Events of recent years on the Teton Sioux reservations in the western Dakotas have emphasized the influence the mixed-blood population exercises in the political and economic lives of Indian communities. The participation of descendants of white-and-Indian parents in tribal affairs is not a new phenomenon. Neither are the keen rivalries that exist between this element and their full-blood cousins. Today, however, the classifications of mixed blood and full blood are based as much upon cultural characteristics as they were, historically, upon biological factors.¹

The emergence of the Sioux mixed bloods as an influential force having distinctive economic and political interests began to take place during the last decade of the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth centuries. A lengthy dispute over an allotted tract of Indian land highlighted this development and eventually appeared on the docket of the Circuit Court of the United States, District of South Dakota, Central Division, as Jane E. Waldron, Complainant, v. The United States of America, Black Tomahawk, and Ira A. Hatch, as Indian Agent at Cheyenne River Indian Agency, Defendants. The decision in Waldron v. United States et al., handed down

in 1905 in favor of the plaintiff, established in broad and virtually unassailable terms the full and equal status of Sioux mixed bloods in all legal aspects of their tribal affiliation.\(^2\)

An examination of the circumstances surrounding *Waldron v. United States et al.* provides important historical perspective on the position of mixed bloods in modern Sioux political life. The thousand-odd pages of printed testimony upon which the court ultimately based its decision describe in considerable detail the status of mixed bloods during the early reservation period and identify the roots of the mixed-blood–full-blood rivalry existing today. In addition, this case was unique in that the court formally recognized the authority of tribal custom and tradition at a time when official government policy called for the destruction of almost every vestige of traditional Sioux life.

The basic outline of the Waldron and Black Tomahawk controversy can be simply sketched. The principals in this landmark dispute, Jane E. Van Meter Waldron, a mixed blood married to a white man, and Black Tomahawk, a full-blood Teton of the Two Kettle band, were both enrolled at the Cheyenne River Sioux Agency located on the Missouri River in north-central South Dakota. Both sought to receive an allotment covering the same tract of land on a portion of the former Great Sioux Reservation that had been ceded under the Sioux Agreement of 1889. That document provided for the creation of five smaller reservations west of the Missouri River: the Rosebud, Pine Ridge, Lower Brule, Standing Rock, and Cheyenne River. The territory not included in these new reservations was opened for white settlement and for allotment to individual Indians such as Jane Waldron and Black Tomahawk.\(^3\)

The tract of land claimed by the two parties consisted of three hundred twenty acres on the west bank of the Missouri River immediately north of the frontier community of Fort Pierre. Waldron established residence on the property in early July 1889, and Black Tomahawk did the same later that month. They filed their allotment

\(^2\) Oral testimony and depositions taken during court-ordered hearings in *Waldron v. United States et al.* were printed in two paper-covered volumes containing 1,037 pages (N.p., 1904). The volumes are deposited with the South Dakota State Historical Society, Pierre, and are hereafter cited as *Testimony*. The decision of the court is found in U.S., Circuit Court, District of South Dakota, *Waldron v. United States et al.*, Federal Reporter 143 (1905): 413-20.

\(^3\) A convenient summary of the basic facts in the initial phase of this dispute can be found in U.S., Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, *Sixty-First Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior*, 1892 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1892), pp. 31-33.
declarations at the Cheyenne River Agency on 10 September and 4 October 1890, respectively. Both erected structures in which to live and added other improvements as their means permitted. After receiving their conflicting claims, the Department of the Interior asked for a ruling on the issue through the Justice Department. The opinion by an assistant United States attorney general favored Black Tomahawk, stating that as the child of a white father and a mixed-blood Indian mother, Waldron was not, in fact, an Indian and was not entitled to be enrolled at Cheyenne River or eligible to take an allotment. The foundation for this opinion was the common-law rule that a child born to a white man and his Indian wife follows the condition of the father and is a citizen of the United States rather than an Indian. Citizens, as non-Indians, were not entitled to receive allotments under terms of the 1889 agreement.\(^4\)

When the Interior Department denied the Waldron allotment application, the Waldron family tried political influence to obtain a reversal but without success.\(^5\) Waldron continued, however, to reside

---

4. Ibid.
5. A. C. Van Meter to Charles Foster, 13 Dec. 1892, and Foster to the Secretary of the Interior, 13 Dec. 1892, Testimony, pp. 1025-26. Foster had been a member of the 1889 government commission that secured Sioux approval for sizable land cessions and the initiation of allotment. These communications stressed the vital role Waldron's father, Arthur C. Van Meter, other white husbands of Indian women, and mixed bloods had played in securing approval of the 1889 agreement at Cheyenne River Agency.
on the disputed tract without serious legal opposition until 1899. In March of that year, the government issued Black Tomahawk a trust patent and shortly thereafter ordered Agent Ira Hatch to remove Waldron, by force if necessary, from the disputed claim. When she subsequently filed suit in federal court, her case hinged on proving, first, that as a mixed blood she was, in fact, an Indian, and second, that she had a right to file for an allotment at Cheyenne River Agency.

