup> Through the narrative frameworks of their respective papers, Hampton and Haskell aimed to substitute the values and belief systems that students brought with them from home with the “creed and code” that animated the boarding school.<sup>51</sup> By way of example, I include below a representative poem and editorial that elucidate two important aspects of the relationship between character building and embodied labor. The first, a poem extolling virtuous industry, illuminates the affective orientation that industrial-moral training sought to foster. The second, an editorial profiling Henry Ward Beecher, reveals how efforts to distinguish between the industrious and the lazy contributed to the reorganization of racial difference in the post-Civil War era.

In September 1897, Haskell’s *Indian Leader* published “The Right Kind of Boy,” a poem that modeled for readers the proper affective relationship to labor. Through the genre of poetry, readers encountered Haskell’s aphorism that labor is an obligation to be met head-on and with conviction. In its opening stanza, the poem reveals the

importance of one's internal orientation to labor in the cultivation of good character. The poem begins:

We need the boy who's not afraid  
To do his share of work;  
Who is never by toil dismayed  
And never tries to shirk.<sup>52</sup>

This poem instructs readers that those with good character accept their obligation to work with courage and enthusiasm. The right kind of boy, or the proper subject, is unafraid of labor and does not shy away from the responsibility to work. The right kind of boy is not dismayed but rather stimulated and enlivened by the very act of labor. The right kind of boy does not sneak off or try to otherwise evade his responsibilities. Instead, he welcomes "his share" of the work, meeting his obligations with courage and resolution. The right kind of boy may go so far as to seek out opportunities to labor rather than shying away from them. The orientation to labor laid out in this poem was central to Haskell's conception of good character. School authorities sought to nurture an ethical orientation to labor that would compel students to direct their internal capacities towards productive labor without the need for force.

By developing an enthusiastic relationship to labor, school authorities proposed that Black and Native students would improve their character and, eventually, their socioeconomic standing. On the other hand, those individuals who did not develop such a relationship to labor would remain culpable for any political, economic, or social degradation they faced. In 1872, Hampton's *Southern Workman* published a profile on abolitionist and orator Henry Ward Beecher. The editorial content and excerpted speeches contained in this profile reinforced a distinction between the industrious person of good character and the degraded, lazy individual. Beecher's reprinted remarks establish a dissimilarity between the "man of influence"—a man who did not achieve his station "by sitting under the harrow of despondency"—and the "idle man" who had never "benefitted the world, his friends, or himself."<sup>53</sup> Deepening his criticism of lethargic character, Beecher described the idle man as "prey to grief" and a "lazy do-little sort of vagabond, who hardly earns his bread and butter."<sup>54</sup> Here the industrious worker is represented as an asset to himself and to society. The man who does not work is, in contrast, a drain on social resources and a threat to himself. Based on this sort of opposition, Hampton and Haskell authorities demarcated between valued and devalued life: those who labored diligently earned social status and material comforts while those uncommitted to hard work deserved what poverty and degradation might befall them.

Beyond attempting to fulfill late-nineteenth-century labor demands, the discourse of character building contributed to the revision of racial and colonial categories, replacing binary oppositions between Black/white and Native/settler with gradations of difference. A set of oppositions structured the ideology of character building, distinguishing between valued and devalued subject formations: industrious/lazy; moral/immoral; gender normative/gender nonnormative; Christian/non-Christian; and propertied/unpropertied. These binaries established differentiations between

individuals who might otherwise be perceived as members of homogenous racialized and colonized populations. Through these seemingly nonracial binaries, school authorities crafted new gradations of racial and colonial difference. In place of monolithic representations of Black and Indigenous subjects, assessments of good character and industriousness allowed school authorities to distinguish between those Black or Native subjects who had oriented themselves towards racial-settler capitalism and those who had not. In this way, they established shades of racial difference arrayed along the lines of orientation to productive labor rather than phenotype alone.<sup>55</sup> By differentiating between those who labor willingly and those who do not, character building reifies the devaluation of racialized life that is newly conceived as unproductive.

