

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Claiming Tribal Identity: The Five Tribes and the Politics of Federal Acknowledgment. By Mark Edwin Miller.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0tq931t9>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 38(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Miller, Robert D.

Publication Date

2014-06-01

DOI

10.17953

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/>

to other issues as well: in a book emphasizing the important role of parents teaching language to their children, a stray statement that children and elders are the most important segments of the population for language is sadly left for readers to ponder on their own.

Hinton's conclusion to the volume, "Bringing Your Own Language into Your Own Home," does fulfill the cover's promise of a "How-to Guide for Parents." Hinton already has two other how-to guides available. One is on the master-apprentice method: Leanne Hinton, Matt Vera, and Nancy Steele's *How to Keep Your Language Alive: A Commonsense Approach to One-on-One Language Learning* (Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books, 2002). The other is a fourteen-page effort on the web entitled "How to Teach when the Teacher Isn't Fluent," which advocates the Total Physical Response method. In this recent effort, Hinton's conclusion provides a rationale for the different approaches found in the essays. Given the diversity, it is hard to see how a how-to compendium would have been possible. The conclusion serves as the next best thing to an index, which is sorely missing in a book where language-learning subjects are not concentrated together but rather appear and disappear throughout. Complaints aside, *Bringing Our Languages Home* is a very enjoyable and informative book.

Nile Robert Thompson

Dushuyay Research and North Seattle Community College

Claiming Tribal Identity: The Five Tribes and the Politics of Federal Acknowledgment. By Mark Edwin Miller. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013. 490 pages. \$26.95 paper.

Federal recognition remains an elusive goal for many groups, most notably the Lumbees of North Carolina. Though academics question the utility of examining American Indians as tribes, and the public continues to view tribes as populations forever trapped in a pre-modern existence, American Indians consider tribal recognition as an important government-to-government acknowledgment of their status as sovereign Native peoples. Scholars, including Vine Deloria, Jr., Brian Klopotek, and J. Kēhalani Kauanui, have advocated a liberalized recognition process, or have identified federal efforts to verify indigenous heritage using non-Native sources as colonialism. The current Federal Acknowledgment Process, adopted in 1978, is a frequent target of criticism due to its increasingly onerous requirements. Mark Miller's *Claiming Tribal Identity* traces the Five Tribes' involvement in the development of this process and examines their motivations for opposing the recognition of self-identified

tribes. Miller eschews advocacy for either the retention or liberalization of the current acknowledgment system in order to explore the political and economic justifications for the federal recognition of some southeastern groups and the rejection of others.

In the years after World War II, southeastern Native communities enjoyed a rebirth as economic growth reduced the region's isolation and the civil rights movement challenged legalized discrimination. During the 1960s, individuals could self-identify as American Indians on the US census while the counter-culture valorized American Indians as the antithesis of American materialism and militarism. Within this context, numerous southeastern groups sought recognition as Native peoples, frequently claiming descent from one or more of the Five Tribes. Some of these populations originated from long-isolated multiracial communities located throughout the Southeast on marginal lands ignored by whites. Other communities, however, emerged during the decades after World War II. Many southeastern communities lacked reservations and did not hold their lands in common. Their lack of tribal structures, their efforts to win recognition as American Indians through the adoption of Plains Indian attire and dances, and their assimilation of white southern culture led the Five Tribes to question their authenticity.

To the Five Tribes, the difficulties of these aspirants for federal recognition represented the latest Euro-American effort to defraud Native peoples. The decision by southeastern state governments to recognize many of these groups without consulting the Five Tribes sparked further resentment. As a result, the Five Tribes and the Bureau of Indian Affairs lobbied for the creation of a clear, uniform system of vetting groups desiring to secure federal recognition. Ultimately, Congress acceded to the efforts of the BIA and the Five Tribes by creating the aforementioned Federal Acknowledgment Process. This process required claimants to demonstrate they met seven criteria; a group's inability to satisfy just one criterion would justify the denial of federal recognition.

However, four of the most difficult criteria to prove became the focus of BIA evaluations. Prospective tribes had to: (1) demonstrate outsiders had historically identified them as Indian; (2) demonstrate the presence of a distinct community from the time of first contact with non-Indians; (3) prove that its leadership historically exercised authority or influence over members and that this leadership persisted to the present; and (4) prove its descent from a historical tribe or from historical tribes that united and "functioned as a single autonomous political entity from historical times to present" (241). Initially, the BIA, federally recognized tribes, and groups seeking federal recognition approved the Federal Acknowledgment Process, but the legislation has generated extensive controversy. Supporters of the current acknowledgment process contend legitimate claimants possess the legal and historical evidence

to prove their claims and secure federal recognition. Opponents, however, argue the threshold of proof is too burdensome for many Native groups due to a paucity of written documentation.

