

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Dismembered: Tribal Disenrollment and the Battle for Human Rights. By David E. Wilkins and Shelly Hulse Wilkins.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0m5943zk>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 43(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Michael, Nicky Kay

Publication Date

2019-03-01

DOI

10.17953/0161-6463-43.2.157

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

change our understanding of Dakota women's innovations in beads and quills during the reservation era, the same years during which Europeans and Americans formulated the key tenets of modernism? *Becoming Mary Sully* honors Mary Sully's artistic achievements by imploring us to consider these questions further.

Annika Johnson

Associate Curator of Native American Art, Joslyn Art Museum

Dismembered: Tribal Disenrollment and the Battle for Human Rights. By David E. Wilkins and Shelly Hulse Wilkins. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2017. 224 pages. \$83.11 cloth; \$25.49 paper; \$14.75 electronic.

Coauthors David E. and Shelly Wilkins clearly acknowledge that Indigenous nations have sovereignty as "an inherent way of being" (26). As American Indian legal scholars and academics, their support of tribal sovereignty seems absolute. Yet in tribal governance, sovereignty is but one factor of many. Other contributing legal influences involve Congress, federal recognition, treaties, and the commerce clause of the US Constitution. Notwithstanding the various court decisions and plenary power claimed by Congress, tribal governments have a right to protect their lands, businesses, and the welfare of their citizens, and they also wield the power to exclude members or outsiders. As sovereign tribal governments, the authors assert that Indigenous peoples "retain as their core powers of self-governance the right to decide who may or may not be considered a citizen or member of their nation" (26).

The main point of the Wilkinses' book, however, is to present cautionary evidence to tribal governments and audience members that current Indigenous banishment and unenrollment practices are not necessarily products of Indigenous traditions. The authors argue that although some tribes historically practiced banishment, contemporary money and economic influences have superimposed and supplanted traditional Indigenous practices. Many current Indigenous studies scholars would likely agree with their argument that colonial capitalism has influenced tribal governments to act in ways antithetical to their historic traditions. In other words, tribal governments are hurting only themselves and their members by unenrollment and dismemberment. Yet in using the written record and court cases as the tools to argue their case, the Wilkinses' argument leans on the same colonial system that has structured traditional systems of tribal governance.

Among the Oxford dictionary's meanings of "dismember" is to "break up or tear into pieces" and to "cut off, sever from the body (a limb or member)." Adding to these meanings, the authors argue that "dismember" can also equate to banishment and unenrollment practices among the Indigenous nations of the United States. They assert that dismemberment is a means of breaking apart a tribal nation, thus finishing the extermination and assimilation practices of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

In this regard, membership is the ultimate meaning of sovereignty because a tribal nation would not be sovereign without its people, or members. Moreover, to

banish and disenroll members is like cutting off the appendages of a sovereign nation. Historically many tribal peoples sought to incorporate outsiders, not exclude them. Indeed, the Wilkins state, "Outsiders were frequently welcomed into tribal communities through traditional ceremonies and later through formal tribal acts. This openness is evidence of an inherent cultural confidence and generosity that were once hallmarks of Native nations" (27). This statement epitomizes much of the book in that tribal societies historically limited banishment and exclusion because Indigenous cultures valued good relations. In this acknowledgment, the authors seek to warn current tribal governments that banishment and unenrollment are not who the Indigenous peoples were, nor what they did.

The Wilkinses briefly examine dismemberment through a world picture of banishment. This assists in developing the trajectory of how and why severing one's relationship to society was used. Banishment "derives from the Latin word *bannitio*, which means 'Exclusion by a ban or public proclamation'" (13). From ancient India to the early American colonists, numerous peoples and societies have used banishment or exile as a form of punishment throughout human existence. Banishment through transportation of Indigenous populations to other areas of the world or enemy nations as slaves is an extension of its definition. However, Indigenous peoples used banishment for internal controls, not as a means of gaining slaves for economic gain as in many western examples. As a form of social control, banishment was used historically among many Indigenous peoples throughout the world, including islanders. Lesser forms of banishment included but were not limited to, "fines, alienation, and ostracism" (19). In a tight-knit, kin-based society, where survival depended on community, the worst thing that could happen to an Indigenous individual was banishment and therefore it was only used in extreme cases. Some of those worst-case scenarios might be child incest or murder.

The stronger lens of the Wilkinses' arguments lies in US case law. The Wilkinses selectively and meticulously list case law and court judgements to clarify the multi-faceted issues of jurisdiction and membership criteria. From the Cherokee Treaty of New Echota, 1835, to the Dawes and Allotment Act of the 1880s, each court case gives credence to a tribal government's authority to determine citizenship or some variation between—such as a citizen while non-Indian, i.e., a white man married to a Cherokee woman in the Cherokee Nation in the 1850s. In the 1880s, the Dawes Commission was charged with creating tribal rolls by determining who could be an enrolled member. Despite the many "errors and omissions," the Dawes rolls remain in use today to determine membership and blood quantum (35). Essentially, congress passed law after law to supersede the authority of tribal governments at this time and very few resistance efforts could ward off the implementations of the "civilization" policies. Another wave of termination and relocation took hold in the 1950s, tearing at the fabric of tribal sovereignty. But by the time the 1975 Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act was implemented, tribal governments once again have congress and law on their side enforcing their decision-making capacity for who belongs in their membership. The authors contend that dismemberment explodes in the era after passage of the 1975 Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance

act. A culmination of federal government support and economic development (particularly gaming) set the stage for tribal governments to exercise their “autonomy” and thus implement unenrollment processes (35). Since then, over seventy tribal governments have disenrolled or banished members and the authors provide ample evidence to demonstrate the reason (67).

