

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Legislating Indian Country: Significant Milestones in Transforming Tribalism. By Laurence Armand French.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5kp3w1fm>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 32(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Beck, David R. M.

Publication Date

2008-03-01

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/>

The Kiowa Ohoma Society was obtained from the Cheyenne, who received it from the Lakota, who obtained it from the Omaha. The Kiowa originally called the Omaha Tribe “Ohomogau” (Ohomo People), which shifted to “Ohoma” in the 1920s. As the last men’s society to spread to the Kiowa, the Omaha dance was acquired in 1884 and thus after the period of warfare and the Fort Marion imprisonment. The Kiowa may have been introduced to the Cheyenne version of the dance at Fort Marion, but most of the Fort Marion dances used improvised materials, and the Kiowa were not given the rights to it until later. There is considerable evidence that Frizzlehead, perhaps along with Red Otter, saved White Bear by cutting the rope, which became a society trophy (172). The Kaitsenko contained ten sash owners but many more members (173). When magnified, the image on the “man standing alone on the prairie” (fig. 108) is actually of two individuals not one. Pah-bo was the father of Teybodle (Carrying a Quarter of Meat) and died in 1880 (194n44).

Overall, I like this work and feel that it accomplishes its primary objectives well. It contributes to a growing body of Plains Indian graphic arts for anyone interested in ledger-style art and the Fort Marion experience. Each author adds unique insights into the sketchbook and its history. It is interesting, well illustrated, and thorough in its application of analytical manuscript and document analysis, and it provides several methodological contributions that can be applied to future studies of similar manuscripts.

William C. Meadows

Missouri State University

Legislating Indian Country: Significant Milestones in Transforming Tribalism.

By Laurence Armand French. New York: Peter Lang, 2007. 208 pages. \$29.95 paper.

Laurence Armand French intends to provide a “viable analysis of U.S. Indian policy” by “revisit[ing] the basic geopolitical foundations of American society and its emerging epistemological ideals.” He posits that the United States is “a biased democracy based on elitism and moral privilege” with the “dual Christian ideals of white supremacy and cultural ethnocentrism” as the foundations for manifest destiny (1). Federal Indian policy, he believes, is thus rooted in racism. Accordingly, America’s “vision of a new society . . . based on white supremacy and free from Native Americans . . . became national policy” (21–22). The purported purpose of his book is to analyze how this policy shaped Indian country.

The narrative, more polemic than analysis, is based within a framework of five federal policy periods that generally conform to the five conventional policy periods, from treaty making through self-determination. Each forms the cornerstone for a chapter of *Legislating Indian Country*. French presents the policy periods chronologically and identifies genocide as a key policy focus—physical genocide for the first two periods, which lasted through Indian Removal and the Indian wars, and cultural genocide for the next

two periods of federal management of reservation communities followed by termination. The author does not, however, define physical or cultural genocide precisely, beyond referring to physical genocide as “Indian wars and concentration camps” and cultural genocide as “Christianization and allotment” (60). Instead, he expects the reader simply to accept his use of these terms. He also fails to clarify the differences between genocidal practices and nongenocidal policies that were also destructive to tribal society. He abandons his focus on genocide at the end, arguing that it disappeared in the 1970s self-determination era.

To provide background, French contrasts what he defines as the Native American worldview, “the Harmony Ethos,” with the white worldview, represented by Protestant-based capitalistic ethnocentrism. He provides lengthy quotations from federal documents (for example, court decisions, presidential correspondence and statements, congressional documents, and laws) punctuated with snippets of narrative, contextualizing them within his framework of genocide, white supremacy, and greed in the book’s early sections, and with Republican Party policies from the latter half of the twentieth century into the present toward the end of the book.

French uses tribal examples to illustrate the impact of policies primarily from the three tribes he identifies as the largest: the Cherokee, the Navajo, and the Sioux. He refers to the latter two as having “bands and tribes residing in Canada” (3). There are Dené groups in Canada, but they are not tribes or bands of the Navajo of the southwestern United States. He also discusses the Menominee during the termination era and several national Indian organizations, including the National Congress of American Indians, the American Indian Movement, the National Indian Youth Council, and the Native American Rights Fund. Nonetheless, French’s analysis largely omits evidence of agency on the part of tribal leaders. In this telling, tribal leaders neither shape policy nor respond to policy initiatives.

Instead, the book provides a laundry list of policy philosophy and actual laws. This approach produces a work that reads less like an analysis of policy impact on Indian country and more as a litany of law after law and a screed against American injustice. It seems as if French was unable to decide whether he wanted to write a documentary history or a manifesto. The result is a work that ultimately flounders. It contains much of the key legislation that has shaped tribal relations with the United States, occasionally providing insightful analysis of it, but more often providing either simplistic analysis or virtually none at all. Unfortunately the lengthy quotations from particular laws and policy initiatives continually disrupt the narrative and leave the reader wondering how they tie in to a historical or cultural context.

