

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Faith in Paper: The Ethnohistory and Litigation of Upper Great Lakes Indian Treaties. By Charles Cleland.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7jr4z32t>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 37(3)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Silvern, Steven E.

**Publication Date**

2013-06-01

**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/>

The final chapter, "Laboring in the City," takes on the notion of stereotype and survival in the poetic works of Chrystos with a particular focus on racialized geographies of indigeneity. According to Rifkin, in Chrystos's poetry "City Indians" are used to track "the fetishizing effects of putting Indianness in motion for non-Native identification and consumption" (236). Inevitably, however, the corporeal manifestation of Chrystos and her representation of bodily experience possess an "underlying, encompassing sovereignty." Rifkin breaks with the highly sexualized narrative usually invoked for analyzing Chrystos's poetry to point to the erotic of place: erotics as the felt threshold of multiple, converging pasts and presents. In this way, we come full circle from the assertion of erotics as a formative metaphor for indigeneity, to a critical assessment of the appropriation of the same formative metaphors. The differences that stand between the felt aspects of sovereignty, and political sovereignty granted by the federal government, are the ways that erotics inherently refuse settlement.

Brian Joseph Gilley  
Indiana University

**Faith in Paper: The Ethnohistory and Litigation of Upper Great Lakes Indian Treaties.** By Charles Cleland. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011. 408 pages. \$95.00 cloth.

The last quarter of the twentieth century witnessed intense political and legal conflict over Indian treaty rights in the Great Lakes region of the United States. In *Faith in Paper: The Ethnohistory and Litigation of Upper Great Lakes Indian Treaties*, ethnohistorian Charles Cleland contributes to and extends the existing scholarship on Indian treaty rights in the upper Great Lakes region. In this book, Cleland demonstrates the importance of ethnohistory—a scholarly discipline that combines historical and anthropological perspectives—in providing the historical and cultural context for understanding recent Indian struggles to gain recognition for treaty rights to land and natural resources in the Upper Great Lakes. Trained as an anthropologist, Cleland became interested in the intersection of anthropology and history in 1975 when asked to work for the Ojibwe as an expert witness in the Indian fishing treaty rights case *United States v. Michigan*.

*Faith in Paper*, however, is not a simple exercise in ethnohistory. Exploring the historical-cultural context of treaty-making with a focus on Native value systems and perspectives, the book also includes the voices and perspectives of lawyers who argued Indian treaty rights cases in the region during the last quarter of the twentieth century, with the ostensible goal of showing the

specific, real-world legal context of Cleland's ethnohistorical work. The result is a book that demonstrates how ethnohistory effectively intersects with legal scholarship, legal interpretation, and legal practice.

*Faith in Paper* is organized into four parts. The four chapters of part 1 provide the reader with an overview of the history of Indian treaty-making. Cleland defines treaty-making as a cultural practice and examines the cultural differences—Euro-American versus Algonquin—that underlie treaty negotiations, different interpretations of treaties, and the legalistic rules defining treaties. Treaty-making, he writes, was favored by Americans because it avoided costly warfare, provided a legalistic basis for acquisition of Indian lands and resources, and promoted “civilization” and assimilation of Indian people. In chapter 3, Cleland focuses on the dynamics of Algonquin cultural systems as key to understanding what perspectives and practices Native people brought to treaty-making. In chapter 4, he turns his attention to the actual process of negotiating treaties, noting how unequal power relations, language barriers, and different cultural understandings shaped the drafting and implementation of treaties. Cleland examines how Indian tribes were defined and incorporated into the American political system, and how treaties have been interpreted in the American law/court system according to specific rules or canons of construction that are supposed to take into account (though often did not) Native interpretations and understanding of treaties. Part 1 of *Faith in Paper* could be read on its own and used in the classroom to introduce students to Indian treaty-making.

Parts 2 and 3 are really the heart of the book. In these sections, Cleland examines in detail the specific nineteenth-century Great Lakes Indian treaty provisions related to off-reservation usufructuary rights and the permanence of reservations and their boundaries. His goal is to place the Indian treaty-making process and the Native understandings of the meaning of specific treaty provisions into cultural context. Cleland's ethnohistorical account of each nineteenth-century treaty is accompanied by a chapter written by a lawyer(s) who argued the tribe's case for either continued existence of the off-reservation rights or the continued existence of the tribe's reservation and reservation boundaries.

In part 2 the focus is on the question of the permanent or temporary nature of Indian off-reservation hunting, fishing and gathering rights in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Cleland demonstrates how the tribes and federal government came to the negotiations speaking different languages and with different understandings of what usufructuary rights were being negotiated. Tribes believed their rights to hunt, fish, and gather on ceded lands were permanent, while the federal government and states viewed them as temporary, or at least limited by changing geographical conditions. In four

chapters, Cleland writes about the Indian treaty rights cases litigated in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, three major and one minor: *United States v. Michigan, Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Chippewa Indians v. Voigt, Mille Lacs Ojibwe v. Minnesota*, and the lesser known case of *Menominee v. Thompson*.

The discussion of the Ojibwe treaty rights cases will be familiar to historians and legal scholars who have studied Indian treaty rights and the importance of negotiation records, published court decisions, and unpublished court briefs filed in these cases. Cleland's narrative brings these materials together in a coherent narrative with an emphasis on the tribes' understanding of the treaties. This part of the book focuses on two sets of treaties the United States negotiated with the Great Lakes Ojibwe. Cleland emphasizes how Indians understood their hunting and fishing rights as permanent and restricted, or modified only by changing conditions such as their misbehavior or expansion of non-Indian settlement. The chapters written by the lead attorneys involved in these twentieth-century treaty rights cases describe the arguments and claims of the state and the tribes, the court cases that preceded and influenced the current case, and the current status of any ongoing litigation or negotiations between state and tribes over the exercise of the treaty rights.