## CHARACTER BUILDING AND THE ACCUMULATION/DISPOSSESSION OF LAND

The cultivation of self-directed laborers was but one element of a character-building ideology that sought nonviolent means to incorporate Indigenous territories into the structures of racial-settler capitalism. At Hampton and Haskell, character building sutured industrious labor to the accumulation of private property by holding out the promise of land ownership as the rightful reward for a tireless work ethic. Despite the two schools' efforts to create a common desire to own land-as-property amongst Black and Native people, however, the political and legal structures of the era created uneven possibilities for property ownership. The ability to own land was, on the one hand, largely denied to African American people and, on the other, forcibly extended over Native nations. Land ownership figured centrally in the freedom dreams of enslaved and freed Black people, appearing as a material foundation upon which to establish autonomous and economically independent communities.<sup>56</sup> Thus, when industrial school advocates such as Reverend Doctor W. H. Ward argued that Southern Black people had to be "infected with land hunger and become land-holders" to arrive at economic independence, he tapped into existing conceptions of Black freedom.<sup>57</sup> Drawing on this association between land ownership and self-sufficiency, Hampton nurtured Black students' desires to become property owners. The desire to own land was, however, largely at odds with the realities of the Reconstruction Era and, later, the Jim Crow South. Throughout the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Southern policymakers and economic elites worked in concert to prevent African Americans from entering the propertied class.<sup>58</sup>

Hampton's Black graduates thus entered a political-economic environment arranged to impede their aspirations to own land. In contrast, Hampton and Haskell's Indigenous students encountered a political-legal structure that encouraged land ownership for individual Native people, particularly after the passage of the 1887 Dawes General Allotment Act. Through allotment policy, social reformers aspired to create an Indigenous landowning class modeled on the American ideal of the yeoman farmer. The Dawes Act divided communally held reservation territories into individually owned plots of land which would be assigned to members of a given tribe. The division and sale of reservation land transformed collectively held territories into

units of private property that could eventually be bought, sold, and leased on the open market.<sup>59</sup>

Even when we read these divergent experiences of Black and Native property ownership as evidence of the uneven extension of citizenship rights in the late nineteenth century, we must remain wary of interpreting the allotment of Indigenous lands through the framework of civil rights. Although frequently described by late-nineteenth-century social reformers as a measure to ensure the property rights of Native people, scholars widely interpret the Dawes Act as one iteration of a sustained effort to dispossess Native nations of communally held and treaty-protected lands.<sup>60</sup> The formalization of individual land title through allotment overwrote the communal systems of land tenure upon which many Native nations articulated themselves as peoples. In this way, allotment facilitated the breakdown of tribal land bases and the incorporation of Indigenous lands into the extractive systems of racial-settler capitalism in the United States.<sup>61</sup>

In addition to positioning industrious labor as the foundation of a moral life, Hampton's and Haskell's curricula upheld the performance of settler domesticity as an indication of good character. Female students were required to take courses that prepared them to become housewives and domestic laborers, such as domestic arts and sciences, physiology, and hygiene. The two schools' newspapers reinforced the lessons taught in these courses by publishing short stories and parables featuring young women endeavoring to maintain a "respectable" home. For instance, Haskell's school newspaper, the *Indian Leader*, published "What Two Girls Are Doing," a letter reporting on the lives of Mabel and Emma, two boarding school students who had returned home and were reunited with their parents. Both young women were diligently working to live according to the school's models of proper domesticity. Mabel (nation not specified) did her best to keep a clean, civilized home. She put the breakfast dishes away, swept the floor, and made the bed, even taking time to decorate the house by hanging paper flowers on the wall alongside "picture cards arranged in groups." Mabel took care of her physical appearance as well. She combed her hair and "dressed herself in a clean, pink calico dress."<sup>62</sup> Emma, "a returned Santee girl," kept a similarly appointed home alongside her mother and father.<sup>63</sup> In Emma's two-room home, "part of the ceiling and walls were covered with white muslin . . . to keep the mud plastering from crumbling and falling." The room was appointed with Emma's needlework, a "little shelf of books," neatly made beds, and a fire "burning brightly."<sup>64</sup> These two girls, the letter suggests, had internalized the lessons of normative settler domesticity enforced in residential boarding schools. The physical arrangements of these girls' homes—the clean dishes, swept floors, neatly made beds, and sweetly decorated walls—signaled the transformation of their character, their progressive assimilation into settler norms, and their adoption of settler domesticity as the ideal way to live.

Mabel's and Emma's stories celebrate the success of the boarding school project. However, these stories also reveal educators' anxieties about the precarity of the cultural and subjective transformation they so greatly desired. Like many reformers of the day, boarding school officials feared that students returning to unreformed reservations would "go back to the blanket," the racially inflected metaphor for maintaining

Native traditions despite settler schools' teachings. John Oberly, superintendent of Indian Schools, warned his peers that when students returned to reservations, they returned "to a social condition in which civilization must necessarily perish." On the reservation, he argued, "all the influences of family and race become active in the work of drafting them back to Indian life and Indian ways."<sup>65</sup> Seemingly, proximity to unassimilated family and peers enticed former students to return to the cultural forms, epistemologies, and embodied practices that the boarding school system was attempting to stamp out.

