Click Here



```
The main goals of Indian reservations were to bring Native Americans under U.S. government control, minimize conflict between Indians and settlers and encourage Native Americans to take on the ways of the white man. What is the main purpose of the reservation system? Overview. The Indian reservation system was created to keep Native
Americans off of lands that European Americans wished to settle. The reservation system allowed indigenous people to govern themselves and to maintain some of their cultural and social traditions. How do you research Native Americans wished to settle. The reservation system allowed indigenous people to govern themselves and to maintain some of their cultural and social traditions. How do you research Native Americans wished to settle.
Has a vast online library, Tracing Native American Family Roots. www.ncai.org/tribal-directory Provides the online tribal directory where contact information for specific tribes can be found. Why do you think the federal government has forced Native Americans to assimilate into mainstream American culture? The policy of assimilation was an
attempt to destroy traditional Indian cultural identities. Many historians have argued that the U.S. government believed that if American Indians as the government failed to
keep its promises. The nomadic tribes were unable to follow the buffalo, and conflict among the tribes increased, as the tribes competed with each other for fewer resources. What was the purpose of the Dawes Act? The desired effect of the Dawes Act? The desired effect of the Dawes Act was to get Native Americans to farm and ranch like white homesteaders. An
explicit goal of the Dawes Act was to create divisions among Native Americans and eliminate the social cohesion of tribes. What is the meaning of reservation system? Reservation system? Reservation system? Reservation system? Reservation system means the method or arrangement which purchasers are required to utilize in order to reservation system?
are advantages of reservations? What are the advantages of using a central reservation system? Better customer relationship. Synchronization of information. Increases flexibility and efficiency. Saves time and money. Keeping track of reservations. Ease of use and secure payment. What is the origin of the Native American? The ancestors of living
Native Americans arrived in what is now the United States at least 15,000 years ago, possibly much earlier, from Asia via Beringia. A vast variety of peoples, societies and cultures subsequently developed. Most Native Americans live in small towns or rural areas. Why do we celebrate Native Americans live in small towns or rural areas.
American Heritage Month? The month is a time to celebrate rich and diverse cultures, traditions, and histories and to acknowledge the important contributions of Native people," according to the National Congress of American Indians. How did the government treat the natives? To Americans, the history includes both treating Native American tribes
as equals and exiling them from their homes. The new U.S. government was thus free to acquire Native American lands by treaty or force. Resistance from the tribes stopped the encroachment of settlers, at least for a while. How and why did federal
policy toward Indian people change in the decades following the Civil War? It caused federal officers to end tribal rule and bring Indians into American mainstream. Geographical isolation managed to preserve tribes, but a plan for permanent Indian territory fell apart. Land managed by Native American nations under the United States Bureau of
Indian Affairs This article is about Native American reservations in the United States of America. For similar entities in Canada, see Indian reserve (disambiguation). Not to be confused with Reservation in India. Indian reservations Also known as: Domestic dependent nations Category Political
divisionsLocationUnited StatesCreated1758 (Brotherton)-PresentNumber326[1]PopulationsAbout 1 million (total)[2][3] Largest: Navajo Nation (165,158)[4]Areas1.32 acres (0.53 ha) (Cemetery of the Pit River Tribe in California) - 27,413 sq mi (71,000 km2) (Navajo Nation Reservation located in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)[1] This article is part
of a series on Political divisions of the United States First level State (Commonwealth) Federal district Territory (Commonwealth) Indian reservation (list) / Hawaiian home land / Alaska Native tribal entity / Pueblo / Off-reservation trust land / Tribal Jurisdictional Area Second level County / Parish / Borough Unorganized Borough / Census area / Villages
/ District (USVI) / District (AS) Consolidated city-county Independent city Municipality (PR) Unorganized atoll Third level Township Cities, towns, and villages Coterminous municipality Census-designated place Barrio Chapter State-recognized tribes Fourth level Ward Other areas Protected areas (Conservation district, National monument, National
park) Congressional district Special district Special district (school district) Homeowner associated states Military base Federal enclave Unincorporated area Ghost town United States portalvte An American Indian reservation is an area of land held and government. The
reservation's government is autonomous but subject to regulations passed by the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs. It is not subject, however, to a state or local government of the U.S. state in which it is located. Some of the country's 574[5] federally recognized tribes govern more than one of
the 326[6] Indian reservations in the United States, while some share reservations, and others have no reservation at all. Historical piecemeal land allocations under the Dawes Act facilitated sales to non-Native Americans, resulting in some reservations becoming severely fragmented, with pieces of tribal and privately held land being treated as
separate enclaves. This intersection of private and public real estate creates significant administrative, political, and legal difficulties.[7] The total area of the United States and about the size of the state of Idaho.[8][9] While most
reservations are small compared to the average U.S. state, twelve Indian reservation, is similar in size to the state of Rhode Island. The largest reservation, the Navajo Nation Reservation, is similar in size to the state of West Virginia. Reservation, the Navajo Nation Reservation, the majority being situated west of the Mississippi River
and occupying lands that were first reserved by treaty (Indian Land Grants) from the public domain.[10] Because recognized Native American nations possess tribal sovereignty, albeit of a limited degree, laws within tribal lands may vary from those of the surrounding and adjacent states.[11] For example, these laws can permit casinos on
reservations located within states which do not allow gambling, thus attracting tourism. The tribal council generally has jurisdiction in Indian country is shared between tribes and the federal government, depending on the tribal affiliation of the
parties involved and the specific crime or civil matter. Different reservations have different systems of government, which may or may not replicate the forms of government but a small number, mainly in the East, owe their origin to state
recognition.[12] The term "reservation" is a legal designation. It comes from the conception of the Native American nations as independent sovereigns at the time the U.S. Constitution was ratified. Thus, early peace treaties (often signed under conditions of duress or fraud), in which Native American nations surrendered large portions of their land to
the United States, designated parcels which the nations, as sovereigns, "reserved" to themselves, and those parcels came to be called "reservations".[13][14] The term remained in use after the federal government began to forcibly relocate nations to parcels of land to which they often had no historical or cultural connection. Compared to other
population centers in the U.S., reservations are disproportionately located on or near toxic sites hazardous to the health of those living or working in close proximity, including nuclear testing grounds and contaminated mines.[15] The majority of American Indians and Alaska Natives live outside the reservations, mainly in the larger western cities
such as Phoenix and Los Angeles.[16][17] In 2012, there were more than 2.5 million Native Americans, with 1 million living on reservations.[2][3] From the beginning of the European colonization of the European colonizat
forceful ejection, violence, and in a few cases voluntary moves based on mutual agreement. The removal caused many problems such as tribes losing the means of livelihood by being restricted to a defined area, poor quality of land for agriculture, and hostility between tribes. [18] Early English settlers in the Americas entered into treaties with Native