Waldron won a landmark suit against the federal government, thus establishing the full and equal status of mixed bloods in all legal aspects of their tribal affiliation.

After procedural delays, hearings finally began before a special court examiner in December of 1902. Seven sessions, totaling twenty-six days, were held over a period of seven months at Pierre, the South Dakota state capital, at Cheyenne River Agency, and at the Yankton Sioux Agency at Greenwood, South Dakota, where a number of

older members of Waldron's mother's family were enrolled. In all, 114 witnesses testified (some being summoned for both sides), the majority of whom were Indians who required the services of an interpreter. This Indian testimony, together with the evidence provided by other mixed bloods and whites closely associated with the Sioux, gave the case its unique character and greatly influenced the decision handed down by District Judge John E. Carland on 1 July 1905. The decision was a complete victory for Waldron, reversing the initial ruling and ordering the revocation of Black Tomahawk's trust patent. The court stated that historic precedent and Sioux custom respecting the status of mixed bloods were the determining factors in recognizing them as Indians with full legal rights, including participation in allotment.7

In one respect, at least, Waldron was ideally suited to bring the legal action that resulted in such a far-reaching affirmation of mixed-blood rights. Through her mother, she was descended from one of the oldest mixed-blood families among the Sioux. One maternal great-grandfather, Augustine Aungie, himself part Indian, is generally recognized as one of the three founders of Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, a primary trading center on the upper Mississippi River in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Another great-grandfather played an even more prominent role in the early history of the Old Northwest. He was Robert Dickson, the Scottish fur trader through whom the British enlisted support among the western Indians during the War of 1812. Both Dickson's and Aungie's wives were full-blood Sioux women. Their granddaughter, Mary Aungie, married Arthur C. Van Meter, a white man, and it was from this union that Jane Waldron was born. By Waldron's evaluation of her ancestry, her mother was five-eighths Indian and she was five-sixteenths. Culturally, however, she and her family claimed roots deep in the traditional ways and lifestyle of her mother's people, and it was evidence of this heritage that ultimately influenced the court in her favor.8

The Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 that had created the Great Sioux Reservation also acknowledged that the white men then residing with Sioux wives and families among the Teton bands were full-fledged members of the tribe. By the late 1880s, the sons and

daughters of these old fur traders and other whites had literally as well as figuratively "come of age." In earlier years, the numbers and influence of this group had been small. In 1876 and 1877, for example, when the army took control of the Cheyenne River Agency following the Custer disaster and other hostilities of that period, a military census disclosed that less than two dozen mixed-blood families were then living on that part of the reservation. When the Sioux Agreement of 1889 was negotiated, however, one hundred seven white and mixed-blood males over the age of eighteen signed the document. More than fifty percent of these signers were under thirty years of age, and over seventy percent were less than forty years old. Paralleling this numerical growth was the government's institution in the 1880s of acculturation policies that suited the interests, needs, and capabilities of the mixed bloods and served to further increase their stature.

At the same time, however, the position of the mixed bloods within the tribal structure and under existing treaty provisions was not clearly defined. Agency administrators generally recognized the right of mixed bloods to equal shares of ration issues and annuity goods, primarily because tribal custom permitted mixed bloods to be included. Even though the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 had recognized white men living with the Teton bands as tribal members, that document made no provision for officially identifying, either then or later, exactly who was included among these so-called 68-ers and their privileged offspring.

Like the 1868 treaty, the Sioux Agreement of 1876, which ceded the Black Hills, made no specific reference to the mixed bloods. One section did indicate, by implication at least, that they were not of equal standing with the full bloods. Article 7 provided that persons then residing among the Sioux who were considered to be of objectionable moral character could be excluded from benefits.