Scholars and groups seeking federal recognition have denounced the Five Tribes' support for the rigorous standards of the Federal Acknowledgment Process. These critics accuse the Five Tribes of promoting colonial institutions and behaving in a non-Native way. Yet, Indian Removal, the intruders' invasion of Indian Territory, and the inclusion of fraudulent claimants on the Dawes Roll provide clear historical justifications for the Five Tribes' trepidation. Though Miller notes the legitimate concerns of the Five Tribes, he is far from an uncritical promoter of their interests as he acknowledges the economic component of their opposition to a liberalized acknowledgment process. The Five Tribes have long warned that a dramatic increase in the number of recognized tribes would diminish federal funds available to existing tribes, but the rise of Indian gaming has heightened these fears, prompting tribes to hire expensive lobbyists. In effect, "tribal casinos have been the kiss of death" for the Lumbees and others seeking federal recognition (23). The exercise of Native sovereignty by newly recognized tribes could bolster the stereotype of the wealthy, casino Indian—as documented by Alexandra Harmon—and justify a reduction or elimination of needed federal resources. Even prior to the rise of Indian gaming, anti-tribal backlashes united groups as diverse as the Sierra Club and "citizens' rights" leagues against the expansion of Native sovereignty. Tribal leaders recognized that a liberal recognition process could exacerbate these fears.

Having established the Five Tribes' determination to maintain the Federal Acknowledgment Process, Miller provides several case studies to determine why some southeastern groups met with greater success in their efforts to secure recognition. For example, Miller devotes a chapter to the Poarch Band of Creek Indians and the Jena Band of Choctaws, two of the three groups from the Southeast to secure federal recognition under the Federal Acknowledgment Process of 1978. Miller demonstrates that the Poarch Band of Creek Indians succeeded in acquiring federal recognition despite their lack of aboriginal culture as they retained voluminous written documents proving their identities. The Jena Band of Choctaw Indians, however, lacked documentation of their origin but clearly retained Choctaw culture as evidenced by the retention of religious traditions and the presence of Choctaw speakers.

Similarly, Miller examines the inability of the Lower Muskogee Creek Tribe and the MOWA Band of Choctaw Indians to meet the BIA's standards for recognition due to doubts about their legitimacy. Georgia's Lower Muskogee group certainly included individuals with a clearly documented Creek ancestry, but the group's origin in the late 1970s and the dearth of Creek

cultural practices challenged its legitimacy in the minds of BIA investigators. The MOWA Band easily established its historical legitimacy as a community due to its nearly two-hundred-year presence in southern Alabama. However, the MOWA Band was unable to prove that their ancestry included substantial numbers of American Indians. Instead, the BIA determined that the intermarriage of whites and African Americans provided the foundation for this community. According to the BIA's conclusions, American Indians were never more than a small fraction of the group's population.

Miller ably discusses the views of the Five Tribes' leaders, scholars, and representatives, but he contends many enrolled citizens of these nations exhibit greater sympathy for the aspirations of unrecognized groups. This split between the leaders of the Five Tribes and the citizens of these nations merits further analysis. Future research might include surveys of letters to the editor appearing in Native newspapers, transcripts of public meetings in Oklahoma, or interviews with citizens of the Five Tribes advocating the recognition of more tribal governments. In addition, Miller briefly references the related, and highly controversial, topic of the relationships between the freedmen's descendants and the Five Tribes. A scholarly comparison of the debates surrounding the Federal Acknowledgment Process and the tribal citizenship of people of African descent might illuminate both subjects.

Miller's primary contribution is even-handed analysis and disengagement from the rancorous debates surrounding the Federal Acknowledgment Process. The vitriolic rhetoric employed by both sides is detrimental for scholarly examinations of the topic. Though academics raise pertinent questions about the usage of governmental records to document the legitimacy of groups seeking recognition, ignoring the legitimate concerns of the Five Tribes is, in itself, an assault on Native sovereignty. Miller's history may evoke criticism from those seeking a denunciation of federal policies or a proposal to reform the current Federal Acknowledgment Process. However, Miller's extensive research—focused on archival research and extensive interviews with leaders of the Five Tribes and southeastern groups—indicates that easy solutions with clearly defined protagonists and antagonists are illusory. Understanding the seemingly incompatible perspectives of all of the involved stakeholders might identify some common ground, however limited.

Robert D. Miller

California State University, San Marcos