In part 3, Cleland examines lesser-known treaty litigation dealing with the issue of the permanency of Indian reservation boundaries established by treaties and the impacts of assimilationist policies such as allotment in severalty on the continuing existence of the reservation. The issue in the cases discussed in this section is whether the reservation had been disestablished or diminished by acts of Congress following the initial treaty establishing the reservation. While a conventional approach would focus solely on congressional intent, Cleland's focus is on examining what tribal members understood the treaty to mean in relation to their reservation. Cleland's ethnohistorical approach demonstrates that the tribes understood their reserves as permanent homes; in each case he documents the tribes' continuing understanding that their reservations and its boundaries continued to exist despite allotment of reservation lands or extension of state jurisdiction over tribal lands. In the case of the Keweenaw Bay Ojibwe in Michigan, the tribe's understanding was that the reservation and its boundaries would persist despite allotment of lands to non-Indians. In the case of the Stockbridge-Munsee, Cleland studies in detail the 1856 treaty creating their reservation and whether tribal members understood that their reservation had been disestablished or diminished by a subsequent act of Congress that resulted in the sale of much of the tribe's lands. Other cases include the permanence of the boundary of the Mille Lacs Ojibwe reservation in Minnesota and *Keweenaw Bay v. Naftaly*, which concerned the impact of allotment on the state's powers to tax land within the

reservation. The federal district court and appeals court, employing the canons of construction, agreed with the tribe's line of reasoning.

Part 4 contains one chapter detailing what Cleland considers the positive and long-lasting outcomes of the Great Lakes Indian treaty rights litigation, finding a changed economic and political landscape. Tribal sovereignty on-reservation has been enhanced and tribes are now recognized by states as cooperative partners in the management of natural resources on off-reservation ceded lands. In multiple ways, tribes and states now engage in government-to-government relations, a relationship that would not have been imagined before or during the litigation of many of these treaty rights cases some twenty-five years ago.

For students and scholars, *Faith in Paper* is an incredible resource for the study of the legal and cultural history of Indian treaties in the Upper Great Lakes. Cleland's introductory chapters serve as an excellent primer on Indian treaties. His use of documentary evidence and his contextual, ethnohistorical methodology serve as a model for the scholarly and legal interpretation of the meaning and the continuing relevance of treaties for both Indian and non-Indian communities. For scholars studying nineteenth-century Great Lakes Indian history, he provides an exemplary narrative on how Native people understood the treaty-making period and the events following the treaty era into the late nineteenth century. Missing from his discussion is the persistence of the tribes' understandings of their treaty rights from 1900 to the period of the court cases for which he provided expert testimony in the 1970s and 1980s. As a result, we jump from the nineteenth-century court cases to the twentieth-century cases without reference to or accounting for the tribes' continued efforts to exercise and protect their treaty rights against federal and state opposition.

*Faith in Paper* is unique in coupling Cleland's ethnohistorical narrative with chapters on treaty rights litigation written by the lead attorneys working for the tribes. These chapters provide an excellent entry point for students and scholars to begin their own study of the history of Great Lakes treaty rights litigation, summarizing the arguments and judicial decisions. They do not, however, add much that is new to our understanding of the tribes' legal theories or strategies; the discussion replicates what is already in the public record or in legal studies of treaty rights cases. One would have liked more insight into the development of the tribes' legal strategy and theory. Of course, it may be too demanding to ask lawyers, in what is still a litigious arena, to reveal potential future legal theories and strategies.

Despite these minor shortcomings, *Faith in Paper: The Ethnohistory and Litigation of Upper Great Lakes Indian Treaties* is a significant contribution to the study of Indian treaty rights in the Great Lakes. Well written and

researched, Charles Cleland provides a wonderful example of the kind of nuanced, ethnohistorical approach necessary not only to appreciate fully contentious legal issues such as Indian treaty rights, but to understand Indian history more deeply in general.

*Steven E. Silvern*  
Salem State University

**Forced to Abandon Our Fields: The 1914 Clay Southworth Gila River Pima Interviews.** By David H. DeJong. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2011. 192 pages. \$34.95 paper.

When contact was made with early Spanish explorers and missionaries, the Gila River Pimans (Akimel O'odham) had established farming communities along the Gila River. At the time that early American fur trappers and military units were traveling in the same area along the Gila, they also encountered thriving agricultural communities. The Akimel O'odham provided food supplies to American military units that were involved in the preparations for the war with Mexico in the 1840s. By the turn of the twentieth century, this had all changed; the Akimel O'odham had lost most of their irrigation water.

In this important new book, David DeJong, project manager of the Pima-Maricopa Irrigation Project, tells the story of how this happened through the words of Akimel O'odham elders. The book provides a Native voice as part of the historical documentation of the collapse of the Akimel O'odham agricultural system and the effort to stave off disaster. DeJong documents the loss of water through upstream diversions from the Gila River in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, which left many Akimel O'odham near starvation and transformed the Akimel O'odham from self-sufficient successful farmers to dependents of the United States government. Many voices were raised about this injustice, prompting the United States Irrigation Services to assign a young engineer named Clay Southworth to oversee an adjudication of the Gila River Piman water rights in 1914. During this process, Southworth interviewed thirty-four Akimel O'odham elders and farmers, who provide a rich and detailed narrative of the cultural history of farming and water loss along the Gila River in the late nineteenth century. These rediscovered interviews form the core of this remarkable book; it includes an epilogue that carries the story of Akimel O'odham water rights into the twenty-first century.

In the introduction, DeJong summarizes the events leading to the establishment of the 1914 survey led by Southworth to investigate the water rights problems facing the Akimel O'odham. The author presents a June 1900