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This essay examines the gendered settler colonial aspects of Henry Roe Cloud’s relationship with his informally adoptive ‘mother,’ Mary Roe. It argues that Cloud, my Ho-Chunk grandfather, an intellectual, activist, and policy-maker, defied colonial reality by appropriating the white notion of the self-made man, and by relying upon his Ho-Chunk masculinity, his partnership with his wife, Elizabeth, his Christian identity, and Ho-Chunk-centric hubs. It also argues that Cloud’s Ho-Chunk warrior training contributed to his intellectual abilities. Finally, it critiques Joel Pfister’s The Yale Indian, arguing that his ‘colonial’ claim to Cloud’s letters prevents an adequate discussion of Indian-white settler colonial relations. Pfister’s focus on Cloud’s ‘individuality’, dismissing Cloud’s Ho-Chunk-ness, resembles the settler colonial policies of removal.

Henry Roe Cloud (c. 1884-1950), my Ho-Chunk grandfather, was an activist, policy-maker, and intellectual in the early twentieth century. As a young child, a policeman took him to Genoa, a federal boarding school, and, later, he attended the Santee Indian mission school. After being accepted, he traveled to Mount Herman College Preparatory School, and then to Yale University. He was the first ‘full-blooded’ Native to graduate with a bachelor’s and a master’s degree. During his first year at Yale, in 1906, he met Walter and Mary Roe, a white couple. They were Christian missionaries, and worked closely with Native peoples. Soon after they met, Cloud was informally adopted. Even though whites surrounded Cloud, he used creative Ho-Chunk strategies to thrive in a settler colonial environment. These included his white and Ho-Chunk senses of masculinity, Christian identity, Ho-Chunk-centric hubs, and partnership with his wife, Elizabeth Bender Cloud, an Ojibwe. His Ho-Chunk warrior culture and identity helped him develop a Ho-Chunk intellectual lens.
First, I will introduce Pfister’s book, *The Yale Indian*, who wrote about Henry Roe Cloud. Second, I will discuss Cloud’s engagement with and resistance to gendered settler colonialism. Finally, I will critique *The Yale Indian*.

**THE YALE INDIAN: A CASE STUDY OF INDIVIDUALITY**

Pfister uses Henry Roe Cloud as a case study to support his argument about individuality and Native Americans. Initially, Pfister’s analysis of Cloud’s life was to be one third of another book. Pfister explains that his two books, *The Yale Indian: The Education of Henry Roe Cloud* (2009) and *Individuality Incorporated* (2004) share some connections, including the history of shaping individualism, and conversations between Indian-white relations. *Individuality Incorporated* (2004) examines how the mission of the first Native American federal boarding school, Carlisle, was not just to civilise Native students, but also to ‘individualize’ them. Later, he removed the chapter about Henry Roe Cloud as part of *Individuality Incorporated* and decided to use it as a basis for another book. The main goal of *The Yale Indian*, according to Pfister, is to use Henry Roe Cloud to discuss ‘interconnected reproductive processes of emotion making, race making, class making, and incentive making’.

Indeed, the primary conceptual objective of the book is the exploration of interconnected socialising processes. Pfister further explains that he chose not to discuss Cloud’s Ho-Chunk educational training because this information was not available in his published writings or in the letters held in the public archive of the Sterling library at Yale University. In the following article, unlike Pfister, I discuss how Cloud’s Ho-Chunk educational training enabled him to become an important indigenous activist, policy-maker, and intellectual, enabling him to not only survive, but to help his tribal community survive in the midst of settler colonialism.

Growing up, my mother discussed how important Cloud’s Ho-Chunk name, Wo-Na-Xi-Lay-Hunka, meaning ‘War-Chief’ or ‘the Chief of the Place of Fear’, was to him. He was a member of the Thunderbird Clan – the clan, Cloud explains, which ‘obstructed and permitted war’. Cloud’s name and clan membership were central to
his identities as a Ho-Chunk man, leader, and modern day warrior. She also discussed how her grandfather told a significant prophecy about her father. During a winter when food became very scarce, his son did not eat for ten days, because there was no food for anyone. Then his father found a frozen beaver hut, killed the animals, traded some of their skins for corn, boiled the beaver meat, and prepared a feast. During the feast, his father discussed his prophecy. He told his son: ‘Eat, War Chief, for I am hungry but will not eat until you have tasted food. I am old and it makes no difference if I starve, but you are young. The future of the Ho-Chunks lies within you’. His words encouraged him throughout his life always to fight as a Ho-Chunk warrior for the survival of his people. This story outlines a core value of Ho-Chunk warrior identity: to put the survival of the young, who represent the future and continuance of the tribe, before one’s own continued existence. Indeed, Cloud’s Ho-Chunk warrior identity provided him with a strong cultural resource to fight back against gendered settler colonialism, while helping him develop an indigenous analytical lens.