Status of Mixed Bloods

The mixed-blood issue cropped up even more frequently in 1889 during councils at the Sioux agencies with the commission headed by Gen. George Crook. This time, however, the appeals for a greater voice in reservation matters came directly from the mixed bloods and white men themselves. The Crook commission was only too happy to encourage this development, for the vast majority of mixed bloods and reservation whites solidly supported the proposed land cession, and the commission needed all the votes it could muster to secure the required three-fourths affirmative majority. At Cheyenne River Agency, the question of mixed-blood eligibility to vote came up a number of times, both in formal council and in private. While not fully certain about the right of the mixed bloods and younger whites to vote, the commission allowed them to do so and let the legality of their actions be determined later. At Cheyenne River, mixed bloods and white men cast over thirty-five percent of the first 270 votes for the 1889 agreement. There is no way to deter-

mine how many of their full-blood relatives they influenced during the key early stages of balloting. Significantly, when the court handed down the decision in the Waldron case fifteen years later, it gave as one of its reasons for deciding in Waldron's favor that many mixed bloods, including two of her brothers, had voted in support of the 1889 agreement and its provisions for taking land by allotment. The court said it could not now, by ruling against Waldron, deprive the mixed bloods of a benefit that had been promised them in exchange for their vote.

It was against this background, then, that Jane Van Meter Waldron sought to establish her rightful status as an enrolled mixed-blood Indian at Cheyenne River Agency. The evidence submitted by both sides in her suit illuminates at least three important aspects of the mixed-blood problem: their legal and cultural position within the Sioux tribes; the complexity of relationships on the reservation, including the impact of intertribal friction and personal animosity; and the economic advantages mixed bloods frequently derived from their position within both the white and Indian worlds.

Waldron's case was materially strengthened by the knowledge and ability of her attorney, Charles E. DeLand, a Pierre lawyer whose scholarly interest in the history of the upper Missouri River, particularly its Indian inhabitants, had uniquely equipped him to try such a suit. Page after page of testimony shows that DeLand's preparation and presentation of evidence was efficient and systematic. After establishing the qualifications of his witnesses, he launched into a series of basic questions: Are you acquainted with the laws, customs, and practices of the Sioux concerning mixed-blood families? What are these customs? Is there a custom with respect to the heads of families? Who is the head of the family when the father is white and the mother a mixed- or full-blood Indian? Through whom do the children derive their tribal rights? Are such customs applicable to families living outside reservation boundaries?

After establishing that customs regarding mixed-blood families did exist and that the head of the family was clearly the Indian woman,


15. DeLand published two lengthy ethnological studies of the Arikara and Mandan Indians in volumes three (1906) and four (1908) of the South Dakota State Historical Society's South Dakota Historical Collections series. While these studies are now badly outdated, DeLand's detailed treatment of the Sioux Wars (1868-1891), which appeared in volumes fifteen (1930) and seventeen (1934) of the same series, is still useful.
through whom the children derived their treaty rights whether residing on or off the reservation, DeLand posed more specific questions regarding Waldron's family history. Had they received benefits at the Yankton and Cheyenne River agencies? Were they regarded as Indians by both whites and Indians? Was this status affected by the family's migration from one place to another or the education of the children off the reservation?\(^{16}\) Over and over again, the responses were uniformly favorable to DeLand's client. The defense

\[\text{Drawing on his scholarly knowledge of American Indians, Charles E. DeLand skillfully and systematically established Waldron's rightful status as an enrolled mixed-blood Indian.}\]

counsel, Assistant United States Attorney W. G. Porter, regularly challenged his opponent's questions as immaterial and finally, at one point, stated in frustration that his objection was "cumulative, all [of these questions] having been asked of about 25 witnesses."\(^{17}\) The massive impact of their testimony was apparent even to him.

16. For examples of DeLand's technique, see Testimony, pp. 79-83 (Rev. Thomas L. Riggs), 94-95 (William Benoist), 101-4 (Louis LaPlant), and 181-83 (D. F. Carlin).
17. Testimony, p. 720 (Long Foot).
Under DeLand’s direction, the portrait of Jane Van Meter Waldron’s life as an Indian was broadly and skillfully drawn. As a young girl, she dressed, played, and lived like a full-blood Sioux, not learning to speak English until the age of eight. Her mother sat in the Yankton tribal circle with other family heads and drew rations and annuities for herself and her children. Waldron’s white father had no official status whatever in these tribal matters. When Waldron attended school at Ripon College in Wisconsin, her expenses were paid from a government fund administered through the Sioux mission school at Santee, Nebraska. One of her younger brothers attended Lincoln Institute in Philadelphia and in 1888 represented the American Indian people at Queen Victoria’s jubilee. Her mother’s funeral featured two services, one conducted by Christian Indians in their native tongue, after which her father held a “give-away” ceremony, distributing presents to all in attendance. As a married woman, Waldron held a ration ticket at Cheyenne River for herself and her relations. They regularly received annuities and other treaty benefits, and, in 1891, a government agent allowed Waldron to select an allotment for her oldest son on lands ceded under the 1889 agreement. And so on it went.18

