

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

A Fateful Time: The Background and Legislative History of the Indian Reorganization Act. By Elmer R. Rusco.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5wd5960j>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 26(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Clemmer, Richard O.

Publication Date

2002

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/>

romance of the main Euro-Canadian characters. Such ridiculous popular music was long recognized in the non-Native public imagination as an aural image representing Native peoples. In addition, dancers in the film perform an outlandishly choreographed corn festival in which it is impossible to understand from the mixture of icons which culture, besides Euro-American, is being represented. In *The Sun Dance Opera* Zitkala-Ša adapts her version of a Western art form to her own purposes, perhaps adding European elements, such as a witch legend, to suit her own narrative purposes. The opera, like the adaptations of her stories, was intended, perhaps, to communicate the richness of indigenous culture in a form non-Native people would appreciate.

In the section on Zitkala-Ša's stories, Hafen invites a comparison between a text "Squirrel Man and His Double," translated by Bonnin, and a text "The Witch Woman," adapted by Bonnin. Besides including thirteen other stories with literary, historical, and biographical notes and adding Zitkala-Ša's own notes, the inclusion of the translation and adaptation allows the reader insight into her writing processes, for Zitkala-Ša is not merely a translator but an artist who can perform her own translations. The variation of styles among the stories is worth further study, as Hafen notes, and the early poetry included here is also part of an emerging picture of Bonnin's evolution as a writer and political activist.

This collection is most welcome by scholars of Native literature, particularly those devoted to early twentieth century writers. However, the presentation of these newly published works also makes them valuable to the novice student or reader. Hafen does not revise or step back from her findings. Her inclusive approach is admirable and may inspire more collections of early writers whose works and lives may be controversial in some way. It would be helpful to scholars and readers to see a volume of John Oskison's (Cherokee) short stories presented in such a manner or the essays and book reviews of Todd Downing (Choctaw). Jane Hafen's edition of Zitkala-Ša's stories, poems, and opera should inspire more scholars to look for treasure in the archives.

Melissa Hearn

Northern Michigan University

A Fateful Time: The Background and Legislative History of the Indian Reorganization Act. By Elmer R. Rusco. Reno: University of Nevada Press. 2000. 363 pages. \$44.95 cloth.

Using the Wheeler-Howard File in the National Archives Building, as well as the Central Classified Files of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Elmer Rusco adds considerably to an understanding of just how the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) was crafted. Rusco assumes that political ideologies play important roles in determining historic events. This concentration on ideology reveals that two ideologies guided non-Indians' thinking about Indians: the assimilationist ideology and the termination ideology. Following Lewis Meriam's 800-page devastatingly critical report on the state of Indian affairs in 1928, the bureau

hastily developed a third alternative: the reformist ideology. But following Roosevelt's electoral landslide and the coattail effect that changed the political configuration of Congress, the reformist approach was doomed: "The sea change initiated by the 1932 national election made it possible to pass a major statute changing Indian policy in several fields" (p. 282); "Collier thought that the unusual situation existing in 1933-1934 offered the possibility of enacting almost anything and might not occur again" (p. 191). That "anything" was the fourth political ideology that would become the hallmark of Collier's Indian New Deal: the Tribal Alternative.

However, Rusco's work casts doubt on the degree to which Collier actually had a concrete plan for implementing the "tribal alternative," or even what it actually was. Rusco refers from time to time to Kenneth Philp's *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform, 1920-1954* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1977) and on occasion to John Collier's autobiography, *From Every Zenith* (Denver: Sage, 1963). Perhaps the most astonishing departure from Philp's interpretation of Collier, and his assumption that Collier's own interpretation of himself is essentially reliable, is Rusco's revelation that Collier *did not* craft the IRA. Although Rusco expresses his own disbelief that Collier would "let anything as important as a bill that . . . would reform . . . Indian policy move forward without his active knowledge and support," Rusco's work argues for the probability that Collier's input was minimal (p. 194).

Rusco documents several events that argue for this interpretation. First, although the most salient and permanent legacy of the IRA seems to be the creation of tribal councils as the only governments sanctioned by the US government to represent Indians, as late as 1929, when Collier was heavily involved in trying to influence Indian affairs on a national level, "it is doubtful that Collier had yet fully worked out the tribal alternative he would later advocate" (p. 104). In fact, several times before his appointment Collier reported believing that a great many, even most, Indian societies no longer had viable, functioning governments, and largely subscribed to the "vacuum theory," that is, that there was a political vacuum on most reservations, with the Bureau of Indian Affairs being the only entity that could step in and fill it. Rusco contrasts Collier's opinion with what Rusco calls "judge-made law," or interpretations of legal traditions, treaties, and statutes that federal judges used to settle legal disputes regarding Indians in US courts. The "judge-made law" assumed the unbroken continuance of Indian governance that still wielded authority that Native Americans had never surrendered.

Second, proposals to fill that vacuum with Indian governance did not come from Collier until 1933. In fact, a number of actions at the height of the allotment-assimilationist period, perplexingly, seem to have anticipated the inevitability of the persistence of Indian governance, including a statute enacted in 1891 requiring that "where lands are occupied by Indians who have bought and paid for the same, and which lands are not needed for farming or agricultural purposes, and are not desired for individual allotments, the same may be leased by authority of the council speaking for such Indians" (p. 6). This was the statute requiring creation of the Navajo Tribal Council in

1922 to approve oil leases, because the bureau could not do it unilaterally on its own. In the same year, 1922, the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs actually considered a bill that would have required proposed legislation to “be submitted to Indian councils” for approval (p. 125). The bureau opposed the bill and it was defeated.

