1963 Leopold Report as a decisive document that called for NPS to change many of its management practices. He quotes the report as a calling for each park to be maintained in a condition that prevailed at the time of European contact. He goes on to explain that this attitude congratulates Indians for maintaining the land but ignores their adept sustainability efforts used for millennia before the Europeans' arrival.

Burnham's book reveals a rigorous scrutiny of NPS history and American Indian relations, especially with respect to the five sites mentioned. Far from being critical of all government agencies' relations with the tribes he often cites instances where the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or lone actions by the NPS, would come to the defense of the Indian tribes. The founding fathers of NPS, S. Mather and H. Albright, however, are shown as patronizing, manipulative magnates, especially in Glacier, Death Valley, and Grand Canyon national parks. They were also the main architects of a government legacy of double speak to Indian people that continues to influence negotiations today. Burnham also sheds light on the tour and trade concessions in parks as a regulated monopoly. This is still an issue in NPS, and the tribes are seeking to gain a greater share of tourist dollars that flow through their lands as part of their own self-determination and economic development plans. Whether this becomes a new buffalo in Indian Country remains to be seen.

Burnham's choice to frame this work around federal Indian policy is a good one. There are just a few times, such as around the problem of land heirship, which by definition is confusing, when he falls a bit short of providing enough background information for the general reader. His overall work, however, is excellent and is a great asset to the literature on the relations between Indian people and NPS. He clearly describes how the political boundaries established by NPS separated two different cultures, one indigenous and the other bureaucratic. To his credit he especially notes that Indian people are not just another special interest group—they possess rights different from other citizens and agencies.

*Jeffrey M. Sanders*
Montana State University, Billings

**Indian Gaming: Tribal Sovereignty and American Politics.** By W. Dale Mason. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000. 330 pages.

In his new book *Indian Gaming: Tribal Sovereignty and American Politics* political scientist W. Dale Mason explores the question, What is the status of Indian nations in the American political system? Drawing from detailed accounts of contemporary gaming conflicts in New Mexico and Oklahoma, Mason concludes that Indian nations are best characterized as flexible political actors that alternate between acting as sovereign governments, interest groups, or both according to their political needs. Mason argues further that this flexibility is fraught with possibilities and dangers for Indian nations. Generally, he argues that the possibilities of combining tribal sovereignty

with political participation include flexibility of political participation and the ability to secure gaming revenues. The dangers of depending on sovereign status as a political resource include the fragility of that sovereign status and the possibility of fleeting resources if Indian nations do not secure gaming rights.

The first portion of the book is dedicated to a history of federal Indian policy that serves as a backdrop to the contemporary Indian gaming conflicts that constitute the bulk of the work. Here Mason provides a straightforward outline of the foundations of tribal sovereignty, including the Marshall decisions and major federal policies regarding Indian land and resources. Mason describes the status of Indian nations as "anomalous" within the American political system and reiterates the classic conundrum of an American political ideology that must reconcile a massive land grab from indigenous people with the promotion of individual liberty implied by American democracy.

Overall, *Indian Gaming: Tribal Sovereignty and American Politics* does a thorough job of documenting the first 200 years of federal Indian policy. This is not an easy task given the complex interplay of federal, tribal, and state governments in the American political system. By describing the alternating federal policy of termination and recognition of tribal sovereignty Mason shows that the ambivalence of the American public toward Indian nationhood can be directly linked to the policies crafted to handle the so-called Indian problem. Additionally, he argues that one reason for the history of conflicting Indian policies is that most elected officials are not from Indian Country and do not have Indian constituents, so "what happens in Indian country might as well be happening in Antarctica" (p. 7). He concludes that Americans are ripe for education regarding Indian history and affairs.

Mason also does a good job of documenting recent Indian gaming conflicts. However, the book lacks in-depth analysis of this descriptive material, including the reasons for and implications of the dual status of Indian nations in the American system. For example, while Mason acknowledges that policymakers' ignorance of (or indifference to) Indian issues often drives Indian policy, he also lets policymakers off the hook by arguing that tribal sovereignty's history of ebbs and flows is often detained by the changing political currents of United States domestic policy. By arguing that Indian policies are simply carried along by the political zeitgeist, Mason overlooks three crucial dynamics. First, this analysis dismisses the ways that Indian policies, particularly Indian gaming policies, often *drive* domestic policies rather than simply reflect them. Second, the "carried along" argument for Indian policy overlooks the ways that opportunistic policymakers are able to embed their anti-Indian policies in larger domestic projects, thereby masking their pointedly anti-Indian positions. Third, this analysis dismisses the political clout of Indian nations/interest groups, which have been and continue to be active agents in the policy-making process. Many contemporary tribal leaders would argue that tribal sovereignty is less subject than ever to "the current political zeitgeist" now that Indian nations have increased their political engagement at all levels of government.

