

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Sacajawea's People: The Lemhi Shoshones and the Salmon River Country. By John W. W. Mann.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4qj49090>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 29(2)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Heaton, John W.

**Publication Date**

2005-03-01

**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/>

**Sacajawea's People: The Lemhi Shoshones and the Salmon River Country.** By John W. W. Mann. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. 258 pages. \$24.95 cloth.

In 1999, the US Mint generated controversy when it issued a new one-dollar coin bearing Sacajawea's image to commemorate the approaching Lewis and Clark bicentennial and honor the role of Indians in the nation's history. Some non-Indian critics claimed that the image of an Indian on the coin validated American westward expansion, others that Sacajawea's role in the expedition was exaggerated, and a few pointed to the irony of placing the image of essentially a slave on a coin under the word "Liberty." Less well known was a debate among the people who claim Sacajawea as their own, the Lemhi Shoshones of Idaho. Many expressed displeasure that the coin's image bore the features of another Shoshone ethnic group and that the depiction of Sacajawea's baby in a sling instead of a cradleboard misrepresented their material culture.

This disputatious federal attempt to recognize a Lemhi figure came at a time when the Lemhis were pursuing federal tribal recognition. Both issues form the backdrop of John W. W. Mann's study, *Sacajawea's People: The Lemhi Shoshones and the Salmon River Country*. Mann contends that the government's bungled effort is representative of the problem of Indian identity where it intersects with legal questions over treaty rights and land claims, especially when it pertains to groups trying to acquire official tribal recognition. The Lemhis had signed treaties with the government that created Fort Lemhi Reservation but were pressured to sign a subsequent agreement to cede this land and move to Fort Hall Reservation in 1907. In 1936, they legally became part of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes with Fort Hall's adoption of an Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) constitution. As a result, Lemhis failed to meet two federal criteria for recognition; they lived outside their ancestral home and were members of a recognized tribe.

Tribal definition is a thorny issue. The concept of "tribe" in a legal or political sense is Western rather than indigenous to North America. Moreover, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) defines identity differently than the Census Bureau, which bases it on self-definition, or the Indian Health Service, which uses blood quantum and official enrollment status. Tribal groups often use their own criteria to determine membership, which further clouds the issue. Most important to the Lemhis and this study is the test of continuity; groups that lose tribal identity cannot regain official status. When the Lemhis ceded Fort Lemhi, relocated to Fort Hall, and joined the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, they gave the federal government ample basis to deny recognition. Historical narratives buttressed these arguments because they end with Lemhi relocation to Fort Hall. In addition, popular treatments of the famous Sacajawea tended to subsume or ignore the Lemhi historical experience altogether. Mann argues that federal policy, historical accounts, and popular images "contribute to what can only be termed cultural theft, dispossessing the Lemhi Shoshones of aspects of their ancestry, cultural heritage, and identity" (xix). He aspires to restore the Lemhi voice to help reclaim their identity, tribal status, and part of their homeland. Outsiders deny a distinct Lemhi

culture, but Mann contends that this group's ongoing ties to and battles for the Salmon River country provide evidence to the contrary.

The study draws on various scholarly definitions of identity, but the dominant theme that Mann uses to connect these constructions and topical chapters is the tie between the Lemhis and the Salmon River region. Chapters 1 and 2 treat, respectively, a debate over Lemhi origins in the Salmon River region and the impact of non-Indians on the process of ethnogenesis during the nineteenth century. Those who think that Lemhis lived in the region for a prolonged period assert that access to this relatively rich resource base allowed the formation of a distinct culture and more political cohesion than other Shoshone groups. This Lemhi ethnogenesis culminated during the nineteenth century "within the context of, and partly as a result of, increasing non-Indian settlement" (xxi). As the numbers of non-Indians grew by the 1870s, the Lemhis accepted a reservation in their homeland and settled into a more sedentary and dependent existence. Their unsuccessful efforts to hold on to this small reservation represented the main component of the Fort Lemhi narrative. These chapters cover paths well-trodden by earlier historians. In choosing to rely, for example, on Brigham Madsen's accounts of Lemhi-non-Indian relations, Mann neglects opportunities provided by the administrative record to explore the cultural redefinition that occurred at Fort Lemhi as they adapted to agriculture, a more sedentary life, and opportunities for wage labor. As a result, readers cannot grasp unique aspects of this experience that informed the ongoing processes of identity construction. The gap creates a sense that the Lemhi ethnogenesis reached fruition in the 1870s and that Mann privileges the period as the defining moment of an emerging identity.