In Haskell's school newspaper letter, this fear was given physical form in the figure of Mabel's father, who appears as a sickly and degraded presence alongside the signs of "civilization" that marked her family home. The letter's author observed that some areas of the home "did not look quite so well" despite Mabel's best efforts: in a "dingy mud-lined" corner, her father lay resting on the floor. Remarking that "he may have been sick," the author notes that he was "very different from his daughter" as his generation had not had her "opportunities" to attend settler schools.<sup>66</sup> By suturing together the man's ill health and his lack of sustained encounter with US cultures and knowledge systems, the author implies that uncivilized subjectivity has damaging physical manifestations. Perhaps if he had been to school like Mabel, the author suggests, "he would have been as interesting as she."<sup>67</sup> The possibility that her father's unreformed character may be a danger to Mabel is more troubling than his illness, although the letter notes that she, too, is sick with consumption. In the view of the letter's author, this "uncivilized" and sick father acts as an impediment to his daughter's efforts to meet the standards of normative settler domesticity and thus, acts as a hindrance to her performance of good character. Mabel's father—an unschooled man of a previous generation—appears as a sign of an unhealthy, slothful "Indianness" that threatens to derail the civilizing project of Indian education.

The apparent threat of Mabel's unschooled father to her health and her home echoes a belief held by a broad swath of social reformers and policymakers in the late nineteenth century: reservations acted as spatial impediments to the transformation of Indigenous cultures, epistemologies, and subjectivities. Rather than recognize reservation lands as treaty-protected territories that maintained Native nations as landed political entities in the aftermath of war, genocide, and forced removal, social reformers regarded them as roadblocks to the advance of civilization. C. C. Painter, for example, described the reservation boundary as "a wall which fences out law, civil institutions, and social order."<sup>68</sup> Painter articulated the widely held conception of reservations as not only geographically separate from mainstream US society, but also culturally distinct. In the public imagination, reservations hampered the allegedly civilizing influence of dominant US culture and thus appeared to encourage the maintenance of Native traditions, knowledge systems, and social formations.

In this period, the allotment of reservation land gained favor among social reformers and policymakers as the wisest way break open reservations lands and thus to reorient the social and political life of Native nations. Secretary of the Indian Rights Association Herbert Welsh described the Dawes Act as the best means to "break down the walls which separate the Indian" from the world of civilized "thought and

action." The division of reservation lands and the formalization of "permanent individual land tenure" would, he argued, clear the path toward civilization for Indigenous peoples.<sup>69</sup> For many social reformers, the Dawes Act signified a turn away from US histories of violent conquest, and, as a result, the appearance of consent takes a central place in the narrative of allotment. Senator Henry Dawes argued that to effectively usher Native peoples into modern, civilized society, allotment could not be unilaterally imposed upon them. Instead, he argued, successful assimilation depended upon the cultivation of a desire to own land as property amongst Native people(s). Speaking before the 1886 MCFI, Dawes explained that "a farm is no blessing to the man who doesn't want it." Rather than "compel a man to take land," he suggested that a desire for land-as-property might be "enkindled" in Native subjects such that they would become land owners "through some agency" of their own.<sup>70</sup> Thus, although allotment would eventually become compulsory, social reformers imagined that in ideal form, the policy would rely upon the desires and consent of Indigenous people themselves. In this formulation, the success of allotment policy hinged upon the ability of industrial boarding schools to cultivate the propertied desires of Native students.

As a pedagogical tool, Haskell's *Indian Leader* played a key role in the school's effort to nurture students' rejection of Indigenous cultural forms and, in turn, foster their desires to live as "civilized" people. "Ske-de-ke," a short story published in May 1897, told the story of a young Indigenous girl who underwent a subjective and cultural transformation through her time at boarding school. Without specifying the nation or territory of Ske-de-ke's origin, the author indicates that when she arrived, she wore "fringed leggings and beaded moccasins." Her "thick black hair was long and tangled" and her face was "not very clean." Within two days, Ske-de-ke's outward appearance had changed. Her tangled hair was now plaited in "smooth braids tied with bright ribbon." Her leggings and moccasins had been replaced with a dark blue dress and new shoes. Ske-de-ke's transformation continued over time and after five years at school, she was "well advanced in her studies," "could sew neatly," and could do "many other kinds of work" as well.<sup>71</sup> This narrative of transformation suggests that Ske-de-ke had successfully begun to conform to the school's conception of civilized subjectivity. She dressed in "citizens clothes," spoke English, appeared happy at school, and had become a skillful laborer. All appeared well until Ske-de-ke returned home to her reservation.

