

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Loss of Voice at Oneida Indian Nation: Traditional Methods of Social Control in a Contemporary Native Community

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1126k504>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 38(2)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Taylor, Michael

**Publication Date**

2014-03-01

**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/>

Peer reviewed

# Loss of Voice at Oneida Indian Nation: Traditional Methods of Social Control in a Contemporary Native Community

*Michael Taylor*

## INTRODUCTION

On June 4, 1993, the United States Department of the Interior approved a gambling compact between the Oneida Indian Nation (OIN) and New York State, clearing the way for “the first legal [casino] to operate in New York State in at least a century.”<sup>1</sup> The casino was built in the city of Oneida outside the territory that Oneida people frequently refer to as the “traditional 32-acre territory” on a specific tract of land near what is known as the Singing, Walking, or Prophet Stone. This 32-acre piece of land is of great significance to the Oneida people because it is the last remaining tract of the more than six million acres settled originally at the time of their nation’s founding.<sup>2</sup>

As with other Native nations that have adopted gaming as a successful economic enterprise since passage of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act in 1988, OIN has been able to harvest previously unattainable forms of wealth and power in the tribe’s interest. This newfound power and influence has had major consequences in the region for both OIN’s citizenry and the mainstream

---

MICHAEL TAYLOR is an assistant professor with a joint appointment in anthropology and Native American studies at Colgate University. A member of the Seneca Nation from the Allegany Territory of western New York, he received his PhD from Syracuse University.

public. Yet, to this day, many Oneida traditionalists maintain that OIN Tribal Representative and CEO Ray Halbritter failed to use proper procedure regarding when, or how, a casino would be built at OIN.

This type of conflict is not unusual in Native nations, with or without casino ownership. Although casino profits have resulted in profound changes in communities such as the OIN, in part this is due to the expansion of economic opportunities and the resources gained by such ventures. New economic parameters have revealed or resulted in fissures among groups in conflict over issues of change and modernity, groups that are often termed “traditional” and “progressive” or “traditionalist” and “modernist.” Offering an ethnographic study of a contemporary Native American community, this article demonstrates that insofar as Ray Halbritter was selected by clan mothers, he began as a community leader with traditional support, but that today there are two predominant community factions: the first is largely made up of traditional people who no longer support Halbritter, while the second is made up of pro-casino people who do support him.

The abovementioned labels do not, however, apply neatly to both groups. Whereas the traditional or traditionalist label fits the first faction, the progressive or modernist label does not wholly apply to the second because these group members do not completely reject traditional beliefs and practices. Members of the latter group do not accept and follow all traditional dictates but rather pick and choose to find those they deem most beneficial to furthering their political, if not cultural, goals. This cannot be considered an example of the “invention of tradition” as explored by Hobsbawm or of “neotraditionalism” as discussed by Prins because the traditions selected from are not new or introduced from outside the Haudenosaunee world. I will refer to members of this second group as, somewhat inelegantly, “strategic-traditionalists.”<sup>3</sup>

This study explores how, to further their own goals, contemporary Oneida people of various political persuasions use traditional beliefs and practices that are prescribed and enshrined in the Haudenosaunee oral tradition. These include relevant segments of Oneida oral history regarding the proscription to rule by consensus as well as the use of banishment as a means of social control. This essay examines Haudenosaunee oral history to reveal philosophical tenets that prescribe the form that consensus must take in the Oneida world as well as to demonstrate the appropriateness of banishment as a means of social control. An Oneida consultant has defined banishment as *atolyaht*, “to drive one away,” commenting “I’m not sure of the term banishment per se; however Ray Halbritter uses the ‘lose your voice’ [punishment].”<sup>4</sup> Traditionally, banishment had been used to remove undesirable people from the community, and the Oneida tribal government faction presently in power uses it today for the same purpose.<sup>5</sup>

Recounting the historical circumstances that led up to contemporary events in which Oneida citizens have been banished from the nation's territory matters.<sup>6</sup> More specifically, this essay examines Haudenosaunee oral history to reveal philosophical tenets that prescribe the form that consensus must take in the Oneida world as well as to demonstrate the appropriateness of banishment as a means of social control. In an overall context of "loss of place" that commences the Haudenosaunee creation story and Sky Woman's loss of her home in the Skyworld, in using banishment as a means of social control Ray Halbritter has been closely following oral tradition, as will be detailed below.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the story of Sky Woman's twin grandsons establishes the precedent that the primordial state of the Haudenosaunee universe is not characterized by harmony, but instead by a constant tension: that of opponents or factions forever linked in contention.

## TRADITIONS: HISTORIC AND MODERN

What is a tradition? How old does it have to be in order to be considered a long-lived pattern or event? What is invented tradition? How does the Oneida Indian Nation under the leadership of Ray Halbritter fit into this construct? What is "strategic traditionalism"? Briefly, for the purposes of this example, it is the prerogative of cultural bodies to determine the forms and uses of tradition in resonant frames to make connections and therefore legitimate a political regime as a valid governing entity. In this framework, tradition is political: it has currency in political situations and contexts; it is politics in relation to tradition. Since tradition possesses great historic depth, how does tradition connect to cultural and personal memory? In other words, how is tradition a form of cultural transmission? For Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger in *The Invention of Tradition*, invented traditions are ritual or symbolic in nature. Traditions of long-lasting practice must be in a process of continual reinvention—such as those the Halbritter government selected for use as a means of authenticity that connects them to the past and tradition.

This then leads to the question of whether Halbritter's national vision for the OIN is an attempt at decolonization by being able to claim tradition as a linchpin, or a shadow of neocolonization that incorporates Western conditions that have been adapted to the quality of tribal governance in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. By reinventing and reinvesting tradition, does Halbritter cast the OIN as a new form of traditional government or as an old form of sovereignty with modern bounds? Is it a response to globalization as a contemporary Native people and community move forward in time? Is this localized context of tribal tradition a mix of conservative and modernist

ingredients? James Clifford considers the frames in which such tribal government developments take place, where “Practices of cultural/political/struggle mediate differences of region, generation, gender, urban/rural location, and strategy. What is at stake is the power to define tradition and authenticity, to determine the relationships through which native identity is negotiated in a changing world.”<sup>8</sup>

To the outsider/observer/analyst of these internal tribal machinations these may appear as rituals or practices. To the insiders of the tribal community, they are the experiential rules of the nation. As tribal nations strive to maintain their uniqueness via history, they are also peoples and communities that must mediate and negotiate their current socio-locations in relation to modernity and its associated factors which include forms of tribal sovereignty. “To identify something as a tradition, or traditional, is to assert and in some instances to establish that link and to embed a specific present in an equally specific . . . past.”<sup>9</sup> Some forms of tribal politics involve a conception of public authority that is a matter of control through domination and imposition derivative of bureaucratic hierarchical systems of government. These forms of tribal governments are reflective of larger nations. As such, “States have long justified their existence and consequent power over their members by claiming temporal and . . . territorial continuities.” Is this OIN form of contemporary government a mode of cultural production? This is not a neotradition, an adopted practice that becomes contained within the tribal cultural bounds. Such stakeholders make claims of cultural modes of tradition in which “The invocation of tradition prescribes standards for behavior and establishes the borders of permissibility against rival claimants.”<sup>10</sup> By claiming these positions as a matter of state, current regimes of tribal governments take up interior positions and thus other claimants become outsiders in this politics of location and authenticity.