Colonialism infiltrates the most intimate places, even the relationships indigenous peoples experience with others. It is through these ‘intimacies of empire’, Ann Stoler argues, that racial classifications were created and challenged, and where relations between coloniser and colonised could powerfully defy and/or strengthen colonial power. Gendered settler colonialism involved US federal policies regarding the boarding school system, which worked to destroy indigenous kinship systems, trying to supplant them with the heteronormative and patriarchal Euro-centric kinship model of the nuclear family. In the following, I discuss how Cloud resisted gendered settler colonialism by discussing his involvement with Mary Roe, his white adoptive ‘mother’.

MARY ROE, A COLONIAL ‘MOTHER’

In 1907, when Cloud was in his early twenties, the white woman who would become his unofficial adoptive mother, Mary Roe, used colonial tactics to begin her relationship with him during his first year at Yale University. These tactics included flattery and sympathy in order to try to create a psychological wedge between him and the
memory of his Ho-Chunk grandmother, as well as playing upon his vulnerability, his loneliness and a depression brought on from living among whites and away from his extended Ho-Chunk family and tribe. In this way, Mary Roe as an agent of settler colonialism attempted to destroy Cloud’s sense of his Ho-Chunk kinship system.

Mary Roe describes her maternal role in a 1909 letter to Cloud. Colonialism is apparent. She wrote:

Oh Henry, If I had you here this very minute I believe I could make you see the strength and power of that marvelous mother love which has been born in my soul and is gathering up all the repressed motherhood and instinct which have always been part of my nature but have never been given outlet [...]. I know I am a changed woman with a love for all little children, a yearning that is almost pain over unmothered boys, all because the picture of my beloved little son [Cloud] running barefoot ragged and neglected possibly around and around a stump crying with natural fright as the arrows whizzed by that dear little head amidst the laughs of drunken revelry. Darling, I will make up to you and for your sake to every unhappy child for all those children’s sorrows.

Mary Roe describes all the repressed ‘mother-love’ she has kept inside of her, which, she argues, needs an outlet. She then writes about her role as a mother to Cloud, a Ho-Chunk and an orphan. From a white woman’s perspective, she describes Cloud ‘running ragged and neglected’. She imagines Ho-Chunks as ‘drunken’, violent and careless, who shoot arrows near little boys’ heads, assuming that Cloud was ‘neglected’ by his people. In this way, she privileges her own ability as a white woman to take care of children over Ho-Chunk peoples’ capacity. Indeed, she presumes that Ho-Chunks are not only negligent, but also uncaring of their children’s welfare. This portrayal comes from her imagination, since Cloud had a loving, and caring family. This colonial ‘maternal’ assumption must have been difficult for Cloud, who loved and respected his Ho-Chunk people, yet another strategy to weaken his sense of Ho-Chunk kinship. According
to Margaret Jacobs, white women, unfortunately, relied upon these kinds of gendered settler colonial assumptions when they were involved in the removal of Native children and placed them in federal boarding schools.14

Mary Roe’s romantic advice to Cloud touched on race, class, and gender, adding another layer of colonialism for Cloud to deal with, including being treated as an exotic Native man. She wrote that Bessie, his white ‘cousin’, Mary Roe’s niece, was upset with him because he had responded to her correspondence incorrectly, sending a telegram rather than a letter. 15 In contrast, ‘well-taught’ white girls, she explains, understood how men should communicate with them, while girls he was used to, including ‘Indian girls’ and ‘half-educated [white] girls’, did not understand how to act appropriately. Mary Roe placed Cloud ‘higher’ on the social evolutionary ladder than both ‘Indian girls’ and ‘half-educated [white] girls’. She encouraged him to find ‘appropriate’ companions, who understand proper social graces. By encouraging him to find a suitable white, upper class woman for companionship and potentially marriage, she again works to sever his ties to a Ho-Chunk sense of kinship. She warned that Vassar girls were only attracted to him because of his race, not acknowledging his intelligence, handsome features, and charming nature. Instead, she focused only on his ‘exoticism’ as a Native young man. She encouraged him to use his ‘exotic’ qualities to further his Christian mission. Rather than choosing to follow Mary Roe’s romantic advice, which does not recognise the possibility of a well-educated Native woman, in 1916, Cloud married my Ojibwe grandmother, Elizabeth Bender Cloud, strengthening his sense of indigenous kinship connection.

His relationship with Mary Roe was also difficult because she treated him as a child when he was a grown Ho-Chunk man. Out of loneliness as a Yale student, he had asked her to write him frequent letters. She wrote back, calling him a ‘chump’. She wrote:

You dear ridiculous old chump! The very idea of asking me to send you a little message (forsooth) now and then – yes, quite frequently. Walter [his ‘father’] roared [...]. I write to you often, not because I have so much to say
but because I’m lonesome for you [...]. That is an advantage of having such a large child [...].16

In this letter, Mary Roe discusses how she sees Cloud as a large child, even though he was in his early twenties, which fits within a colonial model of viewing Native adults as children and all Natives as positioned lower than whites on the socio-evolutionary scale. She calls him a ‘chump’, which also means a dupe or a sucker, for asking her for frequent letters, alluding to her view of his ‘weakness’, and not being masculine and/or adult enough to handle his loneliness. She combines her colonial treatment, calling him a large child, and a derisive putdown, with a declaration of love. This colonial mixture of maternal love and ridicule could be very confusing and difficult for a Ho-Chunk man in his early twenties, especially since her remarks are a direct challenge to his sense of manhood.