When Ske-de-ke's parents sent for her to return home after five years at school, "she went willingly enough." She "loved her father and mother," after all, and "wanted to see them again."<sup>72</sup> However, when Ske-de-ke arrived home to her unschooled and unreformed family, she was dismayed and realized that she could not remain. At this point in the newspaper story, the narrative perspective shifts and grants the reader access to Ske-de-ke's internal thoughts: "The smoky teepee, the yelping dogs, the ill-prepared food and the general lack of cleanliness sickened her." Anxious to return to a more civilized space, she eventually convinced her parents to let her return to school where she was "happy once more with her beloved teachers, housemother and schoolmates." Again the author draws the reader into Ske-de-ke's mind, where we learn that "she now realized fully the difference cleanliness, energy and education

make. There was a better way and in that way she would live.”<sup>73</sup> This narrative representation of Ske-de-ke’s internal monologue and affective response to both the teepee and the boarding school is critical to understanding how school authorities endeavored to develop students’ desire to become part of civilized society. Amelia Katanski argues that this kind of narrative practice allows the unnamed and likely non-Native author to coopt the voice of a Native girl and thus “tells the readership exactly what to think.”<sup>74</sup> Claiming to represent the internal monologue of an Indigenous girl, the author provides what Katanski calls an “interpretive monologue” which instructs the reader to interpret the teepee and the boarding school as a signifier for uncivilized Indigenous socialities and the space of civilization, respectively.<sup>75</sup> The rhetorical maneuvers of this short story reveal one of the ways that boarding school authorities encouraged Indigenous students to desire the cultural and spatial transformation of reservation territories.

By depicting reservation life as a hindrance to the perfection of civilized subjectivity, assimilation narratives contributed to school authorities’ efforts to make allotment appear desirable and thus obtain the consent of Native students to abolish collective land title. Although allotment is not named explicitly, clearly it is the legislative and ideological foundation of the stories explored here, suggesting that cultural transformation is necessarily associated with the remaking of relationships to land. The two preceding stories illuminate school authorities’ sense that industrial education and allotment policy operated in tandem with one another. Under the rubric of good character, school authorities constructed a framework of civilized subjectivity that depended on a foundation of property ownership to sustain it. Teachers first encouraged students to desire the trappings and ethics of civilized society, and second, warned that civilized lifestyles could not be sustained in settings where Indigenous lifeways and systems of land tenure persisted. Thus, the formalization of individual land title figured as the material basis upon which students could enact the civilized subjectivity learned at school. Policymakers construed allotment and industrial education as two necessary components of a larger effort to create the legal, economic, and cultural conditions which would facilitate the incorporation of Indigenous peoples and territories in the structures of racial-settler capitalism.

## CONCLUSION

Although manual labor and vocational training formed the foundation of both Hampton’s and Haskell’s programs, I argue that the primary aim of school authorities was not to improve students’ technical knowledge and skill, but rather to craft the character of Black and Native students such that they might align their productive energies, desires, and aspirations with the land and labor imperatives of US racial-settler capitalism. In short, character building aimed to make land and labor available for exploitation through the cultivation of the individual. As the ethics of enslavement and conquest receded from the surface of public policy in the late nineteenth century, self making played an increasingly important role in the reorganization of racial-settler capitalism. In this context, the accumulation of land and labor appeared to rely on the

cultivation of consent and desire amongst Black and Indigenous people(s). Attending carefully to the moral elements of late-nineteenth-century industrial boarding schools reveals that beyond working to reorganize relations to labor and land, racial-settler capitalism seeks to rearrange relations to self, land, and others.

In their efforts to sustain public support for industrial-moral education, Hampton and Haskell authorities produced a prolific number of documents attesting to their success in developing the character of Black and Native students. Annual reports to Hampton's Board of Trustees and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs portrayed both schools as uncontested spaces where students willingly followed the lead of their teachers. Public documents such as school newspapers and self-published institutional histories testified to the good character of Hampton's and Haskell's propertied, self-sufficient graduates. In 1893, for example, Hampton published *Twenty-two Years' Work of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute*, a narrative record that portrayed 723 former students as diligent workers and aspiring property owners.<sup>76</sup> In 1920, Haskell's *Indian Leader* published a summary of a report compiled for the commissioner of Indian Affairs. In it, Superintendent Hervey B. Peairs indicated that of 348 former students, 345 successfully integrated the school's values into their lives, while only three appeared as "total failures."<sup>77</sup>

Such documents make clear the authors' desires to portray industrial-moral education as an effective model for aligning Black and Native people with dominant US cultural mores. However, these same records also demonstrate that Hampton and Haskell's students consistently proved themselves unwilling to wholeheartedly adopt the logics and values that underwrote industrial schooling. Hampton's and Haskell's written records contain limited, but telling references to disciplinary measures which indicate that students continued to answer to desires and value systems at odds with those of school officials. Students regularly broke the rules by sneaking out of sex-segregated dormitories, smoking cigarettes, running away, and even setting fire to the school. Those who violated school rules faced an array of penalties, including corporal abuse, denial of meals, confinement to Hampton's dungeon or Haskell's guardhouse, expulsion from the school, or, in some instances at Haskell, being locked to a ball and chain.<sup>78</sup> School officials' reliance on such extreme disciplinary measures makes clear the great lengths they went to in order to coerce students to abide by school rules and adopt the values they enforced.

