

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

State and Reservation: New Perspectives on Federal Indian Policy.
Edited by George P. Castile and Robert L. Bee.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2hz6n3j6>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 17(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Sutton, Imre

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/>

State and Reservation: New Perspectives on Federal Indian Policy. Edited by George P. Castile and Robert L. Bee. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 1992. 259 pages. \$35 cloth; \$19.95 paper.

Few scholars would disagree that the reservation is the locus of Indian lifeways, territoriality, and polity. For more than a century, the Indian reservation has represented the foundation of national policy, even as Congress and the Bureau of Indian Affairs have attempted to undermine or modify its administration. Changes in Indian affairs policy have not been overlooked by critics, for a spate of literature has drawn attention again and again to the failure of policy, the ineptness within the bureaucracy, incompetence in resource management, and the ambiguous status of tribal autonomy. Editors Castile and Bee contend that most of this literature about the reservation system has tended to be descriptive, often lacking in historical context, and is nontheoretical in terms of relating policy to the reservation system. Consequently, they wanted to bring together essays of a more analytical or theoretical nature, ones that shed new light on old issues and provide new insights into Indian affairs policy.

The editors asked their colleagues, "Why did the reservation system come into existence and take the form it did? . . . and why does it persist? If there are problems with this system . . . are they somehow inherent in the system itself or the result of deliberate policies?" (p. 2) Many of the authors see the reservation system as ambiguous in purpose and goals; their review of policies reveals how dichotomous and contradictory the relationship is between constitutional provisions for federal trust responsibility—which entrenches tribal dependency on the government—and self-determination or autonomy—which depends on Congress's benevolent continuation of the policy of trusteeship. In contemporary parlance, Indian policy remains a catch-22. This ambiguous circumstance of Indian affairs draws the collective concern of ten social scientists, who reexamine changing federal Indian policy with an eye to questioning why that policy consistently falls short of expectations.

Organized into four parts, the studies first review "Historical Foundations of the Reservation Policy" (Gold Rush California; Crow Indian Reservation); then explore the "Nonreservation Experience" (Utah and Indian homesteads; Oklahoma; and landless Indians in Washington); assess theory and models in "Power and

Symbols" (application of Weberian theory; hegemony and symbolism); and, finally, reexamine the "Resource Base" (Alaska; self-determination and resource management; and water in the West). A brief introduction serves to identify the critical concerns of each chapter.

A few chapters deserve some special comment, because, in my estimation, they transcend the review of historical facts by providing some new insights or otherwise drawing attention to the less obvious. In light of the emergence of race in American politics, Frederick Hoxie, in "Crow Leadership Amidst Reservation Oppression," asks if Indians behaved like other ethnic and racial groups during the crucial period around the turn of the century. How Indians as a distinct ethnicity have fared relative to the changing political status of other minorities is a subtheme in several chapters. Hoxie, who questions the role of Indian leadership in the survival of Indian communities as social and political entities, contends that scholars must "look beyond a few charismatic elders for an explanatory model." He notes that, through time, Indian political structure was "forcibly incorporated into an alien local and national order" (p. 43).

John Moore's "The Enduring Reservations of Oklahoma" speculates about the events and policies leading to the "extinguishment" of the bulk of the reservations within that state. Despite conventional wisdom that, aside from the Osage, Oklahoma has no other Indian reservations, Moore argues that no laws specifically dissolved the other reservations, and extinguishment was "invented for selfish and anti-Indian purposes . . ." (p. 94). Contending that the existence of these so-called former reservations has never been tested, he notes, "The disuse of the word [reservation] implies that an Indian group has no leaders, no government, no *land*, and no rights" (p. 107; emphasis mine).