The major argument of the book, that Indian nations act as both sovereign governments and interest groups is thoroughly documented by the case study material regarding New Mexico and Oklahoma. The history of the development of Indian gaming in New Mexico and Oklahoma is very descriptive. Perhaps the clearest linking of theory and evidence occurs when Mason observes that while Indian nations in New Mexico acted "as interest groups with a political agenda in the previous year's gubernatorial campaign, the tribes were [later] received in the governor's office as sovereigns entering into a government-to-government relationship with the state of New Mexico" (p. 109).

However, Mason offers little or no interpretation of what this political flexibility means for Indian nations or the myriad ways that it presents a burden for tribal governments. For example, how does being required to hire lobbyists, tribal attorneys, and public relations firms divert precious funds away from tribal governmental programs and Indian people? Why should Indian nations be forced to invest gaming revenues in simply protecting their gaming rights, rather than in improving living conditions for their tribal members (as intended by the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act)? Mason gives attention in each chapter to the fact that Indian nations are making political contributions with gaming revenues, often including the dollar amounts given by each nation. He uses this to support his argument that tribal governments are acting as interest groups. What he does not explore, however, is how this type of political engagement is diverting funds from important governmental activities in Indian Country. While it is important to document the political flexibility of tribal governments in the American political system, it is equally important to explore how this so-called flexibility impacts tribal governments and why it is required of them in the first place.

By arguing that an Indian nation has the flexibility to act as a government or an interest group according to its needs, Mason implies throughout his analysis that this is an advantage over other governments and other interest groups, which are assumed to be limited to one role or the other. However, I believe this approach is too simplistic. First, Indian nations are not the only governments to act as interest groups. State governments, and even foreign governments, routinely lobby for federal benefits or engage with other entities according to their political needs. Second, this narrow interpretation ignores the fact that tribal governments may have no other choice but to act as interest groups because their status as tribal sovereign nations is constantly under attack. Precious tribal resources, including gaming revenues, are spent on lawyers, lobbyists, and campaign contributions when they could be better invested at home on social programs. Diverting this money may not be a choice, but a necessity. As Mason notes, "Gaming revenues provided the war chest that funded the campaign to protect tribal gaming" (p. 230). It strikes me as an obvious disadvantage to tribal governments that they must invest their revenues in protecting the very businesses that produces them. Third, other governments—states, for example—do not need to act as interest groups because their interests are already represented in other ways. State governments cannot endorse candidates, but why should they? They have elected representatives in Congress to represent their needs.

By not taking a stand on what this dual status means for tribal governments, Mason leaves the reader to come to his or her own conclusions. And as he points out in Indian affairs, that is not usually in the best interest of Indian nations.

Mason's book represents a first step in addressing the dual role of tribal governments in the American political system. His thick description of contemporary Indian gaming conflicts in New Mexico and Oklahoma provides an ambitious starting point by raising many interesting questions. Future work should build upon Mason's descriptive material and push the inquiry further by interpreting the meaning of these dual roles and, more importantly, their implications for tribal communities and Indian people.

*Katherine A. Spilde*
National Indian Gaming Association

**Language Policies in English Dominant Countries.** Edited by Michael Herriman and Barbara Burnaby. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996. 244 pages. $99.00 cloth; $39.95 paper.

In this book, Michael Herriman and Barbara Burnaby provide a very important and useful collection of language policies in Australia, Canada, Britain, New Zealand, South Africa, and the United States. The collection is unique in that it contains information compiled for the sake of comparison and the results indicate various linguistic ideologies and ethnocentricities. Perhaps the question concerning this review is, Why is this book under review for the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*? There are important historical aspects of linguistic ideologies and language policies that affected the indigenous populations in Canada and the United States. Perhaps the greatest interest and importance pertain to the status of current ancestral indigenous language situations in both Canada and the United States. Furthermore, the information about South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand offers insight to their language circumstances and how they deal with language loss and revitalization. Such information can be very valuable for language revitalization efforts in North America.

In their introduction, the editors explain that they gathered this material to "provide contemporary data on language policies in some of the world's largest and powerful countries" (p. 2). They immediately describe the difficulty in understanding the term *policy* because of its many definitions. They then include conduct, practice, plans, and actions within the scope of the definition, remarking that these could include implicit or explicit governmental sanction and/or execution. Of course, this also includes the nature of spoken and unspoken policies as well. Herriman and Burnaby mention the sociolinguistic problems encountered, such as official languages, language standards, and language retention in the different countries, and the complexities involved in solving these problems. They end their introduction by stressing the importance of policies that enhance the language(s) in question and do not hinder other languages as a result.