Despite school authorities' efforts to showcase the success of character building in developing proper and productive subjects, evidence of other imaginaries seep through the institutional record. Hampton officials used the teaching career of Sarah Collins, for example, as evidence of the school's accomplishments. Born in 1863 in Baltimore, Collins graduated from Hampton in 1882. By 1893, she had been a teacher for six years, first in Virginia, then in Tennessee. Over the course of those years, Collins taught 250 students, ten of whom became teachers themselves. By the measure of school authorities, Collins was doing precisely what Hampton graduates were meant to do: spreading the gospel of industrial-moral training and doing her part to advance the acquisitive logics of character building.

When Collins described her aim in life as “to do *well* whatever I find to do,” she expressed her commitment to work diligently at the task before her.<sup>79</sup> Although school authorities may have interpreted this assertion as a sign that Collins had fully integrated the school’s conception of good character, her next words point to another set of ethics and conceptions of self. Describing the task she meant to “do well,” Collins characterized her goals in life this way: “to grow broader and deeper in intellect, through reading and study; to keep my heart in sympathy with my fellow creatures and alive to its duties to them, and to make my life a contradiction to the idea that the Negro is low and groveling in sentiment and purpose.”<sup>80</sup> Collins expresses a determination to know more, perhaps of herself and perhaps of others. Her desire to grow deeper and wider in thought pushes against the narrowing effects of industrial-moral schooling that sought to limit the field of self-expression and self-understanding. Collins gestured to a life of study that expands knowledge and relation rather than confining life experience to racialized formations of capital.

Collins’s desire to align her heart with others and to live in her duty to them veers away from the acquisitive and extractive logics of racial-settler capitalism. Her gesture towards “fellow creatures” suggests that Collins understood herself to exist in relation to forms of life beyond the human. Perhaps she envisioned herself in relation to the birds, the land, the air, the animals, and the water. Collins’s words point to forms of relation routed through reciprocity rather than accumulation, extraction, and exploitation. She rejected the idea that Black life was “low and groveling,” indicating that meaning and purpose inhered in racialized lives prior to and outside of racial-settler capitalism. Collins’s words suggest desire to know more, to build relations with human and nonhuman others, and to affirm the dignity of racialized and colonized peoples.

Even as Collins appeared to adhere to Hampton’s model of good character, her words point to something that escapes, that exceeds, that refuses to be contained. Like the Mohawk people who refuse the settler state’s “gift” of citizenship, Sarah Collins refuses the terms of uplift bestowed upon her by benevolent social reformers and educators.<sup>81</sup> Collins’s words register a challenge to school authorities’ narratives of emergence into liberal personhood from the depths of savagery and vice. From within the discursive frameworks established by school officials, Collins asserts a sense of self that refuses to accept the terms of racial degradation and salvation. Her words point to a conception of life and liveliness that operates not for the needs of capital, but for her fellow creatures. Sarah Collins reminds us that despite unrelenting efforts to reorganize social worlds and land upon which they are built, racial-settler capitalism is an always failing and incomplete project.

### *Acknowledgments*

I would like to thank Circe Sturm for shaping this special issue. Her inspired vision and thoughtful guidance have modeled capacious modes of intellectual exchange that point to new ways of thinking and being together. I am also grateful to the other contributors to this special issue for making space to bring our whole selves to the work. My thanks to the anonymous reviewers, as well as the editorial board and staff

of the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, for making this volume possible. I give heartfelt thanks to Crystal Mun-hye Baik, Alicia Cox, Beth Piatote, Nic John Ramos, and SA Smythe, who generously shared their time and thoughts with me as I developed these arguments. For reading early versions of this article, my thanks are due to Nayan Shah and the students who participated in his AMST 701 course: Heidi Hong, Sabrina Howard, and Rebekah S. Park. For their ongoing support, I extend my sincere appreciation to Macarena Gomez-Barris, Chris Finley, and the members of the Indigeneity and Decolonization research cluster. I am grateful, always, to Jenny Hoang and Rosanne Sia for reading drafts and providing feedback. Lastly, I extend my deepest gratitude to my partner, Brady Thomas, for encouraging me and caring for me every step of the way.