Is this form of government already a route to the modern via tradition of Native communities? Here, Clifford’s example of Natives and nativism that use established highways though culture and time and place as a form of indigenous articulation of them in these contexts helps to locate these tribal developments in governance.<sup>11</sup> Is it an example of people being comfortable in more than two places of space, place, and time? Is it an example of the diversity of Native people, cultures, and government without having to be justified or criticized by internal and external critics? This idea of a hybridized government that I have defined as one form of modern tribal government is due to porosity of boundaries and cultural exchanges and experiences; these are examples of transnational dynamics on highly localized tribally bounded geographies. Clifford comments that in articulation theory, the “whole question of authenticity is secondary, and the process of social and cultural persistence

is political all the way back. It is assumed that cultural forms will always be made, unmade and remade. Communities can and must reconfigure themselves, drawing selectively on remembered pasts.”<sup>12</sup>

With these fluid processes and mechanisms of the developments in tribal governance in mind, the scope of this article is itself hybrid: in part an examination of the florescence of tribal expansion and political power, the other part is a commentary on the processes at work in contemporary tribal governments in relative terms of “tradition” and “modernity.” The ways that these tribal nation governments work reflect the directions of those regimes in power, who are no less tribal people as well, regardless of how their business is accomplished in these modern times. To criticize tribal nations for how they are run by whom-ever is in leadership roles is to cut short the variety of tribal Native governance irrespective of labeling them “traditional” or “progressive.” The fact remains is that they are Native people and to cast a questioning eye upon them is, in a way, to insult the particular tribal nation. This limited perspective of modern tribal governments, by considering them only as “traditional” or “progressive” or “hybrid,” is in one form reflective of the *ethnographic present* by denying the factors of time and circumstance on these evolving tribal structures and of how each Native community responds to those influences and pressures presented by modernity as each tribe meets these concerns on a daily basis.

## CULTURAL CONFLICT AND SOCIAL CONTROL AT ONEIDA NATION

In 1995, after the Oneida Nation had been operating a gaming operation for nearly a decade—bingo since 1987 and casino gambling since 1993—a call arose for transparency and disclosure of the details regarding the use and distribution of gaming profits from across the Oneida Nation. Haudenosaunee traditionally lead by what they refer to as consensus. A confidential consultant has noted that the term for consensus, *atyanuni*, means “we all agree,” which is a much more apt description of the governing policy of “being of one mind” in making Haudenosaunee policy and decisions.<sup>13</sup> After much discussion, decisions of the people concerning the choice of leaders must be unanimous. Those selected to leadership roles are believed to possess both political and spiritual integrity.

Although Grand Council sachems or chiefs are chosen for life, they may be removed if they commit crimes or if they act against the will of the people.<sup>14</sup> In 1975 Ray Halbritter was selected as an OIN tribal representative, together with Lyman Johns and Richard Chrisjohn, by OIN women, including his clan matron and maternal aunt, the late Maisie Shenandoah. This, however, did not mean that he and the other men became grand council chiefs, but

rather that he had become a handpicked tribal representative. He was the youngest of the three men selected. Since then, Johns and Chrisjohn have passed on, leaving Halbritter as the only representative of the 1,000-member nation.<sup>15</sup> Halbritter and the other men were not “condoled” into these positions as full-status Pine Tree chiefs of the Haudenosaunee Grand Council, which would have given them legitimacy in the eyes of the traditional form of Haudenosaunee governance. Rather, Halbritter won federal recognition for his traditional government in July 1987.<sup>16</sup> By 1993, he had been left in a position to become the singular tribal representative of OIN, leaving him to fashion a tribal government modeled on his goals of making the Oneida people of the 32-acre territory a modern self-sufficient people and tribal nation, independent and sovereign in their own affairs.

In the reconfiguration of the tribal representative mechanisms, Halbritter formed what he referred to as a Men’s Council to assist in the administrative operations of OIN. Originally constituted as the Oneida Business Council, this group was remade into a governmental position, assisting the office of the tribal representative.<sup>17</sup> The men in these positions are also representatives of the clans of the Oneida Nation, coming from the Turtle, Bear, and Wolf clans respectively. One criticism of the Men’s Council is that they serve in a rubber stamp capacity while Halbritter directs the affairs of the OIN.

The Men’s Council is also publicly supported by a Women’s Council. These women serve in Oneida government in roles similar to traditional Haudenosaunee governance by nominating men for leadership positions on the Men’s Council. Some of these women are also clan mothers, and thus in one aspect reflective of the traditional form of Haudenosaunee government. A criticism of this particular OIN body is that the Women’s Council has no real traditional power or role, that they were merely founded as mimicry of the real matrilineal women’s power in Haudenosaunee government, and that they too act to rubber stamp Halbritter’s agenda.

A contention that surfaced almost immediately during the establishment of Halbritter’s government was over the use of consensus or *atyanuni*. Believing that gaming was the direction to go, with or without the general agreement of the Oneida Nation citizens, Halbritter went ahead with plans for the Turning Stone Resort and Casino. His critics point out that Mr. Halbritter’s dominance violates the primary principle of the nation’s traditional government: that is, to rule through consensus by its members.<sup>18</sup> Failing to use the practice of consensus, Halbritter made inappropriate claims to the legitimacy of his office and role within the tribal leadership structure. His critics contend that there was no input by the Oneida public to advise Halbritter on the direction in which to lead tribal economic development, and that there was no input on his claim to leadership. This perceived breach called the legitimacy

of his leadership into question then and continues to fuel arguments against his tenure as tribal representative and CEO to this day. These multivocal contentions are evidence of the inherent tensions of tribal government where such voices exemplify the kinetic nature of debate in the Haudenosaunee governmental process.