Against this overwhelming evidence, defense attorney Porter attempted to present the other side of the coin—the white lifestyle in which the Van Meters, Waldrons, and their children also shared. The testimony resulting from his efforts is more useful today in supplementing Waldron’s biography than it was in 1903 in defending against her suit, for on several occasions Waldron used Porter’s questions to aid her cause materially. During cross-examination, the defense established that Waldron had lived for most of her life in frame or log houses like other whites in the region; that she and her husband had been married by a white clergyman; that she and her children had adopted the dress, manners, and customs of whites; and that she had been appointed to a state regulatory board by two governors of South Dakota.19 Waldron then completely negated the effect Porter had been seeking, observing, “Well I tried to imitate the customs of the white race as fast as I could learn them, I think that is the aim of the government.”20 On another occasion, when Porter continued to emphasize her adoption of white ways, she replied with some feeling, “I presume if we had been aware that

18. These and other details concerning Waldron’s background are found scattered throughout Testimony, pp. 5-37 (Arthur C. Van Meter), 38-77 (Jane E. Waldron), 420-41 (Helen Williams), and 693-704 (Harriet Aungie).
20. Ibid., p. 63.
we were going to have everything taken away from us the minute we began to be white we would not have striven so hard to be anybody.”

Waldron displayed the same vigor and conviction on the witness stand that had enabled her to battle for fifteen years to affirm her allotment rights. This ability to overcome adversity was apparently part of her character. As a young girl, she was so frequently sick that one of her Indian names had been Suta Sni, meaning “not strong.” Yet, she was described in later life as “small & wiry; tough as a boot; could handle horses better than most men.” It might be added that she could handle United States attorneys quite well, too.

In addition to its far-reaching legal implications, the Waldron case is useful for identifying the development of political or cultural factions among the Sioux people. The distinction between mixed bloods and full bloods that was almost entirely biological in Waldron’s day has now become more descriptive of a way of life without regard to blood fractions. The pattern for this cultural realignment had already begun to emerge in the early 1900s, as is evident from even a superficial look at the witnesses who gave evidence in the Waldron case. Testifying in support of Waldron were eight non-Indians (seven white men and one black) married to Sioux women as well as a number of the more acculturated members of the mixed-blood community. Of the nine identifiable mixed bloods called on behalf of the plaintiff, eight testified in English without an interpreter. The full bloods who gave evidence in favor of Waldron included a number who were generally recognized as Christian Indians. Four of these were actually employed as native missionaries on the Cheyenne River reservation.

In contrast, the witness list for Black Tomahawk included primarily what today would be called “traditionalists.” It contained no whites who had married into the Sioux tribe, and only three of the mixed bloods could communicate in English well enough to dispense with the interpreter. Only one native mission worker was included among the many more full bloods testifying for the defense. This full-blood group included all the surviving chiefs of the tribal council, plus a number of leading conservatives, commonly referred to then as “non-progressives” or “kickers.” This group had been active in the

21. Ibid., p. 69.
22. Flora Ziemann to Harry H. Anderson, 1 Sept. 1975. Ziemann, long a resident of the Fort Pierre area, kept in contact with Jane Waldron after the family moved to Canada in 1912. She provided much useful personal information about Waldron and her family for this study.
1890 Ghost Dance movement, lived far from the agency, and strongly opposed land cession and allotment.

Her long, intimate association with the Sioux people through her mother's family greatly strengthened Waldron's efforts to establish the primacy of Sioux traditions and practices among mixed bloods as the foundation of her case. At the same time, it was precisely her mixed-blood background that caused much of the opposition to her suit on the part of many Cheyenne River reservation full bloods. In addition, part of the testimony taken by both sides was influenced or obscured by prior disputes and personality clashes the Waldrons and their mixed-blood and white relatives had had with the full-blood element, agency officials, and even off-reservation whites.