## NOTES

1. For more on the history and the legacy of the Carlisle Institute, see Jacqueline Fear-Seagal and Susan D. Rose, *Carlisle Indian Industrial School: Indigenous Histories, Memories, and Reclamations* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2016).

2. Helen Ludlow, "An Indian Raid at Hampton Institute," Cora M. Folsom Manuscripts, Box 11, Indian Work at Hampton, Hampton University Museum Archives, Hampton University, Virginia. This shift was, of course, incomplete and uneven. Extralegal lynching and race riots marked the post-Reconstruction era, and wars against Native peoples on the Plains continued through the 1890s.

3. For more on the convergences and divergences of racialization and colonization, see, for example: Jodi A. Byrd, *Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Iyko Day, "Being or Nothingness: Indigeneity, Antiblackness, and Settler Colonial Critique," *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1, no. 2 (2015): 102–21, <https://doi.org/10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.2.0102>; J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "Tracing Historical Specificity: Race and the Colonial Politics of (In)Capacity," *American Quarterly* 69, no. 2 (2017): 257–65, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2017.0019>; Tiffany Lethabo King, "New World Grammars: The 'Unthought' Black Discourses of Conquest," *Theory & Event* 19, no. 4 (2016): 1; Lisa Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015); la paperson, *A Third University Is Possible* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017); Jared Sexton, "The Vel of Slavery: Tracking the Figure of the Unsovereign," *Critical Sociology* 42, nos. 4–5 (2014), <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920514552535>; Frank Wilderson, *Red, White, and Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010).

4. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, xxiv.

5. Joanne Barker asks, "What difference does Indigenous territory make in political organizing and intellectual work . . . addressed to imperialism, racism, and debt? What does Indigenous territory demand differently of the pedagogy of political movements and the frameworks of critical theory? How does Indigenous territory change understandings of the relationships and responsibilities of knowing?" Joanne Barker, "Territory as Analytic: The Dispossession of Lenapehoking and the Subprime Crisis," *Social Text* 36, no. 2 (2018): 20, <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-4362337>.

6. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, xxiii.

7. I draw on the relational approaches laid out by the Critical Ethnic Studies Editorial Collective in *Critical Ethnic Studies: A Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016). A relational approach moves away from comparative perspectives that compartmentalize "human suffering into relatively discreet historical episodes and geographies" (2). Instead, relational analysis explores the

entanglements, overlaps, and divergences of racial slavery, (un)freedom, and settler (de)colonization to reveal how the history of the United States has been constituted through the simultaneous racialization of nonwhite people and the dispossession of Indigenous peoples.

8. For an important example of how settler capitalism implicates both land and labor in Latin American settler states, see Shannon Speed, "Structures of Settler Capitalism in Abya Yala," *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017): 783–90, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2017.0064>.

9. Saidiya Hartman, *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 116.

10. Ibid.

11. Thomas Biolsi, "The Birth of the Reservation: Making the Modern Individual Among the Lakota," *American Ethnologist* 22, no. 1 (February 1995): 29, <https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1995.22.1.02a00020>.

12. Ibid., 29.

13. Ibid., 28.

14. For a discussion of "unlimited war," see Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2015), 56–77.

15. Melamed, "Racial Capitalism," *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1, no. 1 (2015): 78, <https://doi.org/10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.1.0076>.

16. Ibid., 79.

17. Ibid.

18. Cedric Robinson, *The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 21.

19. For more on the globalization of colonial relations, see Anibal Quijano, "Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America," *International Sociology* 15, no. 2 (2000): 215–32, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005>; and Sylvia Wynter, "1492: A New World View," in *Race, Discourse, and the Origin of the America: A New World View* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995), 5–57.

20. W. E. B. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction in America* (New York: Free Press, 1998), 30.

21. For more on the divergent strategies of accumulating racialized labor, see Lisa Lowe's discussion of coolie labor in *Intimacies of Four Continents* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015).

22. Nikhil Pal Singh, "On Race, Violence, and So-Called Primitive Accumulation," *Social Text* 34, no. 3 (2016): 31, <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-3607564>.

23. For more on the theorization of capitalist accumulation as Indigenous dispossession, see Glen Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

24. Melamed, "Racial Capitalism," 76.

25. Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*, 56.

26. Jodi Byrd, Alyosha Goldstein, Jodi Melamed, and Chandan Reddy, "Predatory Value: Economies of Dispossession and Disturbed Relationalities," *Social Text* 36, no. 2 (2018): 2, <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-4362325>.

27. Joanne Barker, "Territory as Analytic: The Dispossession of Lenapehoking and the Subprime Crisis," *Social Text* 36, no. 2 (2018): 34, <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-4362337>.

28. Macarena Gomez-Barris elaborates on the concept of extractive capitalism in *The Extractive Zone: Social Ecologies and Decolonial Perspectives* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017).