Soon after the original casino was opened, a faction of Oneida people, led by the traditionalists, complained that Halbritter had made decisions without consulting his people and kept them in the dark about plans for the casino.<sup>19</sup> Anti-casino Oneidas have challenged Halbritter's authority. They claim he no longer represents the majority of the Oneidas. Days after the original casino opened, several anti-casino Oneidas filed suit against Halbritter, "challenging the legality of the games and Halbritter's authority to run them."<sup>20</sup>

Oneida traditionalists acknowledge that they are opposed to gambling, but emphasize that the central issues of concern to them are financial accountability and respect for the consensus tradition of leadership format.<sup>21</sup> "Nearly every major decision made by the Oneidas is tinged from the Oneida Nation's past, a heritage that the Oneidas take great pains to preserve."<sup>22</sup> For example, they point out that one OIN government policy, the Men's Council's health and safety ordinance, a policy enacted to beautify the reservation community and to ensure the safety of tribal members' housing standards, passed in 1995, did not come before the general population for approval.<sup>23</sup> The ordinance resulted in what is known as the March for Democracy. Participating groups including the traditional Oneida faction, supporters from the American Indian Movement, other traditional Haudenosaunee nations, and the Black Panther Party formed a coalition that organized the march. This sought to give media coverage to the contentions of intra-tribal politics at the Oneida Nation.<sup>24</sup>

## PLACING CONSENSUS AND BANISHMENT IN CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

This section of oral history offers insight into the true nature of what is referred to as consensus in the Haudenosaunee world. Based on the story of the Good Twin and Evil Twin, consensus for the Haudenosaunee does certainly not imply harmony or unanimous agreement. Rather, we must look to the relationship of those brothers for insight into the primordial nature of the Haudenosaunee universe.

Prior to the formation or creation of Great Turtle Island, the earth was a place of darkness or night, covered with water. In this realm there was no human life; it was inhabited by water creatures such as fish, animals such as beaver, otter, and muskrat, and birds such as geese, ducks, and swans.<sup>25</sup> Human life was brought into this place by a deity called Sky Woman; she is so named



because she is from the Skyworld, the world above this one, or from “Above, in the center of the Blue.”<sup>26</sup> In all versions of this portion of the story, she came into this world after falling through a hole created by the uprooting of a giant tree located at the center of the Skyworld, generally understood to be a sacred tree. Harriet Maxwell Converse recorded a version of the story in which Sky Woman was sent on from the Skyworld to bring the gift of life to the “great cloud sea which calls for our help” below.<sup>27</sup> Another collected version tells of Sky Woman’s cravings for “strange delicacies” due to her pregnancy and that she sends her husband to collect the foods of her desires. He digs up roots from the Great Tree at the center of the Skyworld. In this version, either Sky Woman falls through the hole created by uprooting the sacred tree, or, fed up with the constant demands of her tastes, the frustrated husband pushes Sky Woman into the hole.<sup>28</sup> The creatures in the dark water world note her entry, for she introduces light, literally falling or sliding along a beam of light.<sup>29</sup> The birds see that she is a living thing and try to catch her and hold her on their wings, but she is much too heavy for them.<sup>30</sup> She is finally set down on a turtle’s back, upon which she later receives some mud. With this mud she dances the earth into existence, creating Great Turtle Island.<sup>31</sup>

In the version of the story given by Axtell and Hertzberg, it is Sky Woman’s desire for bark from the roots of the tree, which “was not supposed to be marked or mutilated,” that sets events in motion. In touching, eating, or wanting root bark from the sacred tree, she desires banned substances. This sets her outside of the acceptable behaviors of society and also allows her to be physically placed there as well: she is banished, set apart from the Skyworld and sent to the water world below. I contend this event in the story represents banishment because it is in line with the idea of loss as the result of behaviors that are considered to be socially unacceptable, or, in the example of the Oneida Nation, politically acceptable actions that are contrary to societal values. In the story retold by Axtell and Hertzberg, the tree, like the tribal government in place at Oneida, was not to be disturbed or mutilated in any fashion; Skywoman’s digging at the roots of the tree is similar to the opposing factions’ digging at the roots of the presumed stability of the current Oneida Indian Nation government. Symbolic examples from spoken histories can be brought from the past into the present to aid with issues of modernity that arise for Native peoples. The iconographic, resonant imagery associated with these past examples serve as ways to contemplate moving forward as a people while remaining grounded in these spoken ideals.

By her actions, Sky Woman creates the earth, and in Haudenosaunee tradition, connects women and the earth, linking them as providers and sustainers of life, caretakers of the land and procreators of existence in the world. Sky Woman is also responsible for the introduction of the next generation of

human life in the newly created world, for she was pregnant when she arrived into the world below. She gives birth to a daughter and this act connects future generations of human beings to the earth as their place of existence.<sup>32</sup> As the daughter of Sky Woman, Gusts of Wind, grows into womanhood, she becomes ready to provide for the next generation in a central event that provides the remaining story. She is seduced by the West Wind, who puts her in a trance.<sup>33</sup> After she wakes, she finds two arrows lain across her stomach. One arrow is a plain shaft of wood, while the other arrow is tipped by a point made of flint.<sup>34</sup>

This sets the stage for the next generation of beings born into the world, twin boys.<sup>35</sup> The twins are now the central characters in the story, regarded as the driving forces for the rest of creation upon the earth. Just before their birth, the two infants argue over how to be born into the world. One twin is born the natural way from the womb, out through the birth canal. The first-born twin is right-handed dominant and is called as such in Haudenosaunee tradition, as well as called the Good Mind, and Maple Sapling. The second-born twin, the opposite of the first, is left-handed dominant, and is called by this name, as well as Evil Twin, Ice Skin, or Flint.<sup>36</sup> This second twin wants to find its own way out of the mother's body.<sup>37</sup> He has a ridge of flint atop his head and he uses this flint to cut himself out of Gusts of Wind's side.<sup>38</sup> His mother bleeds to death from the wound, and the twin boys and their grandmother, Sky Woman, are then the only human beings on earth. Through the second-born twin's act of matricide, death is introduced into the world.<sup>39</sup>