The Department of Justice ruling that Waldron was not an Indian was, for the defense, a convenient bit of legal fiction; few who knew Waldron, even among her opponents, would have seriously argued the issue of her Indian background. What her full-blood opposition found objectionable was that she was the wrong kind of Indian. Her tribal heritage was that of a Santee, or Eastern, Sioux mixed blood rather than Teton, or Western, Sioux. Waldron's family had been adopted by part of the Teton Two Kettle band, which resided on the Cheyenne River reservation along with the Miniconjou, Sans Arc, and Blackfeet bands, but many Tetons refused to recognize this adoption. The lands being ceded and allotted under the 1889 agreement were Teton lands and, according to the Cheyenne River spokesmen, the Santees had no right to any benefits under that document. Teton mixed bloods could, and did, take allotments without tribal leaders uttering a word of objection. However, the chiefs repeatedly voiced their opposition to the participation of the Santee and Santee mixed bloods in the lengthy negotiations of 1888 and 1889. They argued that the Santees had long ago sold off their lands in Minnesota with no Teton ever receiving a dollar's worth of benefits. Moreover, the Santees had forfeited much of the money they should have received for their lands by going to war against the whites in 1862. After their defeat in the Minnesota uprising, they had been exiled to a small reservation in Nebraska. Now, "those poor people" were demanding a share of the Teton lands.

The Waldron and Van Meter families were easily identifiable as Santees, despite their convenient adoption by some of the Two Ket-

23. Testimony, pp. 780, 788-90, 792 (John Yellow Owl), 815-16 (Black Eagle), 858 (Charging Eagle); Reports Relative to... the Great Sioux Reservation, Ex. Doc. 51, pp. 161, 169, 174, 183; Report Relative to... the Sioux Reservation, Ex. Doc. 17, p. 234.
ties. "I can tell them by the talk that they are Santees," said one member of the Sans Arc band, referring to the Santee dialect, which used a "d" in place of the Teton "l." Anti-Santee sentiment on the Teton reservations was at its height at the time of the Waldron-Black Tomahawk dispute, and it was not surprising that this issue played an important part in the case.

Violation of tribal custom was another issue raised by the defense as, one after another, the old tribal chiefs of the early reservation period testified that the tribal council had never approved placement of the Van Meter-Waldron families on the ration and annuity rolls. Council approval, they maintained, was necessary for all mixed bloods who were not a part of the four Teton groups residing at Cheyenne River. The old chiefs also testified that not only had Waldron, her parents, brothers, and sisters never been recognized by the tribal leaders, but at one council in June of 1889 a unanimous vote had been taken to request the agent to have them removed because as Santees they did not properly belong on the reservation.

Underlying some of this opposition was a strong personal dislike for certain male members of the Van Meter-Waldron clan. One witness for the defense testified regarding John W. ("Buck") Williams, the husband of Waldron's aunt, Helen, that the Indians "hate him the worst kind." Others told that the full bloods suspected Arthur Van Meter of stealing and butchering their cattle because hides had been seen floating in the Bad River near his ranch. One of the Van Meter sons, John, became embroiled with a tribal policeman during the 1889 land councils and a few years later had a dispute with a Two Kettle chief over ownership of an abandoned agency building. Many of the full-blood leaders who testified against Waldron had not forgotten that her father had been an active leader in rounding up support for the 1889 agreement, which they vehemently opposed. It hardly helped improve their attitude when at one point

25. Testimony, p. 817 (Black Eagle). The Sioux nation consists of three principal divisions: Santee, or Eastern; Yankton and Yanktonais, or Middle; and Teton, or Western. Nurge, The Modern Sioux, p. xiii. The languages of these groups, while essentially the same, contain definite variations in pronunciation, particularly for consonants and occasionally in the meaning of words. For example, the directive "go home!" would be kihda in Santee, kikda in Yankton, and kiglia in Teton speech. Thomas Lawrence Riggs, "Sunset to Sunset: A Lifetime with My Brothers, the Dakotas," South Dakota Historical Collections 29 (1958): 160-63.

26. Testimony, pp. 387-88 (Swift Bird), 406-7 (Little No Heart), 783, 787-88 (John Yellow Owl), 803-4 (Henry Takes His Blanket), 822 (Hump).