American tribes as a method of legitimizing their conquests in the face of competing claims by the Spanish Empire and violent resistance from the tribes themselves.[19] Applying the term "treaty" to such unequal relationships may seem paradoxical from a modern perspective because in modern English, the word "treaty" usually connotes an
agreement between two states of theoretically equal sovereignty, not an agreement between conquered people and a conqueror.[19] However, in premodern times, it was common for European princes to routinely enter into unequal treaties with lesser dependent powers.[19] The first reservation was established by Easton Treaty with the colonial
governments of New Jersey and Pennsylvania on August 29, 1758. Located in southern New Jersey, it was called Brotherton Indian Reservation[20] and also Edgepillock[21] or Edgepelick.[22] In 1764 the British government's Board of Trade
proposed the "Plan for the Future Management of Indian Affairs".[23] Although never adopted formally, the plan established the British governments, not individuals, and that land would only be purchased at public meetings.[23] Additionally, this plan dictated that the Indians
would be properly consulted when ascertaining and defining the boundaries of colonial settlement. [23] The private contracts that once characterized the sale of Indian land to various individuals and groups—from farmers to towns—were replaced by treaties between sovereigns. [23] This protocol was adopted by the United States Government after
the American Revolution. [23] On March 11, 1824, U.S. Vice President John C. Calhoun founded the Office of Indian Affairs (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of Defense), to solve the land problem with 38 treaties with American Indian tribes. [24] Indian Treaties
and Laws and Regulations Relating to Indian Affairs (1825) was a document signed by President Andrew Jackson. It discusses several
regulations regarding the Native Americans and the approval of Indigenous segregation and the reservation system. President of the United States of America was directly involved in the creation of new treaties regarding Indian
Reservations before 1850. Van Buren stated that indigenous reservations are "all their reserves of land in the actual proceeds being paid to them."[27] The agreement dictated that the indigenous tribe sell their land to build a lighthouse
[27] A treaty signed by John Forsyth, the Secretary of State on behalf of Van Buren, also dictates where indigenous peoples must live in terms of the reservation system in America between the Oneida People in 1838. This treaty allows the indigenous peoples five years on a specific reserve "the west shores of Saganaw bay".[28] The creation of
reservations for indigenous people of America could be as little as a five-year approval before 1850. Article two of the treaty claims "the reserves on the river Angrais and at Rifle river, of which said Indians are to have the usufruct and occupancy for five years." Indigenous people had restraints pushed on them by the five-year allowance. Scholarly
author Buck Woodard used executive papers from Governor William H. Cabell in his article, "Indian Land sales and allotment in Antebellum Virginia" to discuss Indigenous reservations in America before 1705, specifically in Virginia" to discuss Indigenous reservations in America before 1705, specifically in Virginia [29] He claims "the colonial government again recognized the Nottoway's land rights by treaty in 1713, at the
conclusion of the Tuscaro War."[29] The indigenous peoples of America had land treaty agreements as early as 1713.[29] The British colonies in North America from 1763 to 1775, at the outbreak of the American Revolutionary War, including the locations of Indian Reserve (highlighted in grey) and the proposed colonies of Charlotiana, Transylvania,
and Vandalia The American Indigenous Reservation system started with "the Royal Proclamation of 1763, where Great Britain set aside an enormous resource for Indians in the territory of the present United States," [30] The United States put forward another act when "Congress passed the Indian Removal Act in 1830". [31] A third act pushed through
Scholarly author James Oberly discusses "The Treaty of 1831 between the Menominee Nation and the United States" [33] in his article, "Decision on Duck Creek: Two Green Bay Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816-1996", showing yet another treaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816-1996", showing yet another treaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816-1996", showing yet another treaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816-1996", showing yet another treaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816-1996", showing yet another treaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816-1996", showing yet another treaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816-1996", showing yet another treaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and Indigenous Reservations Reservations and Indigenous Reservations and Indigenous Reservations and Indigenous Reservations Reservations and Indigenous Reservations and Indigenous Reservations Reservatio
and the State of Wisconsin and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran the boundary between the lands of the Oneida, known in the Treaty as the "New York Indians".[33] This Treaty from 1831 is the cause of conflicts and is disputed because the land was good hunting grounds. The Indian Country (highlighted in red) in 1834 The Trade and Intercourse Act
of 1834 says "In the 1834 Indian Trade and Intercourse Act, the United States defined the boundaries of Indian County." [34] Also, "For Unrau, Indigenous Country is less on Indigenous Co
laws on Indigenous Reservations depending on where they were located like the Mississippi River. This act came too, because "the federal government began to compress Indigenous lands because it needed to send troops to Texas during the Mexican-American War and protect American immigration traveling to Oregon and California."[35] The
Federal Government of America had their own needs and desires for Indigenous Country possessed good land, bountiful game, and potential mineral resources. "[35] The American Government claimed Indigenous land for their own
 benefits with these creations of Indigenous Land Reservations . States such as Texas had their own policy when it came to Indian Reservation system which "Prior to 1845, Texas had inaugurated and pursued her own Indian Policy of the U.S."[36] Texas
was one of the States before 1850 that chose to create their own reservation system as seen in Harmon's article, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845-1860."[37] The State of "Texas had given only a few hundred acres of land in 1840, for the purpose of colonization".[36] However, "In March 1847, ... [a] special agent [was sent] to Texas to
manage the Indian affairs in the State until Congress should take some definite and final action. [38] The United States of America allowed its states to make up their own treaties such as this one in Texas for the purpose of colonization.
federal government policy of moving Native populations away from European-populated areas, whether forcibly or voluntarily. One example was the Five Civilized Tribes, who were removed from their historical homelands in the Southeastern United States and moved to Indian Territory, in a forced mass migration that came to be known as the Trail
of Tears. Some of the lands these tribes were given to inhabit following the removals eventually became Indian reservations in Indian Territory (which became Oklahoma). Relations between white settlers and Natives had
grown increasingly worse as the settlers encroached on territory and natural resources in the West.[39] Most Indian reservations, like the Laguna Indian reservations, like the Laguna Indian reservations, like the Laguna Indian reservation in New Mexico (pictured here in March 1943), are in the western United States, often in regions suitable more for ranching than farming. Paul Brodie's Map Showing the Location of the
 Indian Reservations within the Limits of the United States and Territories, 1885 In 1868, President Ulysses S. Grant pursued a "Peace Policy" as an attempt to avoid violence.[40] The policy included a reorganization of the Indian Service, with the goal of relocating various tribes from their ancestral homes to parcels of lands established specifically for
their inhabitation. The policy called for the replacement of government officials by religious men, nominated by churches, to oversee the Indian agencies on reservations. [41] The policy was controversial from the start.