Haudenosaunee cosmology views each twin as necessary, the poles between which the tensions of creation are stretched. The twins are each a creative force in the world in a binary of perpetual tension.<sup>40</sup> In the universe they represent the forces of good and evil, light and dark, day and night, and positive and negative.<sup>41</sup> Throughout their maturation, Right-Handed Twin and Left-Handed Twin are in continual conflict and competition with one another.<sup>42</sup> When Right-Handed Twin creates rivers, the deer, roses, and people, the jealousy and envy of Left-Handed Twin compels him to create rapids and whirlpools, the cougar, thorns, and monsters with his creative efforts.<sup>43</sup> Throughout a series of tests, probing each other's weaknesses, the contests always seem to end with no clear winner or resolution in the outcomes of these events. One contest is a lacrosse game, the first such contest of this traditional Haudenosaunee game in this world. Another is the Sacred Dish or Bowl Game in which peach stones are colored light and dark, the pieces are tossed within the dish then tallied to count the number of light or dark sides facing upwards.<sup>44</sup>

Finally, the contests come to an end when the twins enter into each other's minds while they are sleeping. Each lets the other know what item can harm him.<sup>45</sup> But because Right-Handed Twin knows ahead of time that

this would occur he hides his weakness from his brother, deceiving him. The two then meet to battle for control of the earth, each armed with the items they said would cause injury to the other. Unaware that Right-Handed Twin has deceived him, Left-Handed Twin holds a handful of grass rushes that he thinks will inflict injury upon his brother. Knowing that Left-Handed Twin told the truth about the object that can harm him, Right-Handed Twin carries a deer antler. During the battle, he injures his brother with the deer antler, knocking flint chunks of skin from Left-Handed Twin's body, while of course the rushes have no effect. Finally, Right-Handed Twin subdues his brother.<sup>46</sup>

At the conclusion of the battle for the earth, Right-Handed Twin controls Left-Handed Twin's fate, for having lost the contest, he must abide by his brother's punishment.<sup>47</sup> Yet he is not destroyed by his brother, for that action would also destroy the Right-Handed Twin, and the whole of creation. Each brother's existence is intertwined with the other, as their relationship represents what in English might be termed balance in the universe. As the result of this final confrontation, Right-Handed Twin wins the light, or the day, and Left-Handed Twin must relinquish his desire for the day and for the light. Left-Handed Twin is banished to the Great Rim of the World, or to the Underworld, and must now dwell at the edge of creation and light.<sup>48</sup> Through banishment, the Right-Handed Twin is able to gain control of Creation. However, while Right-Handed Twin is able to keep his brother subdued during the daytime, Left-Handed Twin retains control of the night, of the dark, and of negative forces.

Right-Handed Twin's action foregrounds the use of banishment as a form of social control, one that has had currency throughout Haudenosaunee history. The Haudenosaunee creation story provides the context for many practices and values used in the contemporary life of this people. These stories tell us that the order of the world was based not only on the tension of opposites, but on the tension of combatants. Thus, these stories make it clear what type of social order is deemed ideal for Haudenosaunee societies. This can be translated into the contemporary world as social order being maintained by the checks-and-balance inherent in discourse over important issues by members of opposing factions, like those that exist today at the Oneida Indian Nation.<sup>49</sup>

## BANISHMENT AND OSTRACISM IN THE CONTEMPORARY ONEIDA WORLD

In February 1995 seven Oneidas met with other Haudenosaunee people to discuss tribal grievances. Halbritter took exception to the Oneida protesters meeting with Mohawks, Senecas, and Onondagas. He declared such actions

“treasonous” and a threat to the stability of the Oneida government.<sup>50</sup> The OIN government responded by accusing thirty Oneida protesters of treason. The OIN felt it was justified in removing these people from the tribal roll.<sup>51</sup> In the view of Halbritter and members of the Men’s Council, because Maisie Shenandoah and her followers were considered to have committed acts of treason against the OIN government, they “lost their voices,” meaning the ability to be heard in the Nation’s events, meetings, and buildings. The protesters became *personae non gratae* in the view of Halbritter and the OIN government, and were banned from attending tribal gatherings and functions on the territory, barred from tribal buildings and properties, disenrolled from the OIN, and even had their citizenship in the Oneida Nation revoked.

Another method of silencing the dissidents was orchestrated through the loss of place: a loss of residency on tribal land through eviction.<sup>52</sup> They were also deemed ineligible for national benefits, such as disbursement checks, with the exception of federally funded health care. When challenged by individuals from within the Oneida Nation, Halbritter and the Men’s Council responded by taking away the jobs of those who raised complaints, withholding their profit-sharing checks, and barring them from participation in tribal government. To Halbritter, these people posed a direct threat to the OIN’s stability.<sup>53</sup> The estimated number of Oneidas who lost their voices varies. For example, some reports have a high limit of three dozen, while a following report from the same year considers twenty to be the correct number of Oneidas who fall into this category, which is the Oneida equivalent of stripping away nation citizenship and benefits.<sup>54</sup>

The traditionalist faction quickly grew to resent the increasing influence Halbritter took over their lives on the traditional 32-acre territory. For example, Halbritter had his staff draft new policies governing housing standards in order to evict people from their homes and residences on the territory. People were not, however, simply facing possible eviction from their homes. The new ordinances called for these properties to be razed if a tribal inspection found the residence uninhabitable. From Halbritter’s perspective, the OIN was exercising its state powers by making policy for the Oneida Nation and its citizens. The tribal government felt that it was acting within its prerogatives by legislating and enacting policies that were to the overall benefit of the Oneida people. As a sovereign entity, the OIN was acting to beautify and improve the community, and it regarded this action as within the bounds of its perceived authority.

The opposition, the traditionalist-led group, began to organize efforts aimed at stopping the potential evictions and the razing of homes. Many in these groups are personal relatives of Tribal Representative Ray Halbritter, including his late maternal aunt Maisie Shenandoah and her children, Halbritter’s first

cousins.<sup>55</sup> Several of the properties slated for inspection and possible demolition included the homes of some of his close relatives. Resistance came from a multi-interest coalition that included members of the traditionalist faction who opposed the governing office of Halbritter; individuals throughout the Haudenosaunee Confederacy supporting the potential evictees; observers from the Christian Peacemaker Teams; the Quakers; the Black Panthers; and AIM chapters.<sup>56</sup> These groups supported the Oneida citizens in stopping the demolitions of these homes.

From the 1995 March for Democracy event, thirty-five Oneida people were found to be in conflict as judged by the Oneida Nation government. In 2000, seventeen of the thirty-five Oneidas originally cited as treasonous by the Men's Council for taking part in the March for Democracy each had their voice or tribal status reinstated by the council. In order to have their voices restored and to be heard once again, those who complied with the conditions of reinstatement swore an oath of allegiance to Halbritter and the OIN government.

