

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Seeing Red—Hollywood’s Pixeled Skins: American Indians and Film.
Edited by LeAnne Howe, Harvey Markovitz, and Denise K. Cummings.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7ht4r9bt>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 38(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Bourdeaux, Clementine

Publication Date

2014-09-01

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/>

would have had to acknowledge that Native peoples had their own legitimate interests to protect, yet little or no concern was given to the concerns of the Indians.

But Native communities persevered to the fullest extent of their considerable diplomatic skills to preserve their self-governing autonomy and land tenure. These two core components lay at the heart of their long legal struggle with the federal government. Either by “touching the pen” or walking away from treaty councils in disgust, they gave notice of their desire to stay exclusively on reserved tribal lands and demanded protection from unwanted intruders, along with fair compensation for the land taken from them. Indian treaty-signers believed that by adhering to peaceful relations and the rule of law, their sovereign legal status and land title would be upheld by the United States. Yet their modest terms conflicted directly with the expansionist desires of European-American settlement.

Deloria Jr.’s “The Subject Nobody Knows” laments that despite a profusion of books on Native American Indian legal rights, “it seems peculiar in the extreme that scholars did not jump at the opportunity to do a book on Indian treaties until the present time.” While every treaty has its own complex story to tell, the ones selected by Calloway remind us that each one is notable because even if it was unfair, fraudulent, or violated, it created a government-to-government relationship between the United States and an American Indian nation. This is why Native peoples have consistently asserted to this day that through their treaty relationship the United States has explicitly recognized their inherent sovereign status and accompanying legal rights. With this book, the history of American Indian treaties should no longer be “the subject nobody knows.”

John M. Shaw

Portland Community College

Recognition, Sovereignty Struggles, and Indigenous Rights in the United States: A Sourcebook. Edited by Amy E. Den Ouden and Jean M. O’Brien. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013. 368 pages. \$75.00 cloth; \$26.95 paper; e-book \$175.00.

Why does recognition matter? This question is at the heart of this collection edited by Amy E. Den Ouden and Jean M. O’Brien, and *Recognition, Sovereignty Struggles, and Indigenous Rights in the United States: A Sourcebook* compels the reader to begin thinking of the multiplicity of possible responses. One of the most contentious and pressing matters facing tribal peoples in

the United States is the struggle over recognition, or legal acknowledgment, of their sovereign status by the federal government. Not necessarily good or bad, recognition should instead be understood as a complicated process with varying and uncertain outcomes. The examples provided in this instructive text make it clear that struggles for recognition are circumstantial, particularly the administrative federal acknowledgment process. Each tribal group that petitions, including those that have petitioned unsuccessfully, has a unique story to tell. For readers unfamiliar with the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Office of Federal Acknowledgment, the federal acknowledgment process, or the differences in legal status among Native Americans, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians, the essays in *Recognition* present crucial context and historical background.

The contributors, both Native and non-Native scholars in fields spanning history, anthropology, law, and political science, give forceful accounts of the diverse factors affecting contemporary struggles for federal recognition. All have taken up issues of federal recognition in their work, and thus the nuances of federal recognition these experienced scholars reveal add depth to ongoing debates and musings on the process. Each of the volume's three sections—"Race, Identity, and Recognition," "State and Federal Recognition in New England," and "Contemporary Recognition Controversies"—contains essays that speak to the continuing struggles of unrecognized and state-recognized tribes. To focus primarily on these tribal groups shifts the dominant conversations occurring throughout Indian country toward indigenous American communities which, because of their legal status, are often overlooked. The editors and contributors draw on seminal texts addressing the politics of recognition by authors including Mark E. Miller, Brian Klopotek, Jack Campisi, Jessica Cattelino, and Vine Deloria, Jr., to name but a few.

Deconstructing the federal acknowledgment process (FAP) and its implications for contemporary indigenous groups, the featured authors critically analyze the seven mandatory criteria that are the basis of this bureaucratic process. These mandatory criteria apply a generalized format to all "potential" tribes that offers little room for historical specificities, one of the major shortcomings that have been a consistent complaint of tribal groups involved in the recognition process. As Angela A. Gonzalez and Timothy Q. Evans point out, "the FAP has supplanted the diverse tribal histories, cultures, and customs of Indian groups seeking legal recognition with a simplified and standardized process and criteria to make these groups legible as Indian tribes" (38). *Recognition, Sovereignty Struggles, and Indigenous Rights* compellingly shows how non-federally recognized tribal groups across the nation complicate and negotiate their (non)sovereign status by using creative ways of asserting their presence and identities as indigenous peoples, highlighting these tribes' agency. Hence, the federal government's refusal to acknowledge some tribal groups

does not mean that sovereignty is nonexistent for unrecognized tribes; it is inherent, and tribal peoples continually work through and against their legal classifications.