Reservations were generally established by executive order. In many cases, white settlers objected to the size of land parcels, which were subsequently reduced. A report submitted to Congress in 1868 found widespread corruption among the federal Native American agencies and generally poor conditions among the relocated tribes. Many tribes
ignored the relocation orders at first and were forced onto their limited land parcels. Enforcement of the policy required the United States Army to restrict the movements of wars with Native Americans which included some massacres. The most well
known conflict was the Sioux War on the northern Great Plains, between 1876 and 1881, which included the Battle of Little Bighorn. Other famous wars in this regard included the Nez Perce War and the Modoc War, which marked the last conflict officially declared a war. By the late 1870s, the policy established by President Grant was regarded as a
failure, primarily because it had resulted in some of the bloodiest wars between Native Americans and the United States. By 1877, President Rutherford B. Hayes began phasing out the policy, and by 1882 all religious organizations had relinquished their authority to the federal Indian agency. In 1887, Congress undertook a significant change in
reservation policy by the passage of the Dawes Act, or General Allotment (Severalty) Act. The act ended the general policy of granting small parcels to tribes as-a-whole by granting small parcels to tribes as-a-whole by granting small parcels of land to individual tribe members. In some cases, for example, the Umatilla Indian Reservation, after the individual parcels were granted out of reservation
land, the reservation area was reduced by giving the "excess land" to white settlers. The individual allotment policy continued until 1934 when it was terminated by the Indian Reorganization Act. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, also known as the Howard-Wheeler Act, was sometimes called the Indian New Deal and was initiated by John
Collier. It laid out new rights for Native Americans, reversed some of the earlier privatization of their common holdings, and encouraged tribal lands to individual members and reduced the assignment of "extra" holdings to nonmembers. For the following 20 years
the U.S. government invested in infrastructure, health care, and education on the reservations. Likewise, over two million acres (8,000 km2) of land were returned to various tribes. Within a decade of Collier's retirement the government's position began to swing in the opposite direction. The new Indian Commissioners Myers and Emmons introduced
the idea of the "withdrawal program" or "termination", which sought to end the government's responsibility and involvement with Indians and to force their assimilation. The Indians would lose their lands but were to be compensated, although many were not. Even though discontent and social rejection killed the idea before it was fully implemented,
five tribes were terminated—the Coushatta, Ute, Paiute, Menominee and Klamath—and 114 groups in California lost their federal recognition as tribes. Many individuals were also relocated to cities, but one-third returned to their tribal reservations in the decades that followed. Federally recognized Native American tribes possess limited tribal
sovereignty and are able to exercise the right of self-governance, including but not limited to the ability to pass laws, regulate power and energy, create treaties, and hold tribal court hearings. [42] Laws on tribal lands may vary from those of the surrounding area. [11] The laws passed can, for example, permit legal casinos on reservations. The tribal
council, not the local government or the United States federal government, often has jurisdiction over reservations. Different reservations have different systems of government, which may or may not replicate the forms of government found outside the reservations. The council government found outside the reservations have different systems of government found outside the reservations.
of their original areas; customary Native American practices of land tenure were sustained only for a time, and not in every instance. Instead, the federal government established regulations that subordinated tribes to the authority, first, of the military, and then of the Bureau (Office) of Indian Affairs.[44] Under federal law, the government patented
reservations to tribes, which became legal entities that at later times have operated in a corporate manner. Tribal tenure identifies jurisdiction over land-use planning and zoning, negotiating (with the close participation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs) leases for timber harvesting and mining.[45] Tribes generally have authority over other forms of
economic development such as ranching, agriculture, tourism, and casinos. Tribes hire both members, other Indians and non-Indians in varying capacities; they may run tribal stores, gas stations, and develop museums (e.g., there is a gas station and general store at Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, and a museum at Foxwoods, on the
Mashantucket Pequot Indian Reservation in Connecticut).[45] Tribal citizens may utilize several resources held in tribal tenures such as grazing range and some cultivable lands. As such, members are tenants-in-common, which may be likened to communal tenure. Even if some of this pattern
emanates from pre-reservation tribal customs, generally the tribe has the authority to modify tenant-in-common practices. Wagon loaded with squash, Rosebud Indian Reservation, ca. 1936 With the General Allotment Act (Dawes), 1887, the government sought to individualize tribal lands by authorizing allotments held in individual tenure. [46]
Generally, the allocation process led to grouping family holdings and, in some cases, this sustained pre-reservation clan or other patterns. There had been a few allotment programs ahead of the Dawes Act. However, the vast fragmentation of reservations occurred from the enactment of this act up to 1934, when the Indian Reorganization Act was
passed. However, Congress authorized some allotment programs in the ensuing years, such as on the Palm Springs/Agua Caliente Indian Reservation in California.[47] Allotment - under the Dawes Act, it was not to happen until after twenty-five years. individual
allottees who would die intestate would encumber the land under prevailing state devisement laws, leading to complex patterns of heirship by granting tribes the capacity to acquire fragmented allotments owing to heirship by granting tribes the capacity to acquire fragmented allotments owing to heirship by granting tribes may also include such parcels in long-range
land use planning. With alienation to non-Indians, their increased presence on numerous reservations has changed the demography of Indian Country. One of many implications of this fact is that tribes can not always effectively embrace the total management of a reservation, for non-Indian owners and users of allotted lands contend that tribes have
no authority over lands that fall within the tax and law-and-order jurisdiction of local government. [48] The demographic factor, coupled with landownership data, led, for example, to litigation between the Devils Lake Sioux and the State of North Dakota, where non-Indians owned more acreage than tribal members even though more Native Americansation between the Devils Lake Sioux and the State of North Dakota, where non-Indians owned more acreage than tribal members even though more Native Americansation between the Devils Lake Sioux and the State of North Dakota, where non-Indians owned more acreage than tribal members even though more Native Americansation between the Devils Lake Sioux and the State of North Dakota, where non-Indians owned more acreage than tribal members even though more Native Americansation between the Devils Lake Sioux and the State of North Dakota, where non-Indians owned more acreage than tribal members even though more Native Americansation between the Devils Lake Sioux and the State of North Dakota, where non-Indians owned more acreage than tribal members even though more Native Americansation between the Devils Lake Sioux and the State of North Dakota, where non-Indians owned more non-Indians owned more acreage than tribal members even though more non-Indians owned more non-Indians own
resided on the reservation than non-Indians. The court decision turned, in part, on the perception of Indian character, contending that the tribe did not have jurisdiction over the alienated allotments. In a number of instances—e.g., the Yakama Indian Reservation—tribes have identified open and closed areas within reservations. One finds the majority
of non-Indian landownership and residence in the open areas and, contrariwise, closed areas represent exclusive tribal residence and related conditions. [49] Spring roundup of Paiute-owned cattle begins at Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, 1973. Indian country today consists of tripartite government—i. e., federal, state and/or local, and tribal
Where state and local governments may exert some, but limited, law-and-order authority, tribal sovereignty is diminished. This situation prevails in connection with Indian gaming, because federal legislation makes the state a party to any contractual or statutory agreement. [50] Finally, occupancy on reservations can be by virtue of tribal or individual
tenure. There are many churches on reservations; most would occupy tribal land by consent of the federal government or the tribe. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) agency offices, hospitals, schools, and other facilities usually occupy residual federal parcels within reservations. Many reservations include one or more sections (about 640 acres) of land
for schools, but such land typically remains part of the reservation (e.g., Enabling Act of 1910 at Section 20[51]). As a general practice, such land may sit idle or be used for cattle grazing by tribal ranchers. Main article: Native American gaming In 1979, the Seminole tribe in Florida opened a high-stakes bingo operation on its reservation in Florida.