In April of the same year, the Oneida Nation Men's Council developed the plan to demolish unsafe housing on the 32-acre territory. According to Dick Lynch of the Men's Council, "since 1991, the nation has built roads, a water system, sewers, streetlights, sidewalks and landscaping on the territory. The nation has also built a health center there," and "the program should not be considered eviction."<sup>57</sup> OIN officials say the housing ordinance is designed to keep residents safe by repairing or demolishing substandard housing.<sup>58</sup> As a result, many residents who oppose Halbritter found themselves being evicted from lands on which they had thought they could reside forever. While the Oneida Nation called this a beautification project for the community, and a similar program had been implemented in regard to abandoned cars on community lands in 1998, some residents felt that the policy was created in order to get rid of them as political rivals.

The ordinances were to be used to conduct yearly housing inspections to determine if housing meets Oneida Nation health and safety standards. People were originally told that if the housing failed, the resident could make the required changes and get another inspection. However, if the home were substandard, it would be condemned and demolished. The OIN claims to have set aside \$600,000 to aid residents in relocating or renting other housing for up to six months. The OIN expected to have its citizens in safe housing after inspections are validated. The housing inspections represent another phase of the OIN's plans to rebuild its territory.<sup>59</sup>

For some Oneida Nation residents, particularly those that have opposed the leadership of Halbritter and the Men's Council, the process of housing inspections equaled eviction from their homes as well as demolition of their

homes without compensation.<sup>60</sup> With this in mind, some residents refused to let tribal housing inspectors into their homes. One journalist reports that, “The nation gives members \$50,000 toward new houses, but those evicted on Territory Road won’t get any money. Their membership benefits were stripped after they spoke out against Halbritter’s leadership several years ago.” One such notice of eviction was given to Halbritter’s first cousin, Danielle Shenandoah Patterson, one of the late Maisie Shenandoah’s children, causing more tension in this family’s fracturing. She refused to comply and eventually ended up in a physical altercation with tribal police over the matter. Since that time, as the result of this incident, in order to reduce the charges brought and drop criminal charges, she has agreed to the demolition and her home has been torn down. Eviction orders issued in the past say that the families must leave immediately, and their homes are to be demolished.<sup>61</sup>

In 2000, twenty Oneida Nation citizens filed a lawsuit in Oneida Nation tribal court, claiming Halbritter wrongly suppressed their free speech, banished them from the nation’s events and properties, and threatened to remove them from their homes on OIN’s 32-acre territory.<sup>62</sup> These remaining individuals who had their voices socially silenced refused to go before the Men’s Council because they believed they would have to swear allegiance to Halbritter and his government.<sup>63</sup>

In a 2004 court case hearing the concerns of Oneida Nation residents who believe they have been singled out for Oneida Nation evictions because of their public opposition to Halbritter and the Men’s Council, a federal appeals judge in 2004 ruled that the evictions “don’t rise to the level of a ‘bill of attainder,’ defined as a law that inflicts punishment upon a certain person without trial.” The federal appeals court found that “the terms of the ordinance apply to all residents of the territory at issue, and cannot be said to single out individuals,” the judges wrote in their decision.<sup>64</sup>

As noted, the current Oneida nation-state has been undergirded by an expansion of its state power and authority due to the proceeds garnered from modern economic endeavors such as the Turning Stone Resort and Casino. In this context of tribal state development the contemporary applications of historic forms of social control have become reactivated. The forms of social control recognized and defined as banishment are part of the Oneida Nation’s prerogative in establishing a new tribal national identity. In the past, the forms of social control mentioned here were used to remove undesirable people and behaviors from within the ranks of the Haudenosaunee nations. By bringing these forms into the contemporary scene, the modern tribal nation-state, while redefining itself in terms of modernity, is reverting in one context to traditional forms of process.

## THE TRADITIONALISTS PUSH BACK

As can be expected in these circumstances, there have been attempts on the part of traditionalists to oust Ray Halbritter from his positions as tribal representative and CEO of the OIN. Pointing out that he was never condoled by traditional Haudenosaunee processes, the traditionalists question the legitimacy of federal recognition of Halbritter's leadership position, given the lack of its recognition by the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. They maintain that his claims usurped this traditional mechanism for establishing a peaceful process for the transition of leadership in Haudenosaunee society, one that maintains the integrity of power and the merit of one viewed as a potential public leader.

The most serious effort to remove him from office was initiated by Maisie Shenandoah. As a clan mother of the Wolf clan, Shenandoah held the authority to choose a male representative for the clan. Her authority was vested in a centuries-old process that validated the men chosen for such a responsibility. One of the duties of a man selected through this process is to serve the interests of the people, and his tenure is ensured by his ability to make a consensus of the diverse issues being discussed around any particular topic of concern to the collective group. He has the responsibility of being a steward of the interests of his clan, nation, and Confederacy, as determined by his clan mother leadership. If he fails to do so, his sponsor is obligated to provide him with three warnings about his conduct, the third warning being his final one. Maisie Shenandoah did just that, saying "all he cares about is money" and ordering Halbritter to relinquish his responsibilities.<sup>65</sup> Failing to heed a sponsor means the end of one's time as a public servant in Haudenosaunee governance.

Shenandoah let her decision as to the status of Halbritter's position become known within the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, and sought out the rest of the traditional Haudenosaunee Confederacy governments to validate her decision. As well, she made her decision known to the BIA, which had previously established Halbritter as the federally recognized leader of the OIN. On April 25, 1993, the Grand Council of the Iroquois revoked Halbritter's council seat. In addition, they asked the federal government to respect their decision and revoke Halbritter's federal recognition.<sup>66</sup> When Ray Halbritter was completing negotiations with the state on the casino compact, Onondaga chiefs tried to replace him. Grand Council Tadodaho Leon Shenandoah tried to persuade Ada Deer of the BIA to withdraw recognition of Halbritter from his position as tribal representative.<sup>67</sup>

As clan mother and matrilineal aunt of Halbritter, Shenandoah's public actions in giving Halbritter his three warnings before declaring him removed, or "de-horned," was well within her scope of authority and responsibility.<sup>68</sup> By enacting this traditional form of censure or social control of a chief, Shenandoah

tried to publicly shame Halbritter into compliance. Here shaming is used to mean verbal assaults and accusations that cause individuals to feel humiliated, disgraced, and held in disrepute by others: a form of social control. Shaming is supposed to elicit regret and is designed to censure its targets, causing them to feel guilt and a sense of impropriety concerning their behavior and standing in a community.<sup>69</sup> In Haudenosaunee governance this is an expression of transference of leadership that traditionally leads to removing the offending chief from office and sanctioning another man to replace him.