Indeed, in 1920, his wife, Elizabeth, discusses in a letter how the ‘white race’, including Mary Roe, viewed Cloud as a child, who was seen as unfit to be the leader of the college preparatory Christian high school for Native boys, the American Indian Institute he had founded in 1915. Elizabeth wrote:

I suppose mother [Mary Roe] wrote recommending you be the one to raise the money on the outside while perhaps someone else to be put in charge of this school to have direct charge [...]. There is this thing about it dearie. If you are not made principal of this enterprise and people do not think you have the ability to head this enterprise for our people, then the graceful thing for us to do is to step out. It is evidence enough that the white race still thinks the Indian in the childhood stage of development and Henry Cloud is not meant for the leader of his people [...].17

Referring to Mary Roe’s recommendation of placing him in the role of fundraiser for the school, rather than principal, Cloud’s wife aligns herself with her husband. She expresses her love and respect for him, saying that she would also leave if needed (she also worked at
the school). By underlining his name and not including the surname Roe in the middle, she emphasises his Ho-Chunk identity before his involvement with his white ‘parents’. This vignette illustrates how this loving couple shared the challenges of living in a racist world, including the colonial beliefs of those close to them. His marriage to Elizabeth was absolutely central to Henry Cloud’s resilience in the face of colonial adversity. Furthermore, his indigenous kinship ties to his life-long partner, Elizabeth, helped Cloud maintain his sense of Ho-Chunk manhood.

Elizabeth wrote another letter to Henry about Mary Roe. She referred to Mary Roe’s lack of support for Henry in his bid to become school principal. Elizabeth wrote:

After you wrote what she said, ‘Letting Henry down easy, etc.’, I just felt that I do not want to even see her again [...]. Mother loves very intensely or else does everything in her power to undermine who she has loved if she thinks her love is being cast aside. If she comes down here when school is nearly out, I do not want to see her and I will go down on our family farm if she does come. I wish she had never come into our lives.¹⁸

This letter again shows Elizabeth’s willingness to stand by her husband during times of stress caused by his dysfunctional relationship with his white ‘mother’. Her expression of support, including her fierce rejection of Mary Roe, points to how angry Elizabeth was, and how difficult this colonial maternal relationship could be.

Mary Roe had written an earlier letter a few months before to Cloud, complaining about his behavior towards her. She wrote:

Therefore, dear, whenever, hereafter I seem not to respond or to turn away remember my own assertion of finding a dual personality in you, one of which draws one by the bonds of a tender, a pure, and a faithful affection,
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one that dishonors no one; while the other repels me and can win from me no understanding or cooperation.19

Her discussion of Cloud’s ‘double personality’, alludes to his mixed feelings towards Mary Roe, including his positive and dutiful treatment of her, on the one hand, and his defensive strategy, drawing a boundary between them, and providing him with some distance. It also shows her attempt to use rejection as a reprisal for his creation of a protective space between them. Furthermore, it could point to her rewarding Cloud for ‘white’ behavior, while punishing him for his indigenous ‘behavior’ – again, a possible rejection of his embrace of a warrior identity, and role in life as a spokesperson for his people.

In light of the pressure this correspondence reveals, Cloud’s ability to keep his Ho-Chunk warrior identity strong, even before meeting his Ojibwe wife, Elizabeth Bender, becomes very clear. An explicit example of this occurs when Cloud wrote to Bessie in 1907:

I have discovered a name that you must call me.... it suits my heart. It is ‘wah gi g ah nah’. The first ‘g’ hard as in (give) the second ‘g’ dotted, as in german ‘ch’ in machen. This is its meaning. In time of war among the Winnebagoes [Ho-Chunks], there is a young man, usually the nephew of the war-chief, who does anything, which the war-chief requests him to do. He will be the scout of the war party if it is so requested. He will cook. He must carry the war-chief’s burden on his back during the long marches. The hero of that story [...] was a ‘wah gi g ah nah’. He had to cook, scout, and carry burdens. But of all purely Indians stories I have heard no character [who] appeals to me so much as that one does.20

Cloud wrote this letter to Bessie one year after meeting the Roes and before meeting his future wife, Elizabeth. This letter is evidence of how important and central his sense of Ho-Chunk warrior identity was to him as a Ho-Chunk man, and shows he was strongly resisting the colonial tactics of the Roes, who, according to Pfister, were
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working hard to assimilate him and turn him into an ‘individual’. Indeed, his request to be called by an ancestral Ho-Chunk warrior name is a powerful strategy of resilience that testifies to Cloud’s sense of himself as part of a larger struggle to preserve and protect his people. The passing down of Ho-Chunk names is an honour and a way for us as Ho-Chunk people to perpetuate our culture. It is central to one’s identity as a Ho-Chunk person. It is also evidence of the centrality of Cloud’s sense of Ho-Chunk warrior identity that revolved around taking care of others, and serving his people. Indeed, Cloud’s request was a creative way for him to maintain a connection to his Ho-Chunk past, present, and future, as well as his Ho-Chunk cultural lineage and male identity, while away from his people.