The state attempted to close the operation down but was stopped in the courts. In the 1980s, the case of California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians established the right of reservations to operate other forms of gambling operations. In 1988, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which recognized the right of Native American tribes
to establish gambling and gaming facilities on their reservations as long as the states in which they are located have some form of legalized gambling. Today, many Native American casinos are used as tourist attractions, including as the basis for hotel and conference facilities, to draw visitors and revenue to reservations. Successful gaming
operations on some reservations have greatly increased the economic wealth of some tribes, enabling their investment to improve infrastructure, education, and health for their people. Main article: Indian country jurisdiction Serious crime on Indian reservations has historically been required (by the 1885 Major Crimes Act, 18 U.S.C. §§1153, 3242
and court decisions) to be investigated by the federal government, usually the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and prosecuted by United States Attorneys of the United States federal judicial district in which the reservation lies.[52] Tribal courts were limited to sentences of one year or less,[53] until on July 29, 2010, the Tribal Law and Order Act was
enacted which in some measure reforms the system permitting tribal courts to impose sentences of up to three years provided proceedings are recorded and additional rights are extended to defendants. [54][55] The Justice Department on January 11, 2010, initiated the Indian Country Law Enforcement Initiative which recognizes problems with law
enforcement on Indian reservations and assigns top priority to solving existing problems. The Department of Justice recognized tribes. As one aspect of this relationship, in much of Indian Country, the Justice Department alone has the authority to seek a conviction that
carries an appropriate potential sentence when a serious crime has been committed. Our role as the primary prosecutor of serious crimes makes our responsibility to citizens in Indian Country unique and mandatory. Accordingly, public safety in tribal communities is a top priority for the Department of Justice. Emphasis was placed on improving
prosecution of crimes involving domestic violence and sexual assault.[56] Passed in 1953, Public Law 280 (PL 280) gave jurisdiction over criminal offenses involving Indians in Indian Country to certain States and allowed other States to assume jurisdiction over criminal offenses involving Indians in Indian Country to certain States and allowed other States to assume jurisdiction.
areas. Some PL 280 reservations have experienced jurisdictional confusion, tribal discontent, and litigation, compounded by the lack of data on crime rates and law enforcement response. [57] As of 2012, a high incidence of rape continued to impact Native American women. [58] Further information: Alcohol and Native Americans and
Methamphetamine and Native Americans A survey of death certificates over a four-year period showed that deaths among Indians due to alcohol are obsurted among Indians due to alcohol among Indians due to alcohol are obsurted among Indians due to alcohol among Indians due to alcohol among Indians due to alcohol are obsurted among Indians due to alcohol among India
American Indians are more common in men and among Northern Plains Indians. Alaska Natives showed the least incidence of death.[59] Under federal law, alcohol sales are prohibited on Indian reservations unless the tribal councils allow it.[60] Gang violence has become a major social problem.[61] A December 13, 2009, article in The New York
Times about growing gang violence on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation estimated that there were 39 gangs with 5,000 members on that reservation alone. [62] As opposed to traditional "Most Wanted" lists, Native Americans are often placed on regional Crime Stoppers lists offering rewards for their whereabouts. [63] When the Europeans
encountered the New World, the American colonial government determined a precedent of establishing the land sovereignty of North America through treaties between countries. This precedent was upheld by the United States government, a portion of which
was designated to remain under Native sovereignty. The United States government and Native Peoples do not always agree on how land should be government and The Lakota Sioux tribe members have been involved in sorting
out a legal claim for the Black Hills since signing the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty, [64] which created what is known today as the Great Sioux Nation covering the Black Hills and nearly half of western South Dakota. [64] This treaty was acknowledged and respected until 1874 when General George Custer discovered gold, [64] sending a wave of settlers
into the area and leading to the realization of the land from United States President Grant. [64] President Grant used tactical military force to remove the Sioux from the land and assisted in the development of the Congressional appropriations bill for Indian Services in 1876, a "starve or sell" treaty signed by only 10% of the 75% tribal
men required based on specifications from the Fort Laramie Treaty that relinquished the Sioux's rights to the Black Hills, stating that the land was purchased from the Sioux despite the insufficient number of signatures, [64] the lack of
transaction records, and the tribe's claim that the land was never for sale.[65] The Black Hills are sacred to the Sioux as a place central to their spirituality and identity,[64] and contest of ownership of the land has been pressured in the courts by the Sioux made as the sacred to the Sioux as a place central to their spirituality and identity,[64] and contest of ownership of the land has been pressured in the courts by the Sioux made as the sacred to the Sioux as a place central to their spirituality and identity,[64] and contest of ownership of the land has been pressured in the courts by the Sioux made as the sacred to the Sioux as a place central to their spirituality and identity, [64] and contest of ownership of the land has been pressured in the courts by the Sioux made as the sacred to the sa
legal claim that their relinquishment from the Black Hills was illegal under the Fifth Amendment, and no amount of money can make up for the loss of their sacred land. [64] This claim went all the way up to the Supreme Court United States v. Sioux Nation of Indians case in 1979 after being revived by Congress, and the Sioux were awarded over
$100 million as they ruled that the seizure of the Black Hills was in fact illegal. The Sioux have continually rejected the money, and since then the award has been accruing interest in trust accounts and amounts to about $1 billion in 2015.[65] During President Barack Obama's campaign, he made indications that the case of the Black Hills was going
to be solved with innovative solutions and consultation,[65] but this was questioned when White House Counsel Leonard Garment sent a note to The Ogala people saying, "The days of treaty-making with the American Indians ended in 1871; ... only Congress can rescind or change in any way statutes enacted since 1871."[64] The He Sapa Reparations
Alliance[65] was established after Obama's inauguration to educate the Sioux people and propose a bill to Congress that would allocate 1.3 million acres of federal land within the Black Hills to the tribe. To this day, the dispute of the Black Hills is ongoing with the trust estimated to be worth nearly $1.3 billion[66] and sources believe principles of