Halbritter paid no heed to Shenandoah's decision, claiming that she did not have the authority to relieve him of his duties because she was not a legitimate clan mother who had been selected as head of the extended matrilineal family in due process by the women of her clan, but a "temporary" clan mother. "She's not my clan mother," he said. "She's not a full clan mother. She is a clan mother on a temporary basis."<sup>70</sup> He thereby refused to leave his appointed office by way of the directive of the recognized traditional leadership of the Oneida Nation, and chose instead to remain in power via the federal recognition of the BIA. This usurped the process of Haudenosaunee practice and further widened the schism between "traditional" and "strategic-traditionalist" factions in this community. Halbritter and the Men's Council members said Shenandoah was no longer a clan mother because she stopped attending their meetings. They said she held no valid meetings to oust him. And they said the Oneida people, not the Haudenosaunee chiefs, decide who will lead the OIN.<sup>71</sup>

At first, it appeared that the voice of tradition was heard by the federal interest, the BIA, supporting the claims of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. One day later, however, Ada Deer reinstated Halbritter as the leader of the OIN in August of 1993. Halbritter's victory dealt a serious blow to the Iroquois Grand Council.<sup>72</sup> From this point forward Halbritter began to remake the Oneida Nation into the hybrid body of traditional and contemporary tribal government that it is today. In Halbritter's opinion, the representatives still function and are chosen within a context of Iroquoian government; it is merely that the Oneidas choose not to call such people "chiefs" or "sachems" out of respect for those members who are traditionally condoled representatives. Halbritter remarked that it is not titles that serve people; it is the people in such positions that act in the interests of the Oneida people and for the seventh generation.<sup>73</sup>

## THE MODERN MEANING OF TRADITIONAL BANISHMENT

The internally generated loss of tribal members has a long history in the Confederacy. Historically, the Tadodaho, in the position of the voice of the



Haudenosaunee Confederacy, had the authority to “banish those who refused to obey the laws of their nations.”<sup>74</sup> Antisocial behavior such as murder and rape could be decided by community leadership and the convicted could be sent outside of the bounds of the Longhouse.<sup>75</sup> The judged would be beyond the shade of the Great Tree as an individual alone in the world, an outsider, losing the benefit of protection of the tribal entity. This loss of protection by the tribal entity also meant loss of tribal membership. For morally and socially abhorrent acts, a pronouncement of judgment usually carried an implied death sentence. Once outside of the pall of protection of the nation and its boundaries, the perpetrator realized that he or she might potentially have to forfeit his or her life as a result.

As employed by the OIN the modern use of banishment entails the accused individual losing the tribal benefits of citizenship and, in many cases, legal status in the community. This loss of status is tied to the loss of voice and hence loss of access to the community, tribal membership/enrollment, and access to facilities and services. Such changes can also result in the loss of personal property. These would be extreme forms of social proscription that are used judiciously, depending on circumstances. The tribal government’s right to determine the status of its citizenry, or, in this instance, the loss of people from its community is a function of power— one that subtracts from an already limited number of Oneida citizens. Such actions can have devastating consequences for this small tribal population, not only in immediate terms, because disenrollment of individuals from the tribal register reduces the size of the tribe, but also in the long run, because the only means of population increase are biological reproduction and adoption. In the context of the use of oral tradition, banishment is a part of the traditions of the Haudenosaunee, used judiciously and applied within the Confederacy. However, in the current context of tribal factionalism amid economic development, contemporary banishment as “loss of voice” has been politicized and thus has shifted from being a traditional form of social control to becoming an instrument of authority and political dominance.

## ANALYSIS

Regarding the use of oral tradition in terms of the justification of tribal government forms to be self-aware, the OIN under the leadership of Ray Halbritter seeks to make and strengthen a connection to its cultural past as it moves forward in modernity. The seemingly conscious invocation of symbolic iconography stresses the importance of legitimacy sought by Halbritter and his supporters for their endeavors. The traditional meanings of such iconography

are stretched over the frame of the contemporary corporate-styled OIN government. Connections are constructed between the traditional past and the modern business-oriented government in order to bind the two together, reflecting contemporary tribal circumstances. As tribal nations invested in a global enterprise such as casino gaming are a part of modern tribal development, the highly localized cultural iconography reestablishes the tribal nation as traditional and modern at the same time.

In considering this construction of a hybrid traditional and modern tribal culture, the example of the OIN serves to locate the use of the term of “strategic-traditional” as it consciously blends tradition and contemporary elements and as it is envisioned by Tribal Representative Ray Halbritter.<sup>76</sup> In constructing this hybrid form of government, Halbritter’s administration has selected elements of historic importance as well as modernity to make this an effective vehicle of tribal cultural renaissance. As one aspect of the strategic-traditional, tradition appears in the use of cultural elements such as historical banishment, as in the stories of Sky Woman and the Twins. Since contemporary banishment practices can be linked to traditional values, the OIN is operating in the interests of the seventh generation. The “strategic” appears in the modern hierarchical structure of tribal government and the adoption of an economic format reflective of a capitalist system in which resources generated by a commercial enterprise have come to dominate internal and external tribal relations.

In anthropological terms, it is understood that cultures are not static, but constantly in flux and transition. The forms of some modern tribal governments, such as the Oneida Indian Nation, evidence such dynamism. In traditional forms of Haudenosaunee tribal governments, clan mothers select and nominate men to serve in public leadership roles. In this system women are the core holders of power, with that of men being subject to their performance in their roles as Grand Council chiefs and their ability to negotiate and mediate the issues confronting the Confederacy. However, some Haudenosaunee nations have other forms of government that do not include a clan mother council of chiefs, although they follow traditional forms of matrilineal descent as a means of constructing and grounding clan identity and membership.

The invented new traditions of the OIN under Halbritter include the preeminence of a Men’s Council that supports his leadership. This Men’s Council superseded a created Women’s Council that was to fulfill the position of clan mothers in parallel fashion to traditional Haudenosaunee government. The corporate structure of the OIN government has the tribal representative located in a singular position at the top of a hierarchical structure of government. Below this level of leadership is the Men’s Council. Below that level is

the Women's Council. In this tiered hierarchy, leadership directs the policies of the tribal government while having an insulated political distance from its citizens. It is through these mechanisms that banishment and other historic traditions of social control such as ostracization are brought into the present and connected to Oneida Nation tribal government and then enacted upon by the OIN.

