instance, readers are treated to the bureaucratic side of famed AMNH anthropologist Clark Wissler in his fiscal accounting of Skinner’s expenses. The photographs span the period of the Dimocks’ visit to a Seminole trading store in 1905 to the end of the Skinner expedition in 1910. My only serious criticism of the book is the authors’ failure to include a modern map to guide the reader.

The title *Hidden Seminoles* is very apt. The Seminoles in these photographs are primarily from southwestern Florida, in contrast to those around Lake Okeechobee and on the east side of the Everglades who figure most prominently in early works on the Seminole. The images are hidden also in the sense of having long languished outside the view of scholars and the public. And these Seminoles are also “hidden” compared with typical early published works in the ordinariness and timeliness of the scenes Dimock captured.

True to the styles of the era, many of the men wear derby hats or straw boaters, though sometimes adorned with plumes and headbands. The most striking of these is reproduced on the book’s dust jacket. But there are plenty of shots of men in traditional turbans and men, women, and children in traditional dress. Along with these more exotic images, many pedestrian activities are represented: a woman doing laundry, a Seminole giving a haircut to a member of the Skinner expedition, skinning an alligator, killing a pig for an upcoming feast, cleaning a wild turkey, and more. There are, however, some unusual shots, such as a Seminole silversmith at work, a young man playing a violin, a man at a sewing machine, a couple of Seminole men sharing a bottle of moonshine, a home distillery, and what is perhaps the earliest photo of a plank-sided, shingle-roofed structure in a Seminole camp, although done in Seminole architectural style. Even though little from Seminole ceremonial and religious life is represented, a picture of a medicine man and a scene of a Green Corn Dance site are included.

Together the photographs comprise a fascinating inventory of the material culture of the time. Many non-Indian manufactures—pots and pans, coffee grinders, rifles, a cane mill—are represented, along with Seminole-made items—clothing, houses, and perhaps most prominently, dugout canoes. There are some ethnographically stunning shots. One is of Alanson Skinner in “Seminole clothing,” which includes what appear to be buckskin leggings and a headdress that looks similar to an Iroquoian-style *gustoweh*. Most surprising to this reviewer were the images of a stickball demonstration in which one of the players is wielding a set of ladelleike rackets made entirely of wood, rather than the more familiar type with leather netting (the ladle type was also known among the Eastern Cherokee [personal communication, Raymond D. Fogelson]).

Needless to say, there is a wealth of material here for historical and ethnographic specialists, but there is a very human side of the photographs. Almost all the subjects are identified by name. In a prefatory note to the book, Tina Osceola (Chief Historic Resource Officer, Seminole Tribe of Florida) reminds readers, “The people portrayed in Julian Dimock’s photographs are our relatives.”

J. Anthony Paredes
Professor Emeritus
Florida State University


The essays in *Phantom Past, Indigenous Presence* recognize indigenous ghosts and the phenomenon of haunting as “remarkably complex facets of the experience of colonialism” that allow us to critically engage in “the ways in which knowledge of place and past are constructed, produced, revealed, and contested” (p. ix). In this volume, history is a haunting, an investment in the places and motives of the living informed by a (re)animation of an often violent past. Ghost stories, identified as “first and foremost . . . a technique of
removal” (p. xi) also “perform a wide range of cultural and political work” (p. ix). The collection presents a solid range of engagement with this dialectic: haunting as a form of native historical agency and as an exercise of colonial domination and erasure.

A strong argument working through the essays identifies haunting as a kind of agency invested in the properties of what remains. Plotting this agency requires locating it in a field of Native sensibility and meaning, a locating often complicated and measured through both contemporary narratives and objects surfacing from the past. In Coll Thrush’s work, Native bones surface to unsettle colonial and postcolonial efforts at erasure. Thrush’s call for “a new narrative of urban Indigenous history” (p. 76) depends on a recognition of ghost stories as narrative spaces for “resurrections,” to counter dominant historical narratives. But all histories are “ghost stories,” narratives of the past created in the present (or multiple presents), peopled by specters that represent something that may have happened as it is told, something that is only animated in, and by, telling. John Waterman’s careful analysis of control exerted over Black Hawk’s body, memorial, and history recognizes collecting and disciplining stories of the dead and memory as controlling their cultural meanings. In death Black Hawk serves to “inculcate a sense of national identity” (p. 89) in the face of its challenge.

A provocative chapter by Sarah Schneider Kavanagh investigates how the “ideologies of nationalism” (p. 153) haunt the ghosts of Indian Hill Cemetery. She explores the cemetery as a “vertically penetrative frontier” (p. 153), one that fixes a narrative of indigenous extinction to place and the depth of time. She frames a central question that continues to haunt Native American scholarship: how can America claim, and simultaneously erase, “the Indian” from the national narrative? The manufacture of Indian ghosts firmly located living Native peoples in the past, and their (present) haunting was read as an affirmation of a newly constructed national identity. Schneider Kavanagh makes an intriguing connection between “ghost stories” and the processes of hegemony. By describing hegemonies as socially constructed, “we mean that they are built on history, memory, fear, and desire: they are made from the same things that ghosts are made from” (pp. 171–2).

Many of the essays focus more directly on connections between ghosts, human remains, and other artifacts. Colleen Boyd calls for a reevaluation of “the contested meanings of dirt, stones, and bones” (p. 192). She raises an important question about indigenous worldviews, one that frames the entire volume: “How can we approach unusual stories and experiences—those alter-Native truths—in the true spirit of inquiry and in ways that do not condescend?” (p. 204). C. Jill Grady echoes Boyd’s observations as she questions the usefulness of Western psychological analytical paradigms to comprehend Native understanding of ghosts: Native ghosts are not Western ghosts, one’s sense of hauntings is not easily mapped onto another’s sense of being haunted.

Focusing on the surfacing of remains and artifacts, Victoria Freeman asserts that “bones come up for a reason” (p. 223). Supporting the Introduction’s assertion that “ghosts are political,” she connects this “ancestor activism” (p. 225) to increasing recognition of heritage preservation as a space for political struggle. Ancestors appear here not only as a way to connect to a past often ignored or violently erased, but as reanimators of the present—understood in ongoing struggles for recognition, conflicts over history and the desecration of historical sites, and as voices speaking through their material descendants.

Freeman’s analysis considers museums as potential spaces for reanimation, places for national and alternative-national narratives to unfold, potentially retaking staked and understood assertions of history as spaces for haunting. This ghosting, this disconnected and reconnected spirit of places and peoples, marks this volume as a useful addition to ongoing discourses about sovereignty and reclamation of an indigenous place in a colonial-settler imagination of the past. If ghosts are, in part, evidence of violence and disconnection left unsettled, then recognizing these ghosts reconfigures local and larger histories, reasserting survival and sovereignty as acts of particular resettlement.