restorative justice[64] may be the best solution to addressing this century-old dispute. Fort Stanwix, New York While the 1783 Treaty of Paris, which ended the American Revolution, addressed land sovereignty disputes between the British Crown and the colonies, it neglected to settle hostilities between Indigenous people—specifically those who
fought on the side of the British, as four of the Haudenosaunee did—and colonists.[67] In October 1784 the newly formed United States government facilitated negotiations with representatives from the Six Nations in Fort Stanwix, New York.[67] The treaty produced in 1784 resulted in Indians giving up their territory within the Ohio
River Valley and the U.S. guaranteeing the Haudenosaunee six million acres—about half of what is present-day New York—as permanent homelands.[67] Unenthusiastic about the treaty's conditions, the state of New York secured a series of 26 "leases", many of them lasting 999 years on all Native territories within its boundaries.[67] Led to believe
that they had already lost their land to the New York Genesee Company, the Haudenosaunee agreed to land leasing which was presented by New York Governor George Clinton as a means by which the Indigenous nations could maintain sovereignty over their land. [67] On August 28, 1788, the Oneida people leased five million acres to the state in
exchange for $2,000 in cash, $2,000 in cash, $2,000 in clothing, $1,000 in provisions and $600 annual rent. The other two tribes followed with similar arrangements. [67] The Holland Land Company gained control over all but ten acres of the Native land leased to the state on 15 September 1797. [67] These 397 square miles were subsequently parceled out and
subleased to whites, allegedly ending the Native title to land. Despite Iroquois protests, federal authorities did virtually nothing to correct the injustice. [67] Certain of losing all of their holdings be exchanged from the Menominees in Wisconsin. [67]
President Andrew Jackson, committed to Indian Removal west of the Mississippi, agreed. [67] The Treaty of Buffalo Creek signed on 15 January 1838, directly ceded 102,069 acres of Seneca land to the Ogden company for $202,000, a sum that was divided evenly between the government—to hold in trust for Indians—and non-Indian individuals who
wanted to buy and improve the plots. [67] All that was left of the Cayuga, Oneida, Onondaga and Tuscarora holding was extinguished at a total cost of $400,000 to Ogden. [67] Under this treaty the Haudenosaunee were given the right to reside
in New York and small areas of reservations were largely ineffective in protecting Native American land. By 1889 eighty percent of all Iroquois reservation land in New York was leased by non-Haudenosaunees. [67] See also: Hopi § Hopi-Navajo land disputes The modern-day Navajo and
Hopi Indian Reservations are located in Northern Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surround
as the Pueblo people, made many spiritually motivated migrations throughout the Southwest before settling in present-day Northern Arizona. [68] The Navajo people also migrated throughout western North America following spiritual commands before settling near the Grand Canyon area. The two tribes peacefully coexisted and even traded and
exchanged ideas with each other. Their way of life was threatened when the "New people", what the Navajo called white settlers, began conquering native tribes across the continent and claiming their land, as a result of Andrew Jackson's Indian Removal Act. [69] War ensued between the Navajo people, who call themselves the Diné, and new
Americans. The result was the Long Walk in the early 1860s in which the entire tribe was forced to walk roughly 400 miles (640 km) from Fort Canby (present-day Window Rock, Arizona) to Bosque Redondo in New Mexico. This march is similar to the well-known Cherokee Trail of Tears and like it, many of the tribe did not survive the trek. The
roughly 11,000 tribe members were imprisoned here in what the United States government deemed an experimental Indian reservation that failed because it became too expensive, there were too many people to feed, and they were continuously raided by other Native tribes. [70] Consequently, in 1868, the Navajo were allowed to return to their
homeland after signing the Treaty of Bosque Redondo. The treaty officially established the "Navajo Indian Reservation" in Northern Arizona. The term reservation is one that creates territorialities or claims on places. This treaty gave them the right to the land and semi-autonomous governance of it. The Hopi reservation, on the other hand, was
created through an executive order by President Arthur in 1882. A few years after the two reservations were established, the Dawes Allotment Act was passed under which communal tribal land was divvied up and allocated to each household in an attempt to enforce European-American farming styles where each family owns and works their own plot
of land. This was a further act of enclosure by the U.S. government. Each family received 640 acres (260 ha) or less and the remaining land was deemed "surplus" because it was more than the tribes needed. This "surplus" because it was more than the tribes needed. This "surplus" land was deemed "surplus" because it was more than the tribes needed. This "surplus" land was deemed "s
originally considered barren and unproductive by white settlers until 1921 when prospectors scoured the U.S. government to set up Native American councils on the reservations so that they could agree to contracts, specifically leases, in the name of the tribe.[71] During World War II, uranium was
mined on the Diné and Hopi reservations. The dangers of radiation exposure were not adequately explained to the Native people, who made up almost all the workforce of these mines, and lived in their immediate adjacency. As a result, some residents who lived near the uranium projects used the quarried rock from the mines to build their houses
 these materials were radioactive and had detrimental health effects on the residents, including increased rates of kidney failure and cancer.[72][73] During extraction some Native children would play in large water pools which were heavily contaminated with uranium created by mining activities.[74] The companies also failed to properly dispose of
the radioactive waste which did and will continue to pollute the environment, including the Natives' water sources. Many years later, these same men who worked the mines died from lung cancer, and their families received no form of financial compensation. In 1979, the Church Rock uranium mill spill was the largest release of radioactive waste in
U.S. history. The spill contaminated the Puerco River with 1,000 tons of solid radioactive waste and 93 million gallons of acidic, radioactive tailings solution which flowed downstream into the Navajo Nation. The Navajos used the water from this river for irrigation and their livestock but were not immediately informed about the contamination and its
danger. [75] After the war ended, the American population boomed and energy demands soared. The utility companies needed a new source of power plants in the four corners region. In the 1960s, John Boyden, an attorney working for both Peabody Coal and the Hopi
tribe, the nation's largest coal producer, managed to gain rights to the Hopi land, including Black Mesa, a sacred location to both tribes. Some consider this to be an example of environmental racism and injustice, per the principles established by the Participants of the First National People of
