American Indian Policy in the Twentieth Century
the IRA continued to remain the most important organization to which Indian and non-Indian people could turn for redress of grievances. Hagan has written a valuable contribution to the field. The Indian Rights Association should be required reading for all students of Indian and white relations.
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Scholars interested in the study of American Indian policy have been actively pushing their research into the twentieth century in an attempt to understand the position of Native Americans in the country today. As with any neglected area of research, the rush to fill the perceived void is often filled with works of uneven quality. Such is the case with *American Indian Policy in the Twentieth Century*, edited by prolific writer Vine Deloria, Jr., and containing selections by eleven authors, including Deloria, on various topics relating to the results of contemporary Indian policy. Instead of writing from the position of the “high ideal” of congressional intent, Deloria stressed in his introduction that this book examines the implementation of government policy at the more obscure reservation level where Indian people are directly affected and as such, this is an admirable venture into understanding twentieth-century Indian policy.

As editor, Deloria stated that the “study of government policy, at any level, is best done by hindsight” (3). Yet, no historians, those trained researchers of the past, authored any of these essays; instead, the authors primarily represent the fields of political science, sociology, and law. The essays in this book reflect these diverse academic backgrounds and vary from the short “American Indian Policy: An Overview,” by Joyotpal Chaudhuri, to Deloria’s lengthy “The Evolution of Federal Indian Policy Making.” In addition to general essays, specific studies are included such as Mary Wallace’s article titled “The Supreme Court and Indian Water Rights,” and John Petroskey’s work “Indians and the First Amendment.”

Fred L. Ragsdale, Jr., wrote an insightful essay entitled “The Deception of Geography.” A lawyer by profession, Ragsdale carefully traced the recent legal theory which suggests that tribes residing in Indian country which have historically been defined from a geographical perspective are seen more and more as political entities. This change is significant in that it is easier for courts or Congress to diminish the tri-
Bal sovereignty of a political entity than that of a geographical entity. Ragsdale noted that the "real resource that a tribe has is its power as a government," (79) and to maintain its power, it is important for tribes to carefully weigh the loss of additional political status before entering into jurisdictional litigation with states or the federal government.

In addition to Ragsdale’s essay and following Deloria’s emphasis on the effects of Indian policy on Indian people, Daniel McCool studied the historical attempts of local governments to disenfranchise Indian people. He also examined Indian voting patterns. McCool concluded that in many states, Indian participation in non-Indian elections has been crucial and has meant the difference between success or defeat for many politicians. One area that he failed to address, however, is the unique campaign techniques required for a non-Indian candidate to get those crucial but elusive Indian votes. In Sioux country, for instance, successful candidates have won the local community by holding feasts before addressing Indian voters.

Although some authors were able to follow the book’s intent, and the essays for the most part are strong, several errors of fact exist. In Michael Lacy’s essay, “The United States and American Indians: Political Relations,” he traced the American Indian’s adoption into the United States government. Lacy improperly claimed that in 1933 one-third of the BIA’s classified workers were Indian. Yet the material footnoted does not mention the BIA but indicates that only one half of the openings in the Emergency Conservation Work force were filled by Indians and in June, 1934, only one half of the ECW supervisors were Indian. Tom Holm’s article, “The Crisis in Tribal Government,” views the 1973 confrontation at Wounded Knee as “a good example of this traditional/nontraditional conflict,” (137) which stems from the adoption of a non-Indian department-approved IRA constitution in 1936 that alienated the traditional elements on the reservation. The politics among people on the Pine Ridge Reservation are deeper than that. These differences existed before the approved IRA constitution of 1936 because the Pine Ridge people adopted constitutions in 1921 and 1928 and submitted a revised constitution in 1933 to the Office of Indian Affairs. Long before the IRA, political factions were operating on the Pine Ridge.

Mary Wallace, in her essay “The Supreme Court and Indian Water Rights,” supported the argument that the United States reserved water rights for the tribes. That position falls into the guardian/ward premise that John Marshall described in 1831. A stronger argument for tribal sovereignty would take the position that tribes have inherent rights and, therefore, have reserved for themselves water on their reservations through treaties. In short, tribes act directly in their own behalf.
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and are not dependent on the federal government to negotiate for them.

Despite these differences of opinion, Deloria presented a work that has good ideas for future research. Overall, this book will be valuable both to those trying to understand Native American reactions to Indian policy in the twentieth century and to those individuals seeking another work on the nation’s high ideals. It is a book whose time has come.
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