This is especially problematic because the book’s stated purpose is to contextualize the impact of these policy efforts in Indian country. For example, French records much of the text of the 1934 Johnson O’Malley Act but pays little attention to its implementation in relation to schools. Even in sections in which he discusses Indian education in some depth, he ignores the power this law gave to states and the damage that states inflicted on Indian education. This would have provided a good opportunity to support one of

the points French is trying to hammer home—the deleterious impact of states on tribal well-being. Instead he provides the minute details of the mechanics of law as spelled out in the act but without commentary.

This tendency to provide lengthy text of laws and policies means that most are presented accurately, albeit without contextualization. Unfortunately, French's tendency to generalize and dichotomize leads to some misinterpretation. This is compounded when he makes generalizations and attributions without citing references, which can make them difficult to accept. For example, he says of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Courts of Indian Offenses that "Indian judges had to be assimilated into the dominant white American society" without giving any attribution (72). This was not always the case. French also says of these courts, "These were known as Courts of Cultural Genocide by traditional Indians" (73). He does not say which traditional Indians referred to the courts as thus, and he does not define what he means by traditional Indians. Like the term *genocide*, French assumes that the reader knows what his definition of traditional is, without bothering to define it.

French refers to "concentration camps" without definition as well. This is harsh commentary that needs clarification. Presumably the author is referring to reservations, but he includes no discussion of reservations as homelands, or the meaning of the homelands to tribal people, or of tribal leaders' efforts to secure a place for their people to live. Later, he says of the second Wounded Knee that "American Indians refer to this era as the FBI's 'Reign of Terror'" (117). Although this is easy to believe, there is no citation. Furthermore, the author fails to acknowledge that other tribal members approved of federal tactics in hopes of achieving peace. These histories are complex, and Indian communities and people represent a variety of perspectives, but French does not recognize this. Several times he allows a small handful of, or more often one or two, Indian voices to present what he refers to as "the Native American perspective" (65, 73, 112, 138, 150). That statement is far too simplistic to constitute viable analysis.

French occasionally has problems understanding the policies he writes about. For instance, his presentation of two 1950s policies, termination and Public Law 280, is confusing. French implies that P.L. 280 was passed so that after termination there would be a mechanism for states to deal with Indians legally (111–12). Termination ended the government-to-government relationship of certain tribes with the United States, while P.L. 280 turned criminal and civil jurisdiction over to several states and Alaska. Terminated tribes were not subjected to P.L. 280 except for that period of time between its going into effect and their termination; after termination, tribal citizens were to be treated under law as other citizens of their states. French does, however, provide lengthy excerpts from P.L. 280, HCR 108 (the enabling legislation for termination), and the Menominee Termination Act (107–11).

Legislating Indian Country also contains several errors of fact, some of which may be typographical. For example, French refers to Wilma Mankiller as the "first Cherokee leader"; he refers to the 1968 Indian Civil Rights Act as a 1965 law in one place and a 1968 law in another (97, 117–18). He also

says that within the Americas, “no tribal group is known to have had a written language or methods for the mass dissemination of written literature during aboriginal times,” thus ignoring the Mayan temples, monuments, and codices, and other indigenous groups’ uses of writing (3).

Unfortunately, it is not clear who French perceives to be his audience. The analysis is too simplistic for graduate students or scholars, and the lengthy use of direct text from documents in place of narrative description or analysis makes the work too confusing for undergraduates. Although French is clearly sympathetic to American Indians, his work is too problematic to be useful in the classroom. The back cover of this book states that “Dr. French . . . has worked in Indian country for over thirty years as faculty advisor to the Indian Student Organizations at Western Carolina University and Western New Mexico University.” His understanding of Indian history and law seems at times to be as superficial as this grounding in Indian country.

David R. M. Beck

University of Montana

Living through the Generations: Continuity and Change in Navajo Women’s Lives. By Joanne McCloskey. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2007. 240 pages. \$24.95 paper.

McCloskey’s book is about three generations of Navajo women who live in or near communities located in New Mexico within the region of the Navajo Reservation known as the Eastern Navajo Agency. The governmental site for the Eastern Navajo Agency is in Crownpoint, New Mexico. Crownpoint was established in 1910 by a non-Indian, superintendent Samuel F. Stacher, who selected the site for a boarding school and for the administrative offices of the Eastern Navajo Agency. McCloskey tells us that the growth of Crownpoint helped transform the lives of the three generations of Navajo women in her study. In this respect, the reader learns a little about the history of Crownpoint because it serves as a backdrop for the discussion of how community development economically impacted the lives of these women.

In recruiting potential study participants, McCloskey explained to the women that she wanted to ask them about motherhood, family, and child-bearing patterns. The rationale for studying Navajo women was the centrality of motherhood in Navajo culture and how this centrality is exemplified through the tribe’s traditional matrilineal social organization. The author also adds that Navajo gender ideology was another factor because of the central place that Changing Woman has in the culture. For the Navajos, Changing Woman symbolizes fertility and regeneration of all life.

The women recruited to participate in this study represent three different motherhood typologies: (1) grandmothers, (2) midlife mothers, and (3) young mothers. More specifically, these women included (1) grandmothers who are past childbearing age and grew up in the 1920s and 1930s; (2) midlife mothers who grew up during the 1940s and 1950s and were employed; (3)