Color Environmental Leadership Summit, [76] because the Navajo and Hopi people, which are communities of color, low income, and political alienation, were disproportionately affected by the proximity and the resulting pollution of these power plants which disregard their right to clean air, their land was degraded, and because the related public
policies are not based on mutual respect of all people. The mining companies, however, wanted more land but the joint ownership of the land made negotiations difficult. At the same time, Hopi and Navajo tribes were squabbling over land rights while Navajo tribes were squabbling rights while Navajo tribes were squabbling rights while Navajo tribes w
presenting it to the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs claiming that if the government did not step in and do something, a bloody war would ensue between the tribes. Congressmen agreed to pass the Navajo-Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 which forced any Hopi and Navajo people living on the other's land to relocate. This affected 6,000
Navajo people and ultimately benefitted coal companies the most who could now more easily access the disputed land. Instead of using military violence to deal with those who refused to move, the government passed what became known as the Bennett Freeze banned 1.5 million acres
(6,100 km2) of Navajo land from any type of development, including paving roadways and even roof repair. This was meant to be a temporary incentive to push tribe negotiations but lasted over forty years until 2009 when President Obama lifted the moratorium.[77][78] The legacy of the Bennett Freeze looms over the region as seen by the nearly
third-world conditions on the reservation - seventy-five percent of people do not have access to electricity and housing situations are poor. See also: McGirt v. Oklahoma Much of what is now Oklahoma was considered Indian Territory from the 1830s. The tribes
in the area attempted to join the union as the Native-led State of Seguovah in 1905 as a means of retaining control of their lands, but this was unsuccessful and the lands were merged into Oklahoma with the Enabling Act of 1906. This act had been taken to disestablish the reservation in order for the foundation of the state to proceed. In July 2020,
the Supreme Court ruled in McGirt v. Oklahoma that the area, about half of the modern state, never lost its status as a Native reservation. This includes the city of Tulsa. The area includes lands of the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Cherokee, Muscogee, and Seminole. [79] The ruling is based on an 1832 treaty, which the court ruled was still in force, adding
that "Because Congress has not said otherwise, we hold the government to its word." [80] In 2021, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals ruled that the
Wyandotte Nation's reservation was also never disestablished. [82] [83] Court rulings also confirmed the existence of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma, Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma, and Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma, Peoria Tribe of Oklahom
Native Americans Part of a series on Native Americas Formative stage Post-Classic stage P
Slavery Slavery in the United States Partus seguitur ventrem Indian Removal Act Trail of Tears Native American Slave ownership Indian Territory Americans Racism against Native Americans Indian Appropriations Act Racial Integrity Act Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 Indian
Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native American soluture and Native American solutu
Art Food Music Pow wow Dance Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Film Indigenous Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty Wars Beaver War Sarphorhoods Health Tribal sovereignty Wars Beaver War Pontiac's
War Lord Dunmore's War American Revolutionary War Cherokee-American War Seminole Wars (1836-1877) / Comanche Wars 
1875) / Red River War (1874-1875) / Buffalo Hunters' War (1876-1877) Cayuse War Apache Wars (1849-1924) / Jicarilla War (1849-1855) / Chiricahua Wars (1887-1886) / Post 1887 Apache Wars period (1887-1924) Yuma War Ute Wars (1850-1923) / Battle at Fort
Utah (1850) / Walker War (1853-1854) / Tintic War (1853-1854) / Dakota War (1853-1854) / Dintic War (1863-1865) / Bluff Skirmish (1921) Posey War (1865-1872) / White River War (1865-1872) / Bluff Skirmish (1921) Posey War (1865-1872) / Bluff Skirmish (1923) Sioux Wars (1854-1891) / First Sioux War (1854-1856) / Bluff Skirmish (1921) Posey War (1865-1872) / Bluff Skirmish (1923) Sioux Wars (1923) Sioux Wars (1923) Sioux Wars (1923) Sioux Wars (1
(1866-1868) / Great Sioux War (1876-1877) / Northern Chevenne Exodus (1878-1879) / Ghost Dance War (1855-1856) / Coeur d'Alene War (1855-1856) / Coeur d'Alene War (1855-1856) / Navajo Wars (1849-1866) Paiute War (1860-1871) / Snake War (1855-1856) / Coeur d'Alene War (1855-1856) / Coeu
(1864-1869) Hualapai War (1865-1870) Modoc War (1872-1873) Nez Perce War (1877) Bannock War (1878) Crow War (1878) Bannock Uprising (1895) Yaqui Uprising (1895) Yaqui Uprising (1895) Yaqui Uprising (1897) Bannock Uprising (1897) Bannock Uprising (1898) Crox War (1878) C
movement Self-determination Women in politics Nationalism American Indian Movement (AIM) Red Power Movement Occupation of Alcatraz Trail of Broken Treaties Wounded Knee Occupation MMIW Red handprint Dakota Access Pipeline protests Religious Freedom Act Christianity Eagle Feather law Mormonism
Traditional religions Native American Church Longhouse Religion Sun Dance Keetoowah Society Midewiwin Wabunowin Wocekiye Groups National Congress of American Indians National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) Women of All Red Nations
(WARN) The International Indian Treaty Council (IITC) Ethnic subdivisions Black Indians Indigenous peoples of the American English American English American English American English American English American English Occupancy Societal Statistics Reservations Tribal disense Indian Treaty Council (IITC) Ethnic subdivisions Black Indians Indian Treaty Council (IITC) Ethnic subdivisions Black In
Northeastern Woodlands Northwest Plateau Pacific Northwest Plateau Pacific Northwest Great Plains Southeastern Woodlands Southwest by state Alaska Arizona California Colorado Florida Hawaii Iowa Maryland Michigan Nebraska North Carolina Oklahoma Oregon Virginia Wisconsin Lists Native Americans artists actors war leaders musicians congressional politicians
Native American Medal of Honor recipients List of federally recognized tribes by state List of federally recogn
standard of living on some reservations is comparable to that in the developing world, with problems of infant mortality, [85] low life expectancy, poor nutrition, poverty, and alcohol and drug abuse. The two poorest counties in the United States are Buffalo County, South Dakota, home of the Crow Creek Indian Reservation, and Oglala Lakota County
South Dakota, home of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, according to data compiled by the 2000 census.[86] This disparity in living standards can partly be explained by centuries-long instances of settler colonialism which have systematically harmed Indigenous peoples' relations with land, and have attempted to erase their cultural ways of life.[87]
Potawatomi scholar Kyle Powys Whyte has stated. "While Indigenous peoples, as any society, have long histories of adapting to change, colonialism caused changes at such a rapid pace that many Indigenous peoples became vulnerable to harms, from health problems related to new diets to erosion of their cultures to the destruction of Indigenous peoples became vulnerable to harms.