29. Two notable exceptions to this are Donal Lindsey, *Indians at Hampton Institute, 1877–1923* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1994) and Kim Warren, *The Quest for Citizenship: African*

*American and Native American Education in Kansas, 1880–1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010).

30. Ronald E. Butchart, *Schooling the Freedpeople: Teaching, Learning, and the Struggle for Black Freedom, 1861–1876* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013); Hilary Green, *Educational Reconstruction: African American Schools in the Urban South, 1865–1890* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016); Heather Williams, *Self-Taught: African American Education in Slavery and Freedom* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

31. Eric Anderson and Alfred A. Moss, Jr., *Dangerous Donations: Northern Philanthropy and Southern Black Education, 1902–1930* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999); James D. Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); W. E. B. Du Bois and David Levering Lewis, *Black Reconstruction in America, 1860–1880* (New York: Free Press, 1998); Eric Foner, *Reconstruction Updated Edition: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863–1877* (New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2014); Jacqueline Jones, *Soldiers of Love and Light: Northern Teachers and Georgia Blacks, 1865–1873* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004); William H. Watkins, *The White Architects of Black Education: Ideology and Power in America, 1865–1954* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001).

32. For more on the founding of the Hampton Institute and Samuel Chapman Armstrong's educational philosophies, see Robert F. Engs, *Educating the Disfranchised and Disinherited: Samuel Chapman Armstrong and Hampton Institute, 1839–1893* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999); Lindsey, *Indians at Hampton Institute*; Jacqueline Fear-Seagal, "Samuel Chapman Armstrong—Educator of Backward Races," in *White Man's Club: School, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); William Watkins, "General Samuel Chapman Armstrong," *The White Architects of Black Education*.

33. Frederick E. Hoxie, *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate Indians, 1880–1920* (University of Nebraska, 2001); Beth Piatote, *Domestic Subjects: Gender, Citizenship, and Law in Native American Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

34. David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875–1928* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995); Ward Churchill, *Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of American Indian Residential Schools* (San Francisco: City Lights, 2004); Clyde Ellis, *To Change Them Forever: Indian Education at the Rainy Mountain Boarding School, 1893–1920* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008).

35. Brenda J. Child, *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900–1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998); Michael C. Coleman, *American Indian Children at School, 1850–1930* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2007); K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *They Called it Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995); Tsianina Lomawaima, Brenda J. Child, and Margaret L. Jacobs, *Away from Home: American Indian Boarding School Experiences, 1879–2000* (Phoenix, AZ: Heard Museum, 2000); Clifford E. Trafzer, Jean A. Keller, and Lorene Sisquoc, *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences* (Lincoln, NE: Bison Books, 2006).

36. Myriam Vuckovic, *Voices from Haskell: Indian Students Between Two Worlds, 1884–1928* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008), 34.

37. Reverend William P. Ames, "Highlights of Haskell: A Brief Sketch of the Half Century of Indian Education at Haskell, Lawrence, Kansas" (1936), Haskell Indian Nations University Museum and Cultural Center Archives, Haskell Indian Nations University,

38. Although Haskell is not commonly understood as a biracial school, its student body was comprised of individuals from an array of Native nations. Its first class of pupils, for example, included Ponca, Cheyenne, Arapaho, and Pawnee students. See Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 20.