As widely noted throughout the various essays, in addition to the formal government-to-government relationship and access to federal resources that sovereign status provides, tribal recognition by the federal government signifies the affirmation of a “legitimate” Indian identity. The essays in the “Race, Identity, and Recognition” section critically examine how factors such as race and authenticity come to bear on identity and the recognition process. Joanne Barker’s essay, “The Recognition of NAGPRA: A Human Rights Promise Deferred,” shows that the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act, while lauded by many, actually “repositions native legal standing and rights under federal plenary power” (102). Drawing on NAGPRA’s language, Barker argues that where the act refuses repatriation based on federal recognition status, indigenous human rights are weakened. This section also contains an immensely helpful guide to state recognition by K. Alexa Koenig and Jonathan Stein. Their valuable survey of state-recognized tribes and state recognition processes is one of the first “systematic efforts to survey, categorize, and analyze the complexity of state recognition of American Indian tribes” (115).

Part 2 focuses on New England tribes that face recognition disputes that are due in large part to colonial histories. Because “New England stands as emblematic of the controversy over contemporary recognition,” reaffirming the pivotal role of Northeast tribes is essential (24). For critics of the FAP’s seven mandatory criteria, and, more broadly, the Office of Federal Acknowledgment, Rae Gould’s “The Nipmuc Nation, Federal Acknowledgment, and a Case of Mistaken Identity” shows how the BIA’s reliance on outside sources and archival material can be detrimental to petitioning tribes. By focusing on “objective” sources from the past, the BIA reinscribes narratives of erasure and vanishing as it uses flawed historical documents to deny tribal continuity of the Nipmuc Nation, as well as other tribes in New England.

The third section, “Contemporary Recognition Controversies,” imparts timely examples of contemporary tribal groups that are affected by the FAP. Coauthors Les W. Field, Alan Leventhal, and Rosemary Cambra speak precisely about the issues facing many California tribes, and in particular the Muwekma Ohlones of the San Francisco Bay Area. To reclaim their presence in the landscape and assert their identity as Native American peoples, the Muwekma struggle to reconcile the impact of Spanish/Mexican/American colonial empires and skewed discourses of anthropology with the lives of contemporary Ohlone people, who were denied federal recognition through the administrative process.

While useful solely for the immense amount of information and perspectives provided, the authors and editors of *Recognition, Sovereignty Struggles, and Indigenous Rights* offer “teachable” essays. Any and all of the essays have the potential to strengthen course syllabi and facilitate discussion around these complicated issues. Educators and students alike can learn from the numerous examples, histories, and interdisciplinary case studies. Even as courses in Native American studies hone in on topics such as sovereignty, they often leave out the experiences of unrecognized and state-recognized tribes. The efforts of many non-federally recognized communities may continue to go unnoticed if such discussions are left out of the classroom and knowledge of their situation is not disseminated to a larger public. Whether or not they are from federally recognized tribes, it would be beneficial for students of indigenous heritage to learn more about the US federalist system, the politics of sovereignty, Native identity, and the implications of federal Indian law and policy.

Recognition, Sovereignty Struggles, and Indigenous Rights in the United States concedes that, other than recognition, there are few options available for unrecognized tribes to gain political influence affirmed by the federal government. Looking to the future, many questions and issues about the federal acknowledgment process need to be considered. Should the process be modified? Should it be removed completely? What is the alternative to knowing “what” or “who” an Indian tribe is? Should that matter, and to whom? Grappling with these questions and obtaining perspectives from unrecognized tribes and tribal members themselves is the first step in this longer struggle towards Indian rights and sovereignty in the contemporary United States. *Recognition* is composed in this vein and for readers both experienced and new to the topic, its pages are filled with insights that truly convey why recognition matters.

Olivia Chilcote

University of California, Berkeley

Seeing Red—Hollywood’s Pixeled Skins: American Indians and Film. Edited by LeAnne Howe, Harvey Markovitz, and Denise K. Cummings. Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2013. 180 pages. \$29.95 paper; \$23.95 electronic.

To quote Sherman Alexie’s 1998 film *Smoke Signals*, “The only thing more pathetic than Indians on TV is Indians watching Indians on TV.” If so, it may follow that the only thing more pathetic than writing reviews of American Indian films is American Indian scholars writing reviews of American Indian films. However, *Seeing Red—Hollywood’s Pixeled Skins* does not support