Furthermore, Cloud’s request was a direct challenge against settler colonialism. In Imperial Eyes, Mary Pratt discusses how the very first thing the coloniser did when stepping foot upon the land in the Americas was naming it, using European names. Similarly, whites gave young Native children English language names as part of the assimilation project in federal boarding schools. Cloud’s use of Ho-Chunk naming was a way for him to carve out a Ho-Chunk-centric environment, or hub, in the midst of his white, missionary family, while keeping his sense of Ho-Chunk kinship strong. This Ho-Chunk-centric hub was a valuable strategy, a foundation for the development of his indigenous intellectual ability and perspective. Fundamental to developing one’s identity as a Native intellectual is the ability to see the world through Native eyes. This is similar to the strategies of urban Indians who create hubs of Native-centric interaction while living in the city, thus challenging the purpose of the federal government to use Natives’ relocation into cities to assimilate them.

HENRY CLOUD: HO-CHUNK WARRIOR AND INTELLECTUAL

Cloud’s reliance on his Ho-Chunk warrior identity was inextricably linked to his analytical lens as a Ho-Chunk intellectual, encouraging him to fight back against settler colonialism. In a letter to Mary Roe he asserts his Ho-Chunk warrior identity by using ‘warrior talk’ while discussing General Pratt, the founder of the first government
boarding school for Native Americans, Carlisle. It was founded in 1879 and focused on vocational rather than college training, since Native Americans were viewed lower on the social evolutionary ladder, and therefore not intelligent enough to participate in college preparatory education. He wrote:

General Pratt has shown himself a venomous creature and we need to treat him as such. The poor old man is to be pitied for his long lost fight for Carlisle and his one idea. He has the Indian Office in general against him; all the missionaries who know actual conditions are one against him. All he can do is to join forces with people of like mongrel feathers and there are many of them – all willing to come down to the lowest kind of muckraking methods. I would not have anything to do with him. If he gets in my way I’ll hit him hard and knock him out and go on. The trouble with Pratt is – he is selfishly egotistical [...], he would take the responsibility of recreating the Indian race if he thought he had the power. He little realizes what great harm he has done the Indian race by posing as their greatest friend. He was the man who in the first place limited the Indian education down to the eighth grade.²⁵

Cloud uses warrior language by describing General Pratt as ‘the enemy’ of the Indian race, although I do not think that he would physically hit Pratt, but rather that he would ‘hit him’ with rhetorical blows if he got ‘in his way’. Cloud criticises Pratt’s paternalism, thinking he had the right to ‘recreate the Indian race’. Cloud also adapts the highly racialised and white supremacist term ‘mongrel’ to use against whites who supported Pratt and Carlisle and as a challenge against the impact of colonialism and racism on Native people. The quotation points to how Cloud’s warrior education was fundamental to his anti-colonial strategies, since this education instructed him to protect his people, and fight fiercely against the enemy. It also taught him a Ho-Chunk intellectual perspective, enabling him to critique Pratt as paternalistic and disrespectful of
Native intellectual abilities, assuming that an eighth grade education was sufficient for indigenous children.

Later in his life, in 1944, Cloud also taught Bessie how to examine history from a Native American perspective, once again demonstrating his ability as a Ho-Chunk intellectual. She had sent him her chapter about Indian and white relations in Virginia in the 1600s and asked for his feedback. In response, he wrote:

After ten or more points you bring out as to why the Indians attacked the English so violently in 1622 in Va. [Virginia], I think more should be made of the fact of the Indian dispossessed. Show how this process can be so painful to them.

According to the English Diaries the English looked upon the Indians as inferior, fit to be servants to the English and as the Indians occupied the best corn lands, most fertile spots to be found in the country enjoyed the deer and wild fowl, the English longed for these very lands and as shiploads of them came over there was need for more and more of this land. Then too their domesticated animals ran all over the place destroying cornfields causing disturbances not only in Va. but also in other settlements. If there is one thing an Indian resents, it is to be thought of as inferior. As a matter of fact he thinks or measures himself as superior [...]. Hence pride is one of the most outstanding [facts] of Indian nature. Yet was it not Yardley who took Opechancanough [chief of the Powhatan] by the lock of his hair and utterly humiliated him for corn? No man can do that to a chief and not hear from it later. An Indian never forgot such arrogance. He was humiliated by that act [in front of] the whole tribe. [...].

