encounter with common people, often black, often vagabonds like himself—Emma, the black mammy of Moscow, or Teddy Weatherford, the black jazz musician who befriended him in Shanghai.

And yet there is something lacking in *I Wonder As I Wander*. The book is a travelogue of interesting places, interesting people, and interesting events; it is anecdotal and very readable, but it is not analytical. Hughes crosses the world during the decade after the Soviet Revolution and the decade preceding World War II and the Chinese revolution, and yet gives us only a hint of the great forces of social change and violence that were at work in these places and times. Also, although the book covers the time in his life when he was a self-described “social poet,” Hughes offers little political, historical, or social insight into his experiences.

There are possible explanations for these shortcomings. First, when Hughes wrote *The Big Sea*, his editors had advised him to recount his personal experiences, but to refrain from “abstract pontification and academic theorizing.” Hughes, though not pleased, accepted this advice, apparently for the second volume of his autobiography as well. More importantly, by the time he wrote *I Wonder As I Wander* in the early 1950s, Hughes faced pressure more serious than that from a publisher. In March 1953 he was called to testify before Senator Joseph McCarthy’s Subcommittee on Investigations regarding the political nature of his writings in the 1930s. Hughes did not resist the committee’s investigation nor challenge their decision to ban several of his “pro-Communist” books from State Department Information Centers. In the months following his testimony, Hughes was preoccupied with proving his loyalty. In this context it took courage for Hughes to publish his autobiography and refocus attention on his travels in the Soviet Union; likewise, it is not surprising that he avoided political analysis.

Even with its shortcomings *I Wonder As I Wander* remains an important book which should be read by all who are interested in the black experience. Langston Hughes was an accomplished writer, and this book will not disappoint his many fans.

—Cary D. Wintz
Texas Southern University

**Peter Iverson, ed. The Plains Indians of the Twentieth Century.** (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985) ix, 277 pp., $9.95 paper.

Iverson’s new volume of collected essays by authorities on reservation life serves as an invaluable aid to a further understanding of the sometimes agonizing social problems vis-a-vis the federal government.
The book contains, in addition to Iverson’s short introduction, eleven essays (three by Native Americans) dealing with the complex cultural problems of twentieth-century Plains Indian reservations. Iverson’s essay stresses cultural independence despite overwhelming odds which face the modern Indian.

The first two essays by William Hagan and Donald Berthrong present aspects of the pathetic plight of Plains reservation Indians as a result of the General Allotment (Dawes) Act of 1887 which rendered these people prey to white greed for land. Frederick Hoxie’s essay “From Prison to Homeland” is one of the more hopeful essays in the book in that it illustrates Iverson’s contention that the Plains Indian will prevail. The Cheyenne River Sioux, Hoxie explains, maintained their cultural integrity and economic self-reliance through lucrative cattle raising and autonomous control over their children’s schooling.

Norris Hundley’s essay “The Winters Decision and Indian Water Rights” further illustrates the devastating single-mindedness of the white settlers of Montana in attempting to obtain rights to reservation waters despite outstanding efforts made by U.S. District Attorney Carl Rasch. Joseph Cash and Herbert T. Hoover’s interviews of Plains Indian leaders illustrate the obvious conclusion that the New Deal under Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier was beneficial in allowing for greater autonomous land control. Tom Holm’s “Fighting a White Man’s War” describes the difficulties Indians had during WWII of being stereotyped as warriors and getting dangerous assignments. Ironically, because they did so well, politicians argued for termination of reservations and “mainstreaming.” With Michael Lawson’s essay “Federal Water Projects and Indian Lands” the reader is again exposed to the treachery of government agencies and power commissions to dam reservation lands (including ancestral graves) for the benefit of the majority. Loretta Fowler’s essay which purports to examine the political economy at Wind River Reservation really concerns the Arapahoe and not the Shoshone people. Nonetheless we do garner, in reading her essay, a clear picture of Arapahoe-white relations characterized by an almost incredible amount of jealousy, suspicion, and economic rivalry. As Fowler writes, “The Arapahoes are aware of the negative white stereotypes [sic] and the resentments. They, in turn, harbor a series of stereotypes about whites.”

Donald L. Fixico’s “Tribal Leaders and the Demand for Natural Energy,” despite the fact that he asserts that draglines are operated by “steam,” is a good essay as it illustrates in many ways Plains Indians becoming prey to energy companies whose only motive is the fast buck. And Vine Deloria’s brief essay “The Distinctive Status of Indian Rights” punches home the point that Plains Indians are “extraconstitutional.” He writes, “The Bill of Rights does not mention Indians, and subsequent historic treatment of Indians by the federal government testifies that Indians were perceived to have no constitutional rights at all.” The essay
by Peter J. Powell effectively demonstrates the power of Cheyenne vision seeking at Bear Butte, S.D. Powell explains that “in nearly every generation the Cheyennes have known that someone must return to Nowah’wus; someone must represent the People on the windblown side of the Sacred Mountain.”

While the book is of great value to students of Indian history, it does have weaknesses. There are numerous typographical errors and the word Arapahoe is spelled with and without the final “e.” Some of the essays are rather dull and repetitive, and, in light of the many forceful conclusions drawn in a number of better essays, Iverson’s introduction seems unduly brief and a bit innocuous. The book does contain extensive notes, an index, map, and illustrations.

—Richard F. Fleck
University of Wyoming


This work ranks as one of the most significant analyses of urban Chicano political socialization to date. Unlike contemporaries who are either theoreticians or numbers crunchers, Jankowski undertakes a quantitative analysis that is theoretically based. Hypotheses developed from three theories are tested to ascertain which best explains the political assimilation of Chicano adolescents in San Antonio, Albuquerque, and Los Angeles. The theories compared are: the Wirth/Chicago School which argues that the length of urban residence promotes assimilation; the neighborhood solidarity model which proposes that upward socioeconomic mobility and neighborhood integration promote assimilation; and the Marxist theory which argues that the political-economic structure of a socioeconomic system, i.e., society or city, determines modes of assimilation.

Unlike researchers who limit themselves to either quantitative or qualitative data, Jankowski gathered both. The quantitative information and survey data are examined via path analysis, comparisons of means, and contingency tables, while the qualitative, participant observation, data are studied with an eye to deriving explanations for the quantitative results. Jankowski’s multi-method empirical approach is unique in social science research. Although it took him many years to complete all phases of the data collection, his approach is commendable because it provides an accurate and humanistic test of hypotheses.

This book asks a basic policy question about Chicanos which is rarely