27. Testimony, p. 843 (Moses Spotted Eagle).

28. Testimony, pp. 604 (John Holland), 786 (John Yellow Owl), 804 (Henry Takes His Blanket); Reports Relative to . . . the Great Sioux Reservation, Ex. Doc. 51, p. 178.
Waldron’s attorney tried to impeach their testimony by characterizing them as former “renegades and floaters” who forfeited any rights at Cheyenne River because they had fought against Custer and gone into Canadian exile with Sitting Bull.\textsuperscript{29}

This position was without merit, but there was another accusation that the Waldrons were able to prove to the satisfaction of the court so that it was accepted as a finding of fact. Black Tomahawk was, in effect, a tool of off-reservation white interests who had directed his selection of the land in question so that they could acquire it for their own purposes at a later date. The white men involved were identified as residents of the city of Pierre, on the east bank of the Missouri opposite the disputed allotment, but the motivation for their interest was never clearly stated in the court proceedings. Years later, Waldron maintained that railroad interests were behind the whole affair and that her successful court action had forced the Chicago & North Western Railroad to locate its division point and roundhouse in Pierre rather than west of the Missouri as it had desired.\textsuperscript{30}

The allotment question, likewise a central issue in the Waldron case, also provides some insight into the economic aspects of the mixed-blood–full-blood relationship. More perceptive mixed bloods sometimes took allotments in particular geographic patterns designed to give them long-range economic advantage. One allotting agent, for example, was willing to locate six hundred forty acres due the Waldrons in adjacent forty-acre parcels strung out along the Bad River. Such an arrangement would have provided control of water access—essential to a growing range economy—for a large portion of grazing land. Economic advantages like these became particularly important after 1901, when the government ended the free-ration system and required the Sioux to become self-supporting or participate in reservation improvement projects to earn their food supplies.\textsuperscript{31}

Full bloods frequently resented the ability of certain mixed bloods to take full advantage of the opportunities offered through govern-

\textsuperscript{29} Testimony, p. 949 (Soloman Yellow Hawk). After hearing DeLand’s statement, defense counsel Porter commented that DeLand should “be sworn if he is going to testify in this case” (ibid.). Charles Foster, a member of the Crook Commission, had made a similar accusation against these conservative full bloods in 1889. Angered because they refused to sign the agreement and threatened physical harm to any Indian who did, Foster called them “outcasts on the face of the earth” (Reports Relative to . . . the Great Sioux Reservation, Ex. Doc. 51, p. 185).


\textsuperscript{31} Testimony, p. 58 (Jane E. Waldron); Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1901, 1: 6.
ment policies. The Waldron case offered several other early examples. In particular, the Indians on the Cheyenne River reservation complained that the Van Meters and Waldrons obtained more farm implements from the agency than did the full bloods who belonged on the reservation. The full bloods also resented Jane Waldron's grazing of fifty head of cattle on tribal lands in 1897 while she also occupied the disputed allotment tract off the reservation. The reservation agent ruled the practice perfectly legal, but the full bloods still regarded it as an example of mixed bloods getting the best of both worlds.32

These matters, like others touched upon in the Waldron case, have a familiar ring. Mixed bloods today, particularly those more closely attuned to the standards of white society, frequently take advantage of whatever opportunities contemporary reservation life affords. They do so for reasons that the full bloods or cultural traditionalists choose either not to respond to or reject completely. As in the past, some full bloods resent the results of the mixed bloods' actions. Then, too, the influence of outsiders continues, with the white reservation rancher or town merchant replacing the railroad promoters of Black Tomahawk's day in attempting to manipulate one side or the other in tribal decision making. Finally, old personal rivalries, some handed down through families from generation to generation, remain a part of the modern reservation situation. If nothing else, the case of Waldron v. United States et al. shows that the roots of these conditions go deep into the history of the Teton Sioux and are far more complex than superficial studies of the mixed bloods have led us to believe.33

32. Testimony, pp. 617, 619 (Dennis Buck), 990 (Felix Benoist), 1013 (Jane E. Waldron).
33. For example, the index to James C. Olson's important and detailed study entitled Red Cloud and the Sioux Problem (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965) contains only two brief references to the mixed bloods. One is a lengthy quotation from Pine Ridge Agent Valentine T. McGillicuddy, who blamed the white "squaw-men" and mixed bloods for the failure of the Sioux to progress toward self-support (p. 293). McGillicuddy's statement typifies his widely circulated and highly prejudicial view of these people—a view that has probably done more than any other historical source to create a general but erroneous image of the Sioux mixed bloods as worthless, shiftless troublemakers. While George E. Hyde's A Sioux Chronicle (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956) presents a more understanding treatment, even Hyde does not devote any attention to the development of the mixed bloods as an influential force among the Teton. Finally, the contemporary studies contained in The Modern Sioux, edited by Ethel Nurge, all but ignore historical background on the subject. Some of the best insights into modern reservation politics can be obtained from a careful analysis of Robert Burnette's The Tortured Americans (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971).