In "Indian Sign: Hegemony and Symbolism in Federal Indian Policy," Castile relates Indian policy to broader national ethnic policy, noting that such policy in the past half-century "often seems anomalous, even opposed, to the general trends in ethnic matters" (p. 165). One conclusion is that "the BIA bureaucracy has by default largely been left undisturbed as a caretaker mechanism, holding the reservation peoples frozen in perpetual dependency in their administered communities" (p. 171) He questions why the government would grant "autonomy" to the tribes and why on the basis of "aboriginality." Castile does not feel that any real parallels exist between Indian policy and general

"ethnic" policy but contends that the real "message of Indian self-determination to potentially separatist ethnic groups is that *only* Native Americans can hope to aspire to this autonomy . . ." (p. 182; emphasis his).

In "Getting to Yes in the New West," Thomas McGuire notes that, while tribal land claims were litigated, much of the future of Indian water rights will continue to depend on negotiation rather than litigation. He reviews the *Winters* doctrine, *Arizona v. California*, and other cases and especially examines the implications of a trend toward state adjudication of Indian and other water rights. McGuire is concerned about the changing definitions of trust, equity, and property, since Indian water rights are negotiated often to the detriment of the tribes; his assessment is applied to the Ak-Chin (Arizona) and the Colorado Utes.

As a student of Indian land tenure and polity, I saw in the word *state* just that—the states—and naively hoped that the editors would pay more than passing attention to the increasing role of the states in Indian affairs. True, many authors do place tribal problems within the context of specific states such as Alaska, Arizona, and Oklahoma, but this does not overcome the greater need for evaluation of the role—political and economic—that states play in relation to tribes and reservations. No author, of course, was specifically asked to examine other than federal Indian policy. Yet preoccupation with federal policy too often has obscured the need to explore a new institutional interface between tribes and states.

Even though chapters are uneven and the scope of the entries less than that hoped for, the book does bring us forward since publication of other edited studies of Indian policy (e. g., Deloria's *American Indian Policy in the Twentieth Century*, 1985). The essays invite us to rethink the goals of national policies toward Native Americans. But, in light of the focused concern of the editors, perhaps the book needs more structure in terms of proceeding from broader questions or issues to answers or findings. Although one may prefer that authors be given a free hand to write as they please, a synthesis of findings or some general conclusions would have enhanced this collective effort. I would have preferred to see Bee's study, which explores the application of Max Weber's theories (*Economy and Society*, 1968) up front in modified form before case studies are introduced, and Castile's cogent examination of symbolism at the end, serving as something akin to a closing chapter. The absence of this sense of order, like the lack of

maps, does not, however, diminish the overall rationale for the volume. To be sure, each of us who edits symposia is bound to see the subject matter somewhat differently.

Imre Sutton

California State University, Fullerton

To Please the Caribou: Painted Caribou-Skin Coats Worn by the Naskapi, Montagnais, and Cree Hunters of the Quebec-Labrador Peninsula. By Dorothy K. Burnham. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992. 314 pages. \$30.00 paper.

This marvelous book is a catalog raisonné of half of all the remaining painted caribou-skin coats in the world. In fact, it describes the sixty most significant of the 120 or so known examples, now found in the museums of Canada, the United States, and Europe. The author is a retired curator of textiles of the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, who started to work there in 1929. This book suits her "background and experience, which combined the history of fashion costume with an abiding interest in native skills" (p. xi). The research for this volume took many years, and the final result is a marvelous culmination of and testimony to her life's work.

The volume opens with well-illustrated chapters entitled "Introduction," "Caribou," "Cut of the Coats," "Sewing," "Quill Wrapping and Beading," "Layout of the Design," "Colours," "Painting Tools," and "Design Motifs." The next two hundred pages constitute the catalog of the coats. The entry for each coat includes its museum location, provenance, probable date, detailed history, and description, with sections on quality, condition, cutting, size, sewing, colors, tools, and design forms, and distribution. Each of the sixty cases is illustrated by a black-and-white photograph and line drawings of the cutting design, the types of painted lines, and all the complex design fields. Thus, this book moves the painted caribou-skin coat from a famous but inconsistently known form of native North American clothing to one of the best described and documented. These coats were collected from about 1700 to the 1930s, with the earlier examples probably coming from the Algonkian cultures in the south of this area (Cree, Montagnais) and the more recent examples—and the only ones known through contemporary ethnographic observations—from