They prospered on corn, tobacco, cattle, swine and poultry on lands which the Indian considered rightfully his own. They ruthlessly disinterred the bones of Powhatan [the leader of the Powhatan federation] in 1621. The resting place to the Indian is terribly sacred
[...]. Above all things to alarm the Indians were their imported epidemics [...]. In these times, Indians are losing their lands by the loans ostensibly made as a gesture of friendship on the part of the whites, and then find themselves dispossessed of their lands later when unable to repay [...]. If you put these very strong elemental feelings of the Indians which interpreted by the Indians as jeopardizing their existence then the attack assumed economic, racial and rancor from high handed treatment as Casus Belli rather than cruelty per se. 26

Cloud is able to build a persuasive analytical case against settler colonialism, discussing how the behavior of the English should be viewed as justification for acts of war. By relying on an indigenous warrior perspective, he discusses how the English’s disrespectful behavior would encourage Natives to fight back. Certainly, his Native-centric and Ho-Chunk warrior view of history attacks the underlying assumptions that work to normalize settlers’ behaviour. Settler colonial histories tell a heroic struggle between good and evil, viewing indigenous peoples as evil and settlers as good. Cloud subverted this good versus evil binary by arguing that indigenous peoples were justified to attack the English and that their actions were not ‘cruelty per se’. He challenged viewing settler behavior towards Natives as based upon goodness, friendship, or benevolence by describing the land loss when Natives could not repay the loans given to by the English ‘ostensibly’ as gestures of friendship. 27

Indeed, he reveals how the settlers profited from their occupation of stolen indigenous land. Moreover, Cloud’s astute analysis of how the English’s tactics revolved around land dispossession and economic interest exposes how settler colonialism works.

Cloud’s discussion of the English’s colonial tactics, his emphasis on a Native warrior perspective, and his overall ability to discuss an indigenous approach to history, shows how his Ho-Chunk cultural lens was central to his intellectual analysis. In these ways, his intellectual work is foundational to the development of Ho-Chunk studies, which includes later scholars, such as Amy Lonetree, Truman Lowe, Tom Jones, David Lee-Smith, his daughter, Woesha
Cloud North, George Greendeer, and Allen Walker. Cloud works to open lines of communication between him and Bessie, encouraging her to understand how Natives had a rightful cause to retaliate against unfair treatment. By trying to sensitise Bessie to an indigenous perspective of history, Cloud works again to create a supportive indigenous hub or network in the midst of his white ‘family’, remaining strong and maintaining his identity as a Ho-Chunk man and an intellectual.

As a Ho-Chunk warrior and Christian, Cloud’s appropriation of the popular rhetoric of white masculinity, of the ‘self-made’ man, was yet another strategy of indigenous resilience, helping him to intensify his masculine power in white society. In his autobiographical narrative, Cloud discusses his growing up on the Winnebago reservation in Nebraska, learning traditional Ho-Chunk culture. He discusses being taken by a policeman to a government boarding school, refusing to forget his Ho-Chunk language even though using it was strictly forbidden, attending a mission school where he converted to Christianity, and finally attending Mount Herman, a college preparatory school. He describes how he had to leave Mount Herman for one year in order to make enough money to pay his way. He worked for an entire year on a farm in New Jersey to earn money. He discusses learning to pay for what he received and to understand the value of money, the meaning of hard work, and the worth of time. These are all values that proved he was closer to the ‘modern’ Indian ideal, not a ‘dirty beggar’, a popular stereotype about reservation Indians. Cloud was also applying traditional Ho-Chunk concepts about the hard work of being a warrior – the ‘cooking’ and ‘carrying burdens’ type of warrior apprenticeship.

By emphasising his humble beginnings and his drive to support himself, he appropriates the popular white masculine notion of the ‘self-made’ man, but he as well infuses his identity with the Ho-Chunk notion of warrior as servant. Benjamin Franklin, and later in the century Horatio Alger Jr., were ‘self-made’ men, who became heroes as part of justifying the individualistic spirit of self-interest. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, racial justice movements created leaders into examples of heroic masculinity. These pivotal and influential leaders, including Frederick Douglas, Booker T. Washington, and W. E. B. Dubois, were brave and heroic
fighters for racial equality. What made these figures heroic was not only their ability to rise above humble beginnings to gain personal success, but also, more importantly, their public work and very strong dedication to their racial communities, which is a huge divergence from white ideals of individual improvement. In the same way, Cloud as a warrior appropriated a white ideal, but used it as a kind of camouflage for deeply held indigenous concepts of self and community.

