

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Arbitrary Indian: The Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990. By Gail K. Sheffield.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/925592ks>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 22(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Zastrow, Leona M.

Publication Date

1998-06-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Leech Lake, Minnesota. In point of fact, these two brothers were political leaders at the village of *Sandy Lake*, some seventy miles to the east. More problematic is the entry for "Hole-in-the-Day II, or Boy," the son of the first-named Hole-in-the-Day. The biographical entry states that young Hole-in-the-Day "planned a massacre for the Whites along with his co-partner, the Dakota, LITTLE CROW, in 1862." While this assertion enjoyed some credibility at the time, especially among Hole-in-the-Day's enemies and detractors, it has been largely discounted by historians, beginning with those writing in the late nineteenth century who interviewed eyewitnesses. Significantly, these eyewitnesses, who included fur traders and missionaries, also dismissed the idea of a conspiracy between the younger Hole-in-the-Day and Little Crow, pointing out the practical impossibility of an alliance between political leaders of nations with a history of armed conflict and still sporadically warring with one another in the 1860s. The younger Hole-in-the-Day was a well-known and controversial figure during his lifetime; much more has been written about him than most Ojibwa leaders. It is disappointing to note that the author has not, evidently, sought out all available sources of information.

In conclusion, John Ilko has provided an important service in bringing together in one place a compilation of Ojibwa political leaders as inclusive as this one. But the work must be used with caution. Its usefulness as a research tool is limited. The lack of citation information is a serious handicap. It is unclear how complete the scope of the author's bibliography is. There is no easy way to cross-reference individuals. While carefully compiled, it falls short of providing a systematic discussion of leadership that would ground the biographic entries firmly in the Ojibwa political world. This slim volume represents a valuable first step, but one is left wanting more.

Rebecca Kugel
University of California, Riverside

The Arbitrary Indian: The Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990.
By Gail K. Sheffield. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997. 223 pages. \$27.50 cloth.

This book provides an excellent discussion of the complexity of American Indian law and the confusing results of legislation

passed to assist American Indians with the selling of their arts and crafts. In this book Sheffield has presented the pros and cons of the 1990 Indian Arts and Crafts Act in a logical and scholarly fashion. With states, the federal government, and federally recognized tribes signing gambling compacts, I find her work a timely discussion of the complexity of Indian law in both its anthropological and historical contexts.

Sheffield presents an excellent overview of the intent of this act and the pitfalls of attempting to implement it, explaining the anthropological, historical, and political definitions of terms such as *Indian* and *tribe*. She identifies "state recognized tribes" from ten southeastern states, approximately fifty-three tribes of which are only recognized by one state government, often without any criteria. She relates the history of Indian removal and describes the relationship of the federal tribes to the federal government and how this historical/political relationship has caused much confusion and misunderstanding about the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990. She carefully defines her terms (using a variety of sources) and explains specific issues when she discusses the meaning of and possible misuses of this act.

The Indian Arts and Crafts Board (305a of Title 18) was created in 1935 to assist Indian tribes with economic development and was amended by Public Law 101-644 in 1990. The amendments to this act were instituted by Indian people themselves as they saw their arts and crafts markets continuously eroded by foreign imitation Indian arts and crafts. Thus, the intent of the 1990 amended act was to protect the integrity of the arts and crafts produced by the American Indians residing in the United States. As one who has collected Indian art for many years, I know how the *heshi* of Santo Domingo Pueblo, the silver jewelry of the Navaho and Zuni peoples, has been copied, duplicated, and reproduced in other countries and then exported to the United States to be sold as "authentic" Indian art. I have watched many consumers buy such art and pay too much for fake silver and turquoise and then tell Natives that their original artwork is too expensive.

The intent of this act was to stop exports of "fake Indian arts and crafts" from reaching U.S. markets and protect the authenticity of the work created by Indian artists by certifying the Indian artists as the producers of the artwork. Indirectly it would protect consumers as well because they would know, by the certification, that what they were buying was truly made by American

Indians. The intent of this act seemed to be good and needed by American Indian artists to protect their products.

While Sheffield understands clearly the intent of this act, she explores several major problems with the implementation of the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990, which she says make "bad legislation." One of the major problems is the definition of *Indian* and who is an Indian. The act specifies that Indian tribes, both federal and state recognized, will determine who is an Indian and therefore have the power to certify artists as producers of Indian art. Thus, artists who have claimed Indian descent but have no tribal certification, according to this act, will not be considered Indian unless adopted, enrolled, and certified as members of a federal or state recognized tribe. Artists who are Indian by blood, upbringing, and ancestry, but who are not enrolled members of any federal or state recognized tribe, therefore are not Indian. Sheffield offers several plausible reasons for the lack of tribal enrollment: family pride of knowing one is Indian and not needing a paper to certify this; historical events, such as the Dawes Act, forcing tribal enrollment for land rights; termination of tribal status; adoptions of Indian children by non-Indians; and the rights of tribes to decide membership rights. Thus some children raised on a specific reservation but whose parents, one or both, do not belong to that tribe will not be certified as tribal members and therefore not as Indian artists. Sheffield argues that many people who are Indian by either blood quantum or community recognition will be discriminated against because of the language of this act.

Another problem is the question of what constitutes a tribe. Federally recognized Indian tribes? and state recognized tribes? Sheffield outlines the criteria for becoming a federally recognized tribe and indicates the difficulty in obtaining such status. Part of her discussion centers on the significance of allowing non-federal Indian groups to participate in certifying Indian artists. Because the act allows federal and state recognized tribes to determine who is Indian or a member of their tribe, the inclusion of the recognized state tribes, mostly in the Southeast, appears to give them powers reserved for federally recognized tribes. Federally recognized Indian tribes have sovereignty, a treaty-to-treaty relationship with the United States government, and receive certain benefits because of the treaty rights: education, health, safety, and economic assistance. State recognized tribes are recognized only by the state in which they reside.

While they may receive some state benefits, they are not recognized by the U.S. government as sovereign nations. The act gives both federal and state recognized tribes the same authority to define their membership and their designated Indian artists. Sheffield points out that some notable artists who are not of Indian ancestry have been certified as Indian artists and some artists with Indian ancestry have not. She argues that the entire issue of sovereignty has become more confused and clouded because of the way this act was written.

Finally, in selecting the title of this book, *Arbitrary Indian*, the author demonstrates that she is aware of the problems with this law. The term *arbitrary* implies that some choices made in certifying Indians as artists were made without comprehensive reasoning, and these choices were made by federal law (a judge) determining who could be identified, and identified by whom, as Indian, and thus be able to sell their art as a certified Indian. Through the title and content of this book, Sheffield challenges the legality of this law.

Leona M. Zastrow
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

Bella Bella: A Season of Heiltsuk Art. By Martha Black. Toronto: Royal Ontario Museum, Douglas & MacIntyre, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997. 207 pages. \$40 paper.

This publication provides the reader with a description of a collection of artifacts that was assembled between 1898 and 1906 at the Heiltsuk (Bella Bella) village of Waglisla by Dr. R.W. Large, a Methodist medical missionary. The author provides historical and ethnographic information that places the Large Collection within the context of the great era of museum collecting that took place on the Northwest Coast at the turn of the century. She also differentiates the circumstances of the assembling of the Large Collection from most other collections by professional collectors and/or anthropologists, and by doing so demonstrates the value of missionary-generated collections and documentation in general and the Large Collection in particular.

The original collection assembled by Dr. Large totaled 284 objects sent to the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) in 1901 and 1906. Black only discusses those objects from the original col-