diplomacy, to which they were not as susceptible prior to colonization."[88]This has resulted in an ever widening disparity between Native peoples and the rest of the United States. It is commonly believed that environmentalism and a connectedness to nature are ingrained in the Native American culture. However, this is a generalization. In recent
years, cultural historians have set out to reconstruct and complicate this notion as what they claim to be a culturally inaccurate romanticism. [89] Others recognize the differences between the attitudes and perspectives that emerge from a comparison of Western European philosophy and Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) of Indigenous peoples.
especially when considering natural resource conflicts and management strategies involving multiple parties. [90] The lands on which reservations are located are disproportionately low in natural resources and quality soil conducive to fostering economic prosperity. Starting in the mid-20th century reservations came to be increasingly located in
areas contaminated with toxic runoff from current or historical industrial activities conducted by outside entities including private corporations as well as the federal government.[15] According to anthropologists Merrill Singer and Derrick Hodge: "The toxic and poor land quality of Native American lands is neither a historical accident nor the result
of any cultural deficiency on their part, but rather is the result of aggressive westward economic expansion. This process was calculated and unconcerned with indigenous wellbeing. [...] Thus, federal policy, including the Indian Removal Act of 1830, was designed to displace Native Americans from coveted land and to relocate them to areas seen as
relatively "valueless by nineteenth century standards" [87] Communities living on Native reservations are also disproportionately affected by environmental hazards. [91] Due to them being deemed as "undesirable", lands on and near reservations are often used by the U.S. government and private industries as areas for environmentally hazardous
activities. These activities include uranium mining, nuclear waste disposal, and military testing.[15] Due to this, many reservation communities have been affected for decades by uranium mining and nuclear waste dumping: "Radiation
related diseases are now endemic to many parts of the Navajo Nation, claiming the health and lives of former miners to be sure but also those of Navajos who would never see the inside of a mine. Diné children have a rate of testicular and ovarian cancer fifteen times the national average, and a fatal neurological disease called Navajo neuropathy has
been closely linked to ingesting uranium-contaminated water during pregnancy".[91]Other reservation communities have been subjected to instances like this as well. According to scholar Winona LaDuke, the Paiute- Shoshone community was deliberately exposed to radiation throughout the latter half of the 20th century: "In 1951 the Atomic Energy
Commission set up the Nevada Test Site within Western Shoshone territory as a proving grounds for nuclear weapons. Between 1951 and 1992, the U.S. and UK exploded 1,054 nuclear devices above and below ground [...] According to Sanchez, the Atomic Energy Commission would deliberately wait for clouds to blow north before conducting tests,
so that the fallout would avoid any heavily populated areas such as Las Vegas and Los Angeles. This meant that the Shoshones would get a larger dose, [92] Many Indigenous communities have also been subjected to the degradation of sacred lands in favor of resource extraction, [93] [94] [95] Around 79 percent of the lithium deposits on U.S. soil are
within 35 miles of Indian reservations.[96] Thacker Pass is home to both one of the largest lithium deposits in the world[94] and home to a sacred burial site of multiple tribes including the Pitt River and Paiute.[95] Tribal
members argue that these permits were unlawfully issued, and that "the BLM notified only three of Nevada's 27 tribes about the mine".[95] Historically, Indigenous groups have had little say when it comes to which land they are designated to occupy, as well as what happens to the land. This can be explained by the following excerpt from an
academic journal on the impacts of climate change in the Arctic: "While a government relationship is now officially required, these cases (which continue to define the indigenous people in the U.S., codifying a legal relationship of paternalism that
limits the autonomy of tribal governments. The United States government is thus under a legal obligation to protect the lands, resources and traditionally used areas of indigenous peoples, and government agencies are required to consult with tribal governments and Alaska Native Corporations in natural resource decision-making. While some view
this form of representation as the best and only practical means of influencing Northern policy, the actual involvement of tribal governments has been limited, and seen as perfunctory, and may be precluded by the procedural and structural mandates of federal law and legal precedent."[97] We can see this with the amount of reservations placed near
massive construction projects that lead to pollution, such as landfills or the Dakotas Access Pipeline. In addition, the lands that Indigenous people are designated to occupy by the federal government typically have difficulties already. As explained by scholars Gregory Hooks and Chad Smith in their academic journal connecting the focus on production
to environmental issues, "Federally owned and Native American lands tended to be in close proximity, and they tended to be lands that were concentrated in the states west of the Mississippi, and they tended to be lands that were concentrated in the states west of the Mississippi, and they tended to be lands that were concentrated in the states west of the Mississippi, and they tended to be lands that were too dry, remote, or barren to attract the attention of settlers and corporations."[98] Reservations are often
designated or located close to "superfund sites" areas designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as polluted and hazardous to live in and requiring action to clean up. In 2014, of 1,322 Superfund sites in the United States, 532 or almost 25% where in Indian Country.[99] Some of these include the Jackpile-Paguate Uranium Mine
on the Pueblo of Laguna, the St. Regis Paper Company on the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe's reservation, and the Sulphur Bank Mercury Mine on the Elem Band of Pomo Indian country List of historical Indian reservations in the United States List of Indian
```

```
reservations in the United States Native American reservation politics Reservation poverty Reservation pov
 Indigenous territories of Costa Rica Autonomous administrative divisions of India Indigenous Area (Taiwan) Notes ^ a b Bureau of Indian Affairs (August 19, 2014). "US should return stolen land to Indian tribes, says United
Nations". The Guardian. ISSN 0261-3077. Retrieved October 5, 2023. ^ a b "The Indigenous World 2022: United States of America". IWGIA - International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. Retrieved October 7, 2018. ^ "Federally recognized American Indian
tribes and Alaska Native entities". usa.gov. General Services Administration. July 14, 2023. A sutton, 199.[full citation needed] "What is a federal Indian reservation?" Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Alaska Native entities. Usa.gov. General Services Administration. July 14, 2023. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Alaska Native entities. Usa.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Alaska Native entities. Usa.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Alaska Native entities. Usa.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Alaska Native entities. Usa.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and Indian Affairs. Sutton, 199.[full citation needed] Thomas and In
 Retrieved January 4, 2024. ^ "Explore Census Data". data.census.gov. Retrieved January 4, 2024. ^ Kinney, 1937; Sutton, 1975 ^ a b Davies & Clow; Sutton 1991. ^ Frantz, Klaus (1999). Indian Reservations in the United States: Territory, Sovereignty, and Socioeconomic Change. Chicago: University of Chicago
Press. p. 45. ISBN 0-226-26089-5. Retrieved September 30, 2020. See, e.g., United States v. Dion, 476 U.S. 734 (1986); Francis v. Francis, 203 U.S. 233 (1906). Ab c Hooks, Gregory; Smith, Chad L. (August 2004). "The Treadmill of Destruction: National Sacrifice Areas and Native Americans". American Sociological Review. 69 (4): 558-575.