Third, the idea of tribal councils as governing institutions was not proposed from the Collier camp until 1932, and it did not come from Collier himself: it came from the American Civil Liberties Union’s Collier Indian Rights Committee, chaired by Nathan Margold and arguably established at Collier’s behest. Margold would be appointed solicitor for the Interior Department early in 1933. In 1932, North Dakota Senator Frazier introduced a “tribal council” bill as part of Collier’s agenda. On 25 percent petition, election could be held to draw up a constitution. Department of Interior authority would be transferred to the tribal governments. The BIA opposition defeated it (p. 168). The fact that the idea of “tribal councils” did not spring full-blown from Collier’s head and that it did not become part of his agenda until after establishment of the ACLU’s Indian Rights committee argues strongly for the “tribal council” idea being the product of Nathan Margold’s legal mind.

Finally, there is Collier’s revisionist view of himself and his own history. In 1933, Collier, with Matthew K. Sniffen of the Indian Rights Association and Lewis Meriam, drafted four letters to Congress. “In 1940,” says Rusco, “Collier remembered these letters as embodying ‘the complete basis for the Indian Reorganization Act.’ . . . Kenneth Philp has also asserted that the Wheeler-Howard Act ‘stemmed, in part, from these proposals.’ . . . This is a serious misunderstanding,” claims Rusco. “The letters . . . did not mention several key proposals made by the Collier administration when it presented to Congress the measure that became the IRA. . . . It is clear that the letters did not support any effort to revitalize Native American governments. . . . They were not in any sense a blueprint for the IRA” (p. 107).

What was, then, the blueprint for the IRA? Surprisingly, Rusco makes it clear that the very lengthy, rambling Wheeler-Howard Bill, lacking any basic definitions such as *Indian* and *tribe*, was not the blueprint. Also a surprise is Senator Wheeler’s relationship to this initial draft, and especially that he adamantly opposed certain parts of it and thus was not going to let it pass. Then, “Senator Wheeler met in secret with Assistant Commissioner Zimmerman and told him what provisions of the bill he would accept and which ones he would not” (p. 254). It was this “secret summit” that produced the IRA that Wheeler supported and pushed through.

Also a surprise is that “Representative Howard’s sole identifiable contribution . . . was . . . that the bill contain a provision stating that it would not apply to any society that had voted against it” (p. 286). Despite the fact that Collier and Congress had elicited Indians’ opinions on the draft Wheeler-Howard Bill (and were taken aback that reaction was initially negative, although eventually positive following Collier’s hastily called “Indian congresses” in 1933 in different locations in the country), Howard’s insistence on this provision marked the first time that Indians would systematically have the

option of determining just what policies would apply to them. And this was not Collier's idea. (In fact, the logistics of determining "eligible voters" and holding the referenda caused Collier a great deal of consternation and anxiety: What if the Indians rejected the IRA?)

Rusco's analysis supports the impression given by Lawrence Kelly in his biography of Collier, *The Assault on Assimilation: John Collier and the Origins of Indian Policy Reform* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1983) and by Stephen Kunitz in his short but pithy article, "The Social Philosophy of John Collier" (*Ethnohistory* 18, number 3: 213–229): that John Collier was a very complex individual with a strong drive toward social reform but an equally strong commitment to philosophical mysticism as a guide to action. However, at times, Rusco's critical eye wanders and blinks a little. For example, he asserts that, following approval of the IRA, when BIA consultants fanned out over Indian Country to promote constitution-writing and formation of tribal councils, they did not use any sort of "model constitution" (p. 301). Rusco goes on to note that, "Of 499 'Indian entities' recognized by the national government, only 280 (59%) had 'formally approved organic documents'" as of 1981. "Less than half of all the societies (45%) had constitutions drawn up under . . . the IRA or the similar statute pertaining to Oklahoma." This is quite true, but it also should be noted that nearly a quarter of the "tribes" that voted on the IRA were populations attached to "rancherias" in California. Rarely did the rancherias exceed a few acres apiece and the populations attached to them was usually well under a hundred. The fact that most do not have written constitutions probably has more to do with demographics than anything else. A similar argument could be made for a number of Alaska villages, some of which do have constitutions, which do evince remarkable similarities.

Equally, Rusco devotes only one paragraph to trying to put Collier into a larger context. Rusco speculates that the "tribal alternative"—which Collier did not originate but which was clearly "out there"—might be because of the Progressive Era—from 1900 to World War I—and the push for democracy that characterized that era: direct election of senators, initiative, referendum, and recall established in a number of states. But equally important might be the women's suffrage and women's rights movements, as well as the "radical lifestyle" movement that was developing as early as the 1890s in Greenwich Village in New York and in which Mabel Dodge, who introduced Collier to Indian problems, indulged. In all fairness, it must be noted that Rusco's purpose was not to accomplish a social history or to scrutinize the implementation of the IRA. However, it might be hoped that next, Elmer Rusco will turn his meticulous and careful methodology to finding and analyzing documents that would explain just why and how the writing of constitutions and formation of tribal councils happened, and just what the bureau's role in the process was.

Richard O. Clemmer
University of Denver