

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Organizing the Lakota: The Political Economy of the New Deal on the Pine Ridge and Rosebud Reservations. By Thomas Biolsi.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2c1324r7>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 17(2)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Clow, Richmond L.

**Publication Date**

1993-03-01

**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/>

**Organizing the Lakota: The Political Economy of the New Deal on the Pine Ridge and Rosebud Reservations.** By Thomas Biolsi. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 1992. 244 pages. \$35.00 cloth.

The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 was a pivotal event in the history of the Pine Ridge and Rosebud reservations. The rhetoric of the act linked the tribal dreams of greater reservation self-rule with the ongoing domination of the United States government over tribal government. The Indian Reorganization Act authorized tribes either to accept or reject the law's provisions providing tribal populations the opportunity to organize.

Both the Pine Ridge and Rosebud populations began debating whether to adopt new constitutions and how to create tribal corporations. At the same time, the legislation both heightened tribal dissension and encouraged ongoing Lakota discussions on tribal sovereignty and tribal priorities. After lengthy discussions concerning tribal sovereignty and priorities, Pine Ridge and Rosebud voted to accept the reorganization provisions. Despite the rhetoric of self-rule articulated by supporters of the Indian Reorganization Act, adapting the act failed to increase tribal control over reservation finances, resources, and law and order. The reasons for this failure are complex and diverse.

Thomas Biolsi applied the popular theoretical dependency model to explain the Lakota population's inability to increase their control over their respective reservations. According to Biolsi, the Lakota "submitted" to the United States through treaty, statute, and administrative fiat in the nineteenth century and gave control of their communities and resources to the United States. He contends that the Lakota have resigned themselves to government intervention in tribal affairs, which, in turn, created even greater tribal dependency on the United States government. Taken together, submission and dependency prohibited Pine Ridge and Rosebud from opposing the Office of Indian Affairs, while at the same time, forcing tribal populations to criticize their own subordinate governments who were powerless to oppose the Department of the Interior and its oppressive policies. As a result of long-term submission and dependency, the people of Pine Ridge and Rosebud acquiesced to the wishes of the Department of the Interior and supported the Indian Reorganization Act.

This dependency model is a valid research approach, but, like most theoretical structures, it perpetuates rigidity. Thus it discards evolving and changing cultures and conditions and ignores cause and effect relationships between people and their actions. Following the submission-dependency approach, Biolsi concludes that the Office of Indian Affairs' rejection of the Rosebud Tribal Council antipeyote ordinance demonstrated the tribe's ongoing submission and dependency. On the other hand, Biolsi's myopic approach ignores the dynamic opposition to United States control demonstrated by the council's decision to ban peyote in the face of government control. This, clearly, was not an act of submission.

A closer examination of the tribal vote on the Indian Reorganization Act in South Dakota would have made this dependency-submission theory unnecessary and would, instead, have focused on tribal activism. Of the state's nine reservations, four rejected the act and five accepted; of the five that accepted it, only three completed reorganization by approval of a tribal charter. By any standard, the Lakota resisted the Indian Reorganization Act, and, from 1934 on, their discontent escalated.

Historical blunders in *Organizing the Lakota*—which probably will matter to only a few—indicate a lack of accuracy critical to a book in which the history of events and actions is important. Biolsi claims that some of the old dealers who originally opposed the Indian Reorganization Act later retracted their demands for the abolition of the Office of Indian Affairs. They did not even support Senate Partial Report 310, because they "were trapped into opposing any major reduction of OIA authority, since it was only the preservation of the OIA which would preserve treaty rights" (p. 174.) Actually, the contrary is true, for not only old dealers but members of the Rosebud Indian Reorganization Act council concurred with nearly all thirty-two points in Senate Partial Report 310. The point on which the council could not agree involved the transfer of services to the state or another federal agency that might adversely affect local services. Tribal support of the Senate's critical report surely belies any perception of submission on the part of the Lakota. These errors of fact and judgment emphasize the need for caution and care in research and analysis.

The contribution of *Organizing the Lakota* is that it will encourage more accurate research on the Indian Reorganization Act and the issues surrounding this legislation. By chronicling and explaining the associated political activities connected with organizing

Pine Ridge and Rosebud, Biolsi has demonstrated how neglected this area of study had been and has illuminated the research potential for the present and future.

*Richmond L. Clow*  
University of Montana

**Rainbow Tribe: Ordinary People Journeying on the Red Road.**  
By Ed McGaa, Eagle Man. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1992. 264 pages. \$15.00 paper.

Ed McGaa, a man of Lakota and Scotch-Irish descent, has written this book for members of a newly defined "Rainbow tribe." According to McGaa (p. viii), Rainbow people seek a "closer connection to the created entity around them," gaining "spiritual perception" through "natural participation in what many of the old tribal ways have preserved." In the opening pages of the work, McGaa contemplates his earlier involvement with such individuals, and he assumes some credit for the emergence of this new tribe. He tells us that it was some years ago when he and a friend, Joe Thunder Owl, saw a rainbow looming over a site where they were to conduct a sweat lodge ceremony for a group of nonnatives (p. 36). They interpreted the rainbow as a natural sign designating the people at that site, and the name stuck. So did McGaa's involvement with Rainbow people.

In this guide for "ordinary people journeying on the Red Road," McGaa recommends, for any Rainbow who can afford to buy this book, a nature-based spirituality that he calls the "Natural Way." In matter of fact, however, the practices and ceremonies McGaa outlines as promoting the "Natural Way" are based on and largely transcribe those presented in *Black Elk Speaks* and *The Sacred Pipe: Black Elk's Account of the Seven Sacred Rites of the Oglala Sioux*. In effect, McGaa's counsel to Rainbows on spiritual development is that they should adopt and assume someone else's.

Built up with anecdote, rambling digressions, and testimonials from Rainbows who have taken on names like Buffalo Spirit Woman, McGaa's advice to present and potential Rainbows is divided into four sections: Part 1 describes the Natural Way, which McGaa speaks of as a spirituality linked at present to pervasive ecological concerns rooted in shared attitudes (called tribalism because they are shared) that acknowledge and stand in