Similarly, by highlighting his personal success, humble beginnings, and strong commitment to his Native people and Ho-Chunk identity, Cloud claims his sense of a Native heroic masculinity during a time period when whites had worked hard to greatly reduce Native male power by treating them as defeated non-men. For instance, even though it was Natives who had defeated Custer in defense of their homelands, it is Custer who is highlighted as dying on his feet, asserting his white male masculinity. Cloud’s emphasis of his ‘self-made’ masculine character was an innovative strategy to increase his masculine power so that he would not be viewed as a Native ‘non-man’. Cloud subverted the gendered settler colonial tactic of trying to take away his manhood. It was a Ho-Chunk warrior strategy, a crucial element in his Native male resilience in the face of colonial adversity.

Cloud’s letter to Mary Roe shows the positive impact of his published autobiography, which highlights his identity as a self-made man. In 1916, Cloud describes an instance of racism he experienced with his newly married wife, Elizabeth. He also discusses their fundraising for his college preparatory high school for Indian boys. He writes:

That noon in going to the hotel for lunch we were taken for Negroes and sent to the kitchen for our lunch. When I asked for the ladies wash room and dressing toilet room the proprietors pointed to a slop bucket place and told me to wash there. When I asked her if that was all they had, she said ‘yes’. Needless to say we did not eat in the kitchen nor wash in the slop place. We ate in the dining room with all the members of the Harvard club. Elizabeth and I felt pretty blue for these two days. The
first time she went with me to make an appeal [for money] I got such brusque treatment and such insult from piggish folk.

The world has its two sides but Christian philosophy melts it all. We took it as part of the game. We reported to the McCormick’s and I shouldn’t be surprised if they raised their gift to $3500. One of the finest experiences in my life came after this affair at Lake Geneva [....]. Mr. McCormick invited Elizabeth and me to dinner. [...] To my great surprise he said, ‘We will drive over to my mother’s place and see her [for] five minutes!’ As soon as she came out she said, ‘Why, Henry Cloud I know all about you. I have read [about] your beautiful life in the Southern Workman’. I am so happy to meet you and Mrs. Cloud.  

Cloud emphasises his sense of power and elevated class status as an educated Native man by discussing how he refused to eat in the hotel’s restaurant because of racist treatment, choosing instead to eat at the Harvard club. He highlights his and his wife, Elizabeth’s resilience, quickly recovering from ‘feeling blue’, and seeing their racist treatment as ‘part of the game’, while highlighting their excellent fundraising abilities. Cloud discusses two sides of white society – one that racialises him, and the other that treats him with respect. Rather than viewing Cloud through the lens of racism, Mrs. McCormick refers to his published autobiography, and describes Cloud’s life as ‘beautiful’. Cloud attributes his respectful treatment to Christianity, since the McCormicks were Christians. Indeed, his rhetorical use of the self-made man and Christian identity in his life story very likely supported an elderly Christian woman’s positive impression of him. Cloud’s creative use of dominant discourses, including the self-made man and Christianity, was, therefore, a useful strategy to challenge how settler society had worked to disempower Native men in general.
A CRITIQUE OF THE YALE INDIAN: THE EDUCATION OF HENRY CLOUD

I have discussed how Cloud resisted gendered settler colonialism. In the following section, I critique Pfister’s book, The Yale Indian. The Yale Indian is in the public eye, which influences how Henry Cloud is remembered. The title, The Yale Indian, elucidates the central problem of the book, and that is to view Cloud as an individual, ‘The’ Indian, removed from his Ho-Chunk people. Pfister portrays him mainly as a product of white cultural and institutional education, especially Yale and his adoptive white family.

Pfister removes Cloud from his tribe and Native people. As Pfister himself admits, his book is primarily based upon Cloud’s personal writings and his letters to his adopted white family. However, many of these letters very likely discuss what Cloud strategically chose to write in the context of colonial dynamics related to race, class, and gender. Indeed, these power dynamics can make a subordinated person feel uncomfortable to express one’s true feelings or perspectives. Even so, there is correspondence in the Yale archive which emphasises Ho-Chunk viewpoints missed by Pfister entirely. Pfister even makes a mistake about Cloud’s clan, calling him a member of the Bear clan. This error shows his lack of care regarding a pivotal Ho-Chunk cultural attribute and his lack of knowledge about the powerful importance of clan membership in Ho-Chunk educational training and upbringing. He also makes a mistake about Elizabeth’s tribal affiliation. She grew up on the White Earth Ojibwe (Chippewa) reservation in Minnesota and was not a Bad River Chippewa.