## CONCLUSION

As this case study exploration of the OIN reveals, historic cultural traditions such as consensus and banishment remain vital tools for use in Haudenosaunee society. Although those in opposition to Ray Halbritter as leader of the Oneida people fault him for not using traditional means of governing, this analysis demonstrates that indeed he is using one of the most traditional means of social control—banishment. Taking this fact into consideration makes it clear that the current tribal government of OIN is actually a blend of traditional and contemporary forms of governance. Social controls such as those discussed herein serve as devices to teach social norms and the proper conduct of interpersonal relationships. As traditional forms of social control, banishment is a socially constructed means to evaluate people's interactions with one another. In this regard, Haudenosaunee proscriptions of such behavior can include a loss of social and personal standing in the community, even to the point of losing the rights of citizenship. These historic contexts have influenced the contemporary behaviors of modern-day Haudenosaunee societies through the contemporary use of this social control.

A traditional form of social control such as banishment has been reconstituted in the present by OIN leadership. Though there is a limited potential for the forfeiture of one's life after being so judged by the tribal entity, the banished or disenrolled tribal member is now expatriated from tribal holdings and territory. This dislocation of the individual from community and space/place now situates the individual outside of the tribal citizenry and claims of legitimacy in terms of tribal status. The social status of disenrollment, however, is not a permanent condition. Such a status had been rendered by the tribal state as an expression of its authority and power in regard to its citizens. As such, this state of nonexistence can be remedied by an acceptance of the new tribal state authority.

The OIN government has great control over the OIN people as its citizenry. The impact of a small political faction and the power it wields over the larger Oneida people is large in relation to the size and number of the Oneida tribal community at the 32-acre territory. The contentions over the legitimacy

of leadership and how this cadre has kept and strengthened their position is at the center of these debates. The selective use of resonant traditional contexts of culture by this political faction aims to show its validity in terms of legitimate authoritative leadership. Under the leadership of Tribal Representative Ray Halbritter, the OIN government has used tradition and traditional contexts to connect the past to the present and create the foundation of a modern tribal government that has expanded beyond its 32-acre land base to become a much larger figure of regional and national scope while securing its base of power through economic expansion and enterprise. This particular form of modern tribal government is a hybrid in that it seeks to act as a much larger nation-state in terms of using its economic power to make itself visible and legitimate in western political terms as it seeks to claim a tradition whose pedigree is more than a millennium old.

If we evaluate a relationship between tradition and modernity and how they both affect tribal and indigenous peoples against this long-term temporal yardstick, clearly Native casino gaming is at best two- to three-generations old, a comparatively short time when compared to the age of some tribal systems. Casino chips and bingo daubers will take their places along side red pipe-stone, beaver pelts, quahog shell beads, and Great Lakes ornamental copper. Something new will come along. It always does as societies, civilizations, and modernity move forward. Modern casino-style gaming and the recent developments in the governing structures of tribal nations is merely a blip on that time scale of tribal longevity.

## NOTES

1. Robert L. Smith, "Oneida Faction Asks Feds to Close Casino on Opening Day: the Games Are Proceeding before the Federal Government Has Completed its Review, the Opponents Say," *The Post-Standard*, Syracuse, NY, July 21, 1993, Metro Edition, A6; James Dao, "Once Destitute, Oneida Tribe Braces for Flood of Gambling," *The New York Times*, July 18 (1993) Late Edition-Final, Section 1, 27.

2. Joel Dossi, "Face of the Nation: Oneida Leader Ray Halbritter Keeps Taking Care of Business," *Syracuse New Times*, March 7–14, 2007, 13–15.

3. *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terrance Ranger (Cambridge University Press, 1983); Harald E. L. Prins, "Neo-Traditions in Native Communities: Sweat Lodge and Sun Dance Among the Micmac Today," *Actes du Vingt-cinquieme Congres des Algonquistes*, ed. William Cowan (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1994), 383–94.

4. Anonymous consultant, Oneida Nation citizen, electronic mail interview, August 2, 2010.

5. Banishment had also been a policy of the Tuscarora in regard to whom one could marry. For example, marriage to African-Americans was forbidden "on pain of banishment from nation and the reserve." David Landy, "Tuscarora Tribalism and National Identity," *Ethnohistory* 5, no. 3 (1958): 254.

6. Bruce E. Johansen, "The New York Oneidas: A Case Study in the Mismatch of Cultural Tradition and Economic Development," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 26, no. 3 (2002): 25–43.

7. Kevin White, electronic mail communication, March 11, 2013. Oral histories reflect the legitimacy of a people, society, or social group connected to place and space through time in order to ground a viewpoint based in the spoken traditions of that culture. Haudenosaunee oral history serves as a mode for dealing with past and present human conditions. The ancient wisdom gathered through time acts as a template of potential solutions for the modern issues faced by today's Haudenosaunee people. One such example is the Haudenosaunee creation story. According to White, a Mohawk scholar, there are over forty versions of the creation story that had appeared in print as "published narratives" since the 1600s. Today, this cultural knowledge is passed down within the homes, diffused throughout the modern reservation communities, and offered in the schools where Haudenosaunee are in attendance, as well as recounted in the modern longhouses located in several of these communities.

8. James Clifford, "Indigenous Articulations," *The Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2 (2001): 467–90; quotation at 157.

9. Gordon Schochet, "Tradition as Politics and the Politics of Tradition," *Questions of Tradition*, ed. Mark Salber Phillips and Gordon Schochet (University of Toronto Press, 2004), 301; Akwesasne Notes, *Basic Call to Consciousness*, edited by Akwesasne Notes, Book Publishing Company, Summertown, Tennessee (1995).

10. Schochet, 296.

11. Clifford, 479.

12. *Ibid.*, 469.

13. Anonymous consultant, Oneida Nation citizen, electronic mail interview, August 2, 2010.

14. Michelle Breidenbach, "Oneidas to End Unsafe Housing: Some Residents View Beautification Project as a Scheme to Get Rid of Them," *The Post-Standard*, Syracuse, NY, April 8, 2000, Madison County Edition, B1.

15. William Glaberson, "Struggle for Oneidas' Leadership Grows Bitter as Casino Succeeds," *The New York Times*, June 17, 1996, Late Edition-Final, Section A, 1; David Tobin, "Making Dollars and Dissent, Ray Halbritter Has Been Dogged by Opposition Almost from the Beginning," *The Post-Standard*, Syracuse, NY, October 10, 1995, Metro Edition, A4.