39. Robert Engs, *Freedom's First Generation: Black Hampton, Virginia 1861–1890* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2004).
40. Eric P. Anderson, "Reformers Revealed: American Indian Progressives at Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, 1884–1909," PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2009, 73.
41. Wilcomb E. Washburn and Robert M. Utley, *Indian Wars* (New York: Mariner Books, 2002).
42. Conference Proceedings, First Mohonk Conference on the Negro Question, 1890, 10. All conference proceedings cited hereafter are available through the Library of Congress Microform & Electronic Resources Center.
43. Conference Proceedings, Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian, 1884, 8.
44. Conference Proceedings, Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian, 1885, 15.
45. Linda Gordon, *Heroes of Their Own Lives: The Politics and History of Family Violence—Boston, 1880–1960* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 62.
46. Conference Proceedings, Second Mohonk Conference on the Negro Question, 1891, 76.
47. Conference Proceedings, First Mohonk Conference on the Negro Question, 1890, 131.
48. *Ibid.*, 14.
49. United States Office of Indian Affairs, *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1892*, 666.
50. Fear-Seagal, *White Man's Club*, 219.
51. *Ibid.*, 207.
52. *Indian Leader* 1, no. 8 (September 1897): 1. All issues of the *Indian Leader* cited hereafter available at Haskell Indian Nations University Library, Haskell Indian Nations University, Lawrence, KS.
53. *Southern Workman* 1, no. 3 (March 1872): 4. Hampton University Museum Archives, Hampton University, KS.
54. *Ibid.*
55. For a twentieth-century example of the rearticulation of racial difference through apparently nonracial categories, see Nic John Ramos, "Poor Influences and Criminal Locations: Los Angeles's Skid Row, Multicultural Identities, and Normal Homosexuality," *American Quarterly* 71, no. 2 (2019): 541–67, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2019.0042>.
56. Karen Cook Bell, *Claiming Freedom: Race, Kinship, and Land in Nineteenth-Century Georgia* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2018); Charles L. Flynn, Jr., *White Land, Black Labor: Caste and Class in Late-Nineteenth Century Georgia* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999); Edward Magdol, *A Right to the Land: Essays on the Freedmen's Community* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1977); Erik Mathisen, "It Looks Much Like Abandoned Land: Property and the Politics of Loyalty in Reconstruction Mississippi," in *After Slavery: Race, Labor, and Citizenship in The Reconstruction South*, ed. Bruce E. Baker and Brian Kelley (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2013); and Loren Schweninger, *Black Property Owners in the South, 1790–1915* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1997).
57. Conference Proceedings, Second Mohonk Conference on the Negro Question, 1891, 108.
58. Magdol, *A Right to the Land*, 142; Brian Sawers, "Property Law as Labor Control in the Postbellum South," *Law and History Review* 33, no. 2 (2015): 351–76, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0738248015000012>.
59. Each enrolled and eligible member of the tribe was assigned an allotment, formalizing their status as sole legal owner. Once all members of the tribe were allotted, "surplus" lands remaining within the reservation boundaries were sold to settlers and land speculators. The federal government held the profits of these sales in trust for the education and "civilization" of the tribe. The federal government held the deed for allotted lands in trust for twenty-five years, ostensibly to prevent Native

land owners from losing their land. After the holding period, land owners could do as they pleased with their land. This provision of the law was enforced unevenly.

60. David A. Chang, "Enclosures of Land and Sovereignty: The Allotment of American Indian Lands," *Radical History Review* 2011, no. 109 (2011): 108–99, <https://doi.org/10.1215/01636545-2010-018>; C. Joseph Genetin-Pilawa, *Crooked Paths to Allotment: The Fight over Federal Indian Policy after the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014); Janet A. McDonnell, *The Dispossession of the American Indian, 1887–1934* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991); *The Dawes Act and the Allotment of Indian Lands*, ed. D. S. Otis and Francis Paul Prucha (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1973); Wilcomb E. Washburn, *The Assault on Indian Tribalism: The General Allotment Law* (Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company, 1986).

61. Allotment made possible the accumulation of millions of acres of land and natural resources by US settlers and business interests. According to Janet A. McDonnell, between 1887 and 1900 tribal land holdings were reduced by half, as 3.285 million acres of land were allotted and another 28.5 million acres of land were sold or ceded by allotted tribal governments. See McDonnell, *The Dispossession of the American Indian*.

62. *Indian Leader* 2, no. 2 (April 1898): 4.

63. It is unclear whether the author means that Emma is a member of the Santee Sioux Nation or a former student of the Santee Normal Training School. The editorial from which this story is drawn is listed as an excerpt of a letter published in the *Word Carrier*, the Santee Normal Training School's newspaper.

64. *Indian Leader* 2, no. 2 (April 1898): 4.

65. Conference Proceedings, Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian, 1885, 64.

66. *Indian Leader* 2, no. 2 (April 1898): 4.

67. *Ibid.*

68. Conference Proceedings, Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian, 1886, 20.

69. *Ibid.*, 12.

70. *Ibid.*, 31.

71. *Indian Leader* 1, no. 3 (May 1897): 1.

72. *Ibid.*

73. *Ibid.*

74. Amelia Katanski, *Learning to Write Indian: The Boarding School Experience and American Indian Literature* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007), 75.

75. *Ibid.*, 66.

76. *Twenty-two Years' Work of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute at Hampton, Virginia: Records of Negro and Indian Graduates and Ex-Students* (Hampton, VA: Hampton Normal School Press, 1893).

77. *Indian Leader* 23, no. 19 (January 16, 1920): 1.

78. Letter from J. O. Milligan to Hervey B. Peairs (July 24, 1917), Haskell Subject Correspondence Files, Discipline 1917–1919, National Archives and Records Association, Kansas City, MO.

79. *Twenty-two Years' Work*, 175.

80. *Ibid.*

81. For more on the refusal of state recognition and the gifts of citizenship, see Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014). Simpson's ethnography illuminates how Mohawk peoples in Quebec refuse to stop seeing themselves and living as a sovereign political nation and people.