His choice to focus his research only in one archive means he did not take into account Cloud’s correspondences held in many archives throughout the United States, including the US National archives in Kansas City, Washington DC, and Seattle, and the Presbyterian Church archives. The Cloud family also has many of Henry’s letters. Pfister’s decision to concentrate mostly on Indian-white relations, and not to discuss adequately Cloud’s relationships with other Natives, including his wife, is especially problematic, since Pfister argues that his marriage to Elizabeth was a defining moment in his life, encouraging him to follow a ‘I-am-We’ self-definition and
In this way, Pfister seems to portray Cloud as an emotional/psychological ‘captive’ within the individualising colonial dynamics of a white missionary family (until he met and married Elizabeth). Thus, Pfister minimises Cloud’s cultural strength and power as a Ho-Chunk man raised and educated as a Ho-Chunk warrior. Despite his thorough research in one archive, the book is incomplete also because he decided not to interview Cloud’s descendants and other Ho-Chunk people, and not to use the dissertation of Woeshan Cloud North, Cloud’s daughter, which emphasises Ho-Chunk traditional education. Because of Pfister’s limited scope, the book does not incorporate the pivotal influence of his Ho-Chunk educational upbringing.

Furthermore, Pfister’s methodological approach as an American studies literary scholar has colonial implications. I spoke to him on the phone when the book was soon to be published, and he called the Roe/Cloud letters a ‘theoretical goldmine’. The word ‘goldmine’ has a colonial connotation, and alludes to viewing these letters as knowledge to be extracted, similar to mining resources on indigenous land. I discussed how there were elements of the Roe/Cloud relationship we wanted kept private – a Cloud family concern he did not respect. He seemed to view these letters as knowledge for the taking, with or without Ho-Chunk or family knowledge or consent. In the book’s preface, for example, Pfister discusses that the archive at the Sterling Library at Yale University was accessible since the 1980s and that at least one descendant, Cloud’s daughter, Woeshan Cloud North, knew about these letters. Then, he asserts that Cloud’s descendants could choose to write their own volume about Cloud. Pfister does not discuss the importance of collaborating with Cloud’s descendants and/or the Ho-Chunk tribe from the very start of his archival research. His distinctly colonial attitude – his ‘ownership’ – rules out important Ho-Chunk insights into white-Indian power dynamics. Ethnographic observations of indigenous peoples were assertions of the imperial power to scrutinise indigenous peoples without taking indigenous peoples’ analysis seriously and without consent. Likewise, archival researchers, who use an imperial gaze to analyse indigenous peoples’ letters without taking Native analytical perspectives seriously and without consent, are using a colonial methodology.
Because of Pfister’s many choices, including not discussing Cloud’s Ho-Chunk upbringing, and not relying upon appropriate Ho-Chunk sources, contemporary Ho-Chunks might not recognise Cloud as a Ho-Chunk man. Pfister’s portrayal of Cloud could be in effect an attempt to eliminate Cloud as a Native. Patrick Wolfe discusses how anthropology was for a long time a soliloquy of Western discourse talking to itself without ever engaging seriously with Natives. Similarly, Pfister did not incorporate enough of Cloud’s descendants’ analysis of his letters, or Ho-Chunks’ understandings of him. Ultimately, Pfister needed to ‘remove’ Cloud from his family and tribe in order to support his argument about Cloud becoming an ‘individualist’.

Finally, Pfister chooses not to face the full implication of Mary Roe’s colonial maternal behavior. However, according to Margaret Jacobs, it is essential to face the full colonial implications of white women’s behavior towards indigenous peoples. Indeed, Pfister describes Mary Roe’s maternalism as ‘sentimental mothering’, which should be understood, he argues, ‘compassionately’. Pfister neglects to emphasise Cloud’s unhappiness, and his work to remove himself from the emotional consequences aspect of her ‘maternalism’. It was an ultimately effective defensive tactic, a choice showing his resilience as a Ho-Chunk young man.

In sum, my analytical approach is Ho-Chunk-centric, an approach that is equally aware of Mary Roe’s colonial maternalism and of Cloud’s resistance in the face of gendered settler colonialism. Cloud defied colonial reality by appropriating the white notion of the self-made man, and by relying upon his Ho-Chunk masculinity, his partnership with his wife, his Christian identity, and a cluster of Ho-Chunk-centric hubs. His Ho-Chunk warrior training contributed to his Native intellectual abilities. Pfister’s colonial claim to ‘own’ Cloud’s letters prevents a serious discussion of Indian-white settler colonial power dynamics. Pfister’s focus on Cloud’s ‘individuality’, while not adequately discussing Cloud’s Ho-Chunkness, resembles the settler colonial process of removal, separating Cloud from his Ho-Chunk people. In this way, Pfister participates in a soliloquy within non-Ho-Chunk literary discourse and his theoretical discussion never enters into a responsible conversation with Ho-Chunk and Native perspectives.
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NOTES