16. Dean Chang, "A Bad Bet? Discontent Grows with Profits from the Tribe's Casino," *Daily News*, New York, December 3, 1995, 30.

17. Tobin, "Making Dollars and Dissent."

18. Glaberson.

19. Tobin, "Making Dollars and Dissent."

20. Smith.

21. Glaberson.

22. Chang.

23. Breidenbach.

24. Tobin, "Tribal Faction Unhappy with Halbritter, Protest Planned at Today's Groundbreaking," *The Post-Standard*, Syracuse, NY: May 21, 1995, Madison County Edition, Metro Section, E1.

25. Joanne Shenandoah and Douglas M. George-Kanentiio, *Skywoman: Legends of the Iroquois*, (Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers, 2010).

26. Jeremiah Curtin, "The Creation of Men," *Seneca Indian Myths*, ed. Jeremiah Curtin (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 2001), 192–97.

27. Harriet Maxwell Converse, *Myths and Legends of the New York State Iroquois*, ed. Arthur C. Parker (Albany: New York State Museum Bulletin 125, 1908), 32–34. Harriet Maxwell Converse

recorded Iroquois stories at the turn of the twentieth century as a scholar and researcher of the Iroquois.

28. *Indian Peoples of Eastern America: A Documentary History of the Sexes*, ed. James Axtell (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 174–75. Axtell relies on Hazel W. Hertzberg, *The Great Tree and the Longhouse: The Culture of the Iroquois* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), 11–22. Hertzberg's footnotes indicate that she drew on the work of John Witthoft, who heard and compiled several Cayuga versions (116). In *The Journal of Major John Norton 1816*, ed. Carl F. Klinck and James J. Talman (Toronto: Champlain Society, 1970), 88, Sky Woman is said to be the daughter of the Great Spirit, who uproots a tree and throws her through the resulting hole because of her illicit pregnancy.

29. Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 9; Converse, 8–11.

30. Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 12; *The Journal of Major John Norton, 1816*, 88–91.

31. Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 4; Converse, 8–11.

32. Axtell, 174, 175; Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 14; *The Journal of Major John Norton*, 88–91; Curtin, 194.

33. Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 20; Converse, 8–11.

34. Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 20; *The Journal of Major John Norton*, 88–91.

35. Curtin, 194.

36. David Cusick, *David Cusick's Sketches of Ancient History of the Six Nations* (Fayetteville, NY: Recorder Print, 1827), 2. David Cusick, an Oneida, recorded his version of the Iroquois creation story while at the Tuscarora (Nation) Village in 1827, hoping by his effort to provide the public with a better understanding of Iroquois history; Anthony F. C. Wallace, *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca* (New York: Random House, 1972); Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 22; Wallace, 316.

37. Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 22.

38. Converse, 8–11.

39. Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 22; Curtin, 194; *The Journal of Major John Norton*, 88–91.

40. Wallace, 54.

41. Wallace, 318.

42. Converse, 8–11; *The Journal of Major John Norton*, 88–91.

43. Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 32, 34; Curtin, 195; Cusick, 3.

44. Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 36; Wallace, 54.

45. Cusick, 4; Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 37, 38; *The Journal of Major John Norton*, 88–91.

46. *The Journal of Major John Norton*, 88–91; Converse, 8–11; Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 39.

47. Converse, 8–11; Cusick, 5.

48. Shenandoah and George-Kanentiio, 39.

49. Fenton reminds that “though each authority claims fidelity for his version, each narrator [and version] had his own style. . . . versions exhibit a remarkable consistency of plot and incident, but are nevertheless quite different in detail.” William N. Fenton, “This Island, The World on the Turtle’s Back,” *The Journal of American Folklore* 75, no. 298: 283. I see this as exhibiting the quality of reflexivity of the narrative, or, in an “accordion” effect, the ability of the stories to contract or expand owing to the teller, the audience, and the intent of the story and lessons it provides.

50. In addition, some of the protesters had met with Oneida peoples from Wisconsin and Canada. Some of those with whom the traditionalists met made claims to their origins in the OIN territory before they had left in the eighteenth and nineteenth century for these other settlements. The OIN saw this as acts contrary to the national interest of the Oneida Nation.

51. Glaberson.
52. Breidenbach.
53. Tobin, "Making Dollars and Dissent."
54. Chang.
55. One is his cousin, whom Halbritter sought out and persuaded to help run the tribal enterprises and groomed as his replacement as CEO of OIN enterprises.
56. Anonymous consultant, Oneida Nation citizen, electronic mail interview, August 2, 2010.
57. Breidenbach.
58. Glenn Coin, "Oneidas Look to Supreme Court: Oneidas Claim They're Being Evicted Because They Oppose Ray Halbritter," *The Post-Standard*, Syracuse, NY, April 6, 2004, Local Section, B1, Madison Edition.
59. Breidenbach.
60. Coin.
61. Ibid.
62. Breidenbach.
63. This is one way in which to gain one's "voice" back and gain the return of tribal status. The swearing of allegiance seems to be a form of kowtowing or bowing before a political superior.
64. Coin.
65. Tobin, "Making Dollars and Dissent."
66. Smith.
67. Tobin, "Making Dollars and Dissent."
68. For historic information on this process, see Paul A. W. Wallace, *White Roots of Peace: The Iroquois Book of Life* (Saranac Lake, NY: The Chauncey Press, 1986), 29.
69. Jeffery David Ehrenreich, "Shame, Witchcraft, and Social Control: The Case of an Awa-Coaiquer Interloper," *Cultural Anthropology* 5, no. 3 (1990): 338-45.
70. Tobin, "Tribal Faction Unhappy with Halbritter."
71. In Haudenosaunee government each nation is autonomous, having the ability to determine its own way in terms of leadership. Each nation is said to have the right to do everything but destroy itself wherein the collective nations would step in and regain control over such aberrant behavior.
72. Tobin, "Making Dollars and Dissent."
73. Ray Halbritter, personal interview, Oneida Nation Turning Stone Resort and Casino complex, July 22, 2010.
74. Douglas M. George-Kanentiio, *Iroquois Culture & Commentary* (Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers, 2000).
75. Anonymous consultant, Oneida Nation citizen, electronic mail interview, August 2, 2010.
76. In constructing this hybrid government, this regime has selected elements of historic importance and of modernity to make this a functioning vehicle of tribal renaissance.