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Indigenous Peoples, American Federalism, and the Supreme Court

by David E. Wilkins

A s America breathes a sigh of relief in the afterglow of the pyrotechnics associated with the first post-September 11 July 4, pondering its global status as the leading agent in its self-proclaimed “War on Terrorism,” and its domestic situation with a “War on Federalism” raging between the Supreme Court’s redefined notion of states’ rights and federal authority, it seems a propitious time to ask where indigenous nations fit in this warlike atmosphere, given that the history of Indian/U.S. relations involved a fair amount of war-related activities.

The battle fronts today include, but are not limited to, gaming, recognition of new tribes, water rights, taxation, trust fund (mis)administration, and sacred sites...

...Federalism... developed before many First Nations entered as their political and military power gradually waned. But this weakening had not developed before many First Nations entered into hundreds of ratified treaties and agreements with the U.S. between 1775 and 1912.

Such diplomatic arrangements affirmed the inherently sovereign political character of aboriginal nations even as their geographic and economic independence gradually revealed peoples who had assumed a beneficiary status in relation to their federal trustee.

As the federal government intensified its coercive assimilation campaign against Native peoples in the nineteenth century, with the express goals of individualizing communally held lands, Christianizing Indian souls, and enfranchising Indian citizens, substantial, if inconsistent, federal and state recognition of tribal sovereignty continued in the form of federal case law, sporadic enforcement of the trust doctrine, and state disclaimer clauses (with eleven western states declaring in their organic acts and constitutions that they would forever disclaim jurisdiction over Indian property and persons) confirming that tribal governing powers were not generally subject to the U.S. Constitution.

Tribal fortunes since the founding of the U.S. have frequently hinged on how the balancing contest between the states and the federal government have played out. From the Articles of Confederation to the Indian gaming and recognition controversies of today, the subunit governments of the U.S. have frequently vied with the federal and tribal governments for jurisdictional control of Native peoples, lands, and resources.

First Nations are often frustrated by the repeated federal and state claims of political dominance over their people and resources, but insist on maintaining the nation-to-nation political relationship secured by the treaty process and sustained by the trust doctrine with the federal government.

Such an insistence has proven difficult to sustain in the wake of the Rehnquist Court’s recently concluded term where its judicial clarity and hope that it is upheld...