1 Renato Rosaldo discusses how subordinated groups’ rely upon creativity in order to deal with power relations. See Renato Rosaldo, Culture and Truth: The Remaking Social Analysis (Boston: Beacon, 1989).
2 I use the Paiute activist, Laverne Roberts’ concept of the hub, which explains how urban Native Americans maintain their indigenous senses of culture, community, identity, and belonging, in order to discuss Cloud’s diasporic experiences, living away from his tribal homelands. Hubs are based in geographic space, including meetings, and virtual space, including phone calling. See Renya Ramirez, Native Hubs: Culture, Community, and Belonging in Silicon Valley and Beyond, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).
5 Pfister, The Yale Indian: xiv.
6 Pfister, The Yale Indian: 16.
7 Henry Cloud to Mary Roe, 18/07/07, Box 67, Folder 1078, Yale Sterling Library, Roe Family Papers.
8 Woeshia Cloud North, Notes, Woeshia Cloud North files, author’s possession, no date, no page number.
9 Deborah Miranda, Bad Indians (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, forthcoming), Margaret Jacobs, White Mother to the Dark Race, (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2009).
11 Mary Roe to Henry Cloud, 30/01/07, Yale Sterling Library, Roe Family Papers.
12 Mary Roe to Henry Cloud, 11/12/09, Yale Sterling Library, Roe Family Papers.
13 Pfister, *The Yale Indian*: 101
14 Jacobs, *White Mother to a Dark Race*.
15 Mary Roe to Henry Cloud, 11/09, Box 67, Folder 1098, Yale Sterling Library, Roe Family Papers.
16 Mary Roe to Henry Cloud, 18/07/07, Box 67, Folder 1078, Yale Sterling Library, Roe Family Papers.
17 Elizabeth Cloud to Henry Cloud, 12/03/20. Letter in author’s possession.
18 Elizabeth Cloud to Henry Cloud, 23/03/20. Letter in author’s possession.
19 Mary Roe to Henry Cloud, 21/12/19. Letter in author’s possession.
20 Henry Cloud to Elizabeth (Bessie) Page, 06/10/07, Yale Sterling Library, Roe Family Papers.
21 Woesha Cloud North, *Informal Education in Winnebago Tribal Society with Implications for Formal Education* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Phd dissertation, 1978). My mother writes about the importance of our family’s Ho-Chunk naming ceremony, which occurred on the Winnebago reservation in Nebraska. When a Ho-Chunk person is born, children are named in accordance with their birth order. After a Ho-Chunk person grows older, a name related to one’s clan affiliation is chosen with the help of an elder.
23 Ramirez, *Native Hubs*.
25 Henry Cloud to Mary Roe, 09/02/15, Yale Sterling Library, Roe Family Papers.
26 Henry Cloud to Elizabeth (Bessie) Page, 24/09/44. Letter in author’s possession.
31 Basso, McCall, Garceau (eds), *Across the Great Divide*: 1-2.
32 Henry Cloud to Mary Roe, 06/08/16, Yale Sterling Library, Roe Family Papers.
Ramirez, ‘Henry Roe Cloud to Henry Cloud’

33 Pfister’s title – ‘The Yale Indian’ – uses ‘Yale’ as a modifier, and by using the definite article Pfister emphasises Cloud’s singularity. In other words, for Pfister Cloud is the ‘only’ Yale Indian. In a way, he becomes Yale’s property.


35 Lucy Maddox, Citizen Indians: Native American Intellectuals, Race, and Reform, (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005). Maddox argues that Cloud’s contemporaries, who were members of the Society of American Indians, had to be strategic about what they wrote and spoke about because of racial and other power dynamics.

36 Furness, ‘Challenging the myth of indigenous peoples’ “last stand”’. Furness discusses the difference between deliberate and repressive silence in regards to power dynamics.


38 Even if my sister, Mary McNeil, told Pfister about this powerful partnership, her analysis is not referred to in his book. Papagianni, ‘Pfister’s The Yale Indian’.


41 Pfister, The Yale Indian: xv.

42 Patrick Wolfe, Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology.

43 While Cloud’s descendants did read and gave Pfister feedback regarding his manuscript, his overall argument and approach did not change. His approach was not one of collaboration. He did not work with the Cloud family and/or with Ho-Chunks people from the very beginning of his research. We heard about Pfister’s manuscript right before it was to be published from a Native friend who had seen the manuscript. A copyright lawyer was hired. As a result of their research, Cloud’s descendants determined that they own the copyrights in Cloud’s letters. This is why Cloud’s letters are not quoted in The Yale Indian. I read Pfister’s manuscript and gave him feedback, but he did not seem to be interested in my analysis of the Roe/Cloud correspondence. Anthropologists have been working collaboratively with indigenous communities for decades. I argue that this kind of collaboration with indigenous communities should be carried out by archival researchers as well. Ramirez, ‘Henry Roe Cloud’.

44 Margaret Jacobs, Mother to a Dark Race.


46 Pfister, for example, does not emphasize Cloud’s letter to Mary Roe where he works to extricate himself from the ‘sentimental’ aspect of her mothering. Pfister writes: ‘Two months before the ailing Walter died in 1913, Henry wrote her again […] . He observed that his tie to her was not romantic and that she, in truth, was not his biological mother’. Pfister, The Yale Indian: 111.

47 Henry Cloud to Mary Roe, 0901/13, Letter in author’s possession. My mother collected this letter when she visited the Sterling library’s Yale archive.