Chapters 3 through 5 examine the Lemhi's Fort Hall experience and emphasize how they organized themselves after 1907 to pursue claims against the federal government. Lemhis won an initial claim, but Mann concludes that the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes tried to take their money. The BIA ruled that the Lemhis had a right to the money but refused to distribute it because decades of intermarriage made it impossible to identify Lemhis at Fort Hall. This decision galvanized Lemhis and motivated their pursuit of subsequent court battles with the Indian Claims Commissions (ICC). In the 1960s, the Lemhis emerged as one of four claimants to argue successfully that the government wrongfully seized their lands. They won a \$4.5 million award, but the ICC ruled that all Sho-Ban peoples held a stake in the Lemhi claim, which led to much political wrangling at Fort Hall.

These chapters are considerably stronger than the first two and exhaustively probe the tortuous complexity of ICC cases. They are especially important in how they highlight the problems and contradictions caused by the imposition of Western legal concepts on fluid indigenous societies based historically on kinship and reciprocal resource sharing. Still, the analysis is problematic because Mann does not fully explore nuances in the relations between Lemhis and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. Rather, he perhaps unfairly portrays the Sho-Ban community as thieves that stole the Lemhi minority's birthright. The 475 relocated Lemhis may have been latecomers to Fort Hall in 1907, but this group was one of the largest bands on a reservation

of 1,308 people (before relocation) who also self-identified as members of various tribes and bands. Moreover, Lemhis arrived at Fort Hall just before allotment, so Shoshone-Bannocks received less than half of the expected acreage because they had to share their limited irrigated farmlands with newcomers. Viewed in this light, the costs of Lemhi relocation for the Shoshone-Bannocks complicate notions of fairness in this claims business. The impact of intermarriage between Lemhis and Shoshone-Bannocks also needs more analysis. Mann insists that “despite . . . assimilation” (59) into the Shoshone-Bannock community, the offspring of mixed Indian parentage viewed themselves simply as Lemhi. But intermarriage among peoples organized by kinship also complicates notions of Lemhi identity and requires more scrutiny.

The final two chapters and conclusion consider the twentieth-century presence of Lemhis in Salmon, Idaho, including interethnic friendships forged and tensions that rose and fell over the decades. The small but permanent Lemhi presence, along with a constant stream of visitors from Fort Hall, contributed to the creation of an “Indian village” and a vibrant Native constituency in the community. Lemhis tended the graves of ancestors and utilized subsistence resources as well. Controversy, especially over treaty rights and fishing, erupted in the 1960s and simmered, but after Indians won key court decisions to protect their treaty rights to traditional resources, Lemhi leaders played a significant role in fostering resource management cooperation. Mann concludes by relating ongoing Lemhi efforts to restore federal status and a stake in their ancestral home. He emphasizes the Lemhi strategy to link the effort to Lewis and Clark bicentennial celebrations. These excellent chapters make important contributions to the literature, and Mann is at his best when he describes the ongoing relationship between the Lemhis of Fort Hall and their Salmon country homeland. Here he thoughtfully provides the detail, nuance, and balance lacking in earlier chapters. The extensive interaction between Indians and non-Indians in this localized context is well-documented and engaging. Mann demonstrates the need for further studies of this type and the benefits of scholarly work that emphasizes interethnic dialogues.

On one hand, the strength of these last chapters allows the study to overcome the uneven treatment of topics earlier in the book. But, on the other, Mann’s advocacy undermines his pretensions to offer balanced and unbiased interpretations of empirical evidence. While he makes the case for an ongoing and intimate connection between Lemhis and the Salmon River country, many questions remain unanswered regarding the complexities of Lemhi identity, especially where it intersects with the Shoshone-Bannocks of Fort Hall. Despite such concerns, students of the ICC processes, Indian treaty rights cases, and interethnic dialogue in the twentieth century will find much that is useful and admirable in this book.

*John W. Heaton*  
University of Alaska, Fairbanks