The book’s strengths are explanation of US laws which favor tribal sovereignty and the cumulative evidence to demonstrate their case for disenrollment practices. From the beginning, they use numbers of civilizations, countries, states, legal cases, or Native nations to examine who and what applies or does not apply banishment, exile, or deportation. The authors expand the notion to include that de facto exclusion can be seen in many urban areas though in most states it is illegal to exile a citizen (16–17). Essentially, the authors wrap up their discussion of world banishment history by asserting that “banishment is a powerful erosion of rights and does nothing to solve crime” (18).

The book’s limitations include its use of the Christian bible and colonial systems to bolster their arguments. Christianity acts as a detraction from their argument rather than supporting it. “Exile as a form of punishment was meted out by God in numerous passages in the Hebrew Bible, tracing back to Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden for their act of disobedience” (13). Aside from the punitive aspects of exile conveyed in the bible, Christianity was used to oppress and subjugate Indigenous peoples throughout the world. Including world history would normally seem a reasonable and acceptable argument. However, federal policy forced Indigenous peoples to accept Christianity. With this in mind, I was left questioning whether the authors are contending that banishment was, in part or in whole, an imposed idea based on Christian influences?

What is also left out of the trajectory is that actual western colonialism has been imposed on tribal governments and perhaps banishment and unenrollment were more part of Indigenous cultures than the academic or historical record reflects. After all, many Indigenous stories reveal the lessons of being excluded or exiled for misbehavior and social infractions. The authors’ primary reliance on case law or the written record—colonial in origin and implementation—tends to question their effectiveness of warning tribal governments against unenrollment practices. Perhaps if the authors limited their focus to gaming tribes, they could bolster their case and would likely reveal more about unenrollment practices and injustice. All but six of the seventy tribal nations with disenrollment procedures are gaming tribes (78). For instance, a tribal member parent of the Seminole Tribe of Florida can seek to unenroll their own child if that child’s custodian is a non-Seminole. This is just one of many cases for which colonial capitalism could be said to be supplanting traditional systems of tribal governance in a gaming tribe.

Many non-gaming Indigenous nations are just breaking free of some of the limitations for which Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) constitutions and Self-determination programs have instituted. Case law and legal systems are the same colonial capitalist system to hurt tribal governance just as much as help. Often the benefits were good at the time, but later came to hamper good governance. As the book notes, 161 tribal

nations adopted IRA constitutions and 131 adopted charters of incorporation. Since the IRA, these numbers have increased to 331, while the remaining 567 federally recognized tribes use other forms of charters, council, or theocracy.

In other words, the authors are using the colonial legal system to encourage their argument. Some current legal scholars argue against utilizing colonial systems any further. Walter R. Echo-Hawk's *In the Courts of the Conqueror*, for example, which investigates the "ten worst" Indian law cases, supports the view that Indigenous peoples cannot win in a system historically established to conquer them. With Judge Greg Bigler, during 2016 to 2020 I took notes as these concerns were discussed during conference calls among representatives from Native American Rights Fund, the National Congress of American Indians, the University of Colorado Law School, the United Nations, tribal government leaders and judges, Muscogee and Cherokee cultural leaders, and academic institutions.

Additionally, the socioeconomic influences of the few examples of tribal economic success cannot be discounted in any argument about unethical and unjust enrollment practices. Gaming Indigenous populations went from living far below poverty to a middle class or greater per capita income. Any community, Indigenous or not, would likely exercise exclusion. Indigenous nations, however, have a unique trust status to determine their own membership. As sovereign powers recognized through constitutional provisions and statutes, as well as treaties, tribal governments have inherent authority to determine their own membership. Indeed, both caution and full, thoughtful, and purposeful application of unenrollment procedures and practices would go a long way to ensuring that tribes are supporting their own cultural and political practices.

Nicky Kay Michael
Bemidji State University

Honouring the Strength of Indian Women: Plays, Stories, Poetry. By Vera Manuel (Kulilu Patki). Edited by Michelle Coupal, Deanna Reder, Joanne Arnott, and Emalene A. Manuel. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2019. 391 pages. \$27.95 paper; \$70.00 electronic.

Honouring the Strength of Indian Women is a challenging, emotionally draining, and tragic book. It is also heartfelt, necessary, and important. Known primarily as Vera Manuel (her Christian name), Kulilu Patki (Butterfly Woman) was Ktunaxa and Secwepemc from an area near Cranbrook, British Columbia, and lived from 1948–2010. Many of the plays, short stories, and poetry in this anthology have been previously unavailable and are now bringing the author's legacy to a broader public. Three First Nation scholars and activists, together with the author's sister Emalene A. Manuel, edited and contributed essays to the volume, which is part of the *First Voices, First Texts* series, an initiative to reconnect contemporary audiences with Aboriginal literature, contexts, and neglected classics.