doi:10.1177/000312240406900405. ISSN 0003-1224. S2CID 145428620. ^ "Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980-2000". Census.gov. Retrieved June 5, 2012. ^ For Los Angeles, see Allen, J. P. and E. Turner, 2002. Text and map of the metropolitan area show the widespread urban distribution of California and other
 Native Americans. ^ "40d. Life on the Reservations". U.S. History. Retrieved August 11, 2024. ^ a b c Glover, Jeffrey (2014). Paper Sovereigns: Anglo-Native Treaties and the Law of Nations, 1604-1664. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. pp. 9-14. ISBN 9780812245967. ^ "This Day in Geographic History: First Indian Reservation".
 National Geographic Society. July 18, 2014. Archived from the original on July 12, 2018. A chived from the original on May 7, 2021. Retrieved July 12, 2018. A chived from the original on May 7, 2021. Retrieved July 12, 2018. A chived from the original on May 7, 2021. Retrieved July 12, 2018. A chived from the original on July 12, 2018. A chived from the original on May 7, 2021. Retrieved July 12, 2018.
2010). "The Kepharts: Cohawkin, Raccoon Creek, Narraticon all names left by Lenni-Lenape in Gloucester County". NJ.com. Retrieved July 12, 2018. In 1758, the Colonial Legislature purchased land in Burlington County for a reservation. It was the first Indian Reservation in America and was called Edgepelick. Governor Francis Bernard called it
Brotherton. Today the area is known as Indian Mills. In 1801, an act was passed directing the sale of Brotherton, with the proceeds used to send the remaining Lenape to the Stockbridge Reservation near Oneida, New York. There they formed a settlement called Statesburg. November 7, 2010 ^ a b c d e Remarks on the Plan for Regulating the Indian
Trade, September 1766 - October 1766, Founders Online Selko, William S. (2004). "John C. Calhoun and the Creation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs: an Essay on Political Rivalry, Ideology, and Policymaking in the Early Republic". South Carolina Historical Magazine. 105 (3): 170-97. JSTOR 27570693. Andrew Jackson, "A letter by Andrew
 Jackson, President of the United States of America, Indian Treaties and Laws and Regulations Relating to Indian Affairs: To Which Is Added, An Appendix. Way and Gideon, Printers", 1826. Andrew Jackson, "A letter by Andrew Jackson, President of the United States of America, Indian Treaties and Laws and Regulations Relating to Indian Affairs: To
 Which Is Added, An Appendix. Way and Gideon, Printers", 1826, 580. ^ a b Martin Van Buren, President of the United States of America, "Treaties between the United States of America, "Treaties between the United States of America, "Treaties between the United States and the Saginaw tribe of Chippewas", 1837. ^ John Forsyth, the Secretary of State On behalf of, President Buren, Martin Van of the United States. Martin Van Buren, "Treaties between the United States and the Saginaw tribe of Chippewas", 1837. ^ John Forsyth, the Secretary of State On behalf of, President Buren, Martin Van of the United States.
 Between: The United States of America and the First Christian and Orchard Parties of the Oneida Indians," 1838. ^ a b c Buck Woodard, "Indian Land sales and allotment in Antebellum Virginia: trustees, tribal agency, and the Nottoway Reservation", American Nineteenth Century History 17. no. 2 (2016): page number. 161-180. ^ James E Togerson
 "Indians against Immigrants: Old Rivals, New Rules: A Brief Review and Comparison of Indian Law in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, and Canada." American Indians against Immigrants: Old Rivals, New Rules: A Brief Review and Comparison of Indian Law in the Contiguous
United States, Alaska, and Canada." American Indian Law Review 14, no. 1 (1988), 57-103. ^ James E Togerson "Indians against Immigrants: Old Rivals, New Rules: A Brief Review and Comparison of Indian Law Review 14, no. 1 (1988), 59. ^ a b James Oberly, ""Decision on
Duck Creek: Two Green Bay Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816-1996", American Indian Culture & Research Journal 24, no. 3 (2000): 39-76. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Reviews of New Books
 1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 51. ^ a b George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845-1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845-1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^
George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845-1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 380. ^ Bennett, Elmer (2008). Federal Indian Law. The Lawbook Exchange. pp. 201-203. ISBN 9781584777762. ^ "President Grant advances" Peace Policy with tribes". US National Library of Medicine. Retrieved
November 15, 2014. ^ Miller Center, University of Virginia Archived April 8, 2014. at the Wayback Machine, Retrieved December 3, 2018. ^ "Tribal Governments Work?". Southeastern Oklahoma State University. Retrieved December 3, 2018. ^ "Tribal Governments Work?". Southeastern Oklahoma State University. Retrieved December 3, 2018. ^ "Tribal Governments Work?".
et al, pp. 140-190. ^ The Equalization Act, 1959. ^ Sutton, ed., 1959. ^ Sutton, ed., 1959. ^ Wishart and Froehling Act of 1910" (PDF). Retrieved February 8, 2013. ^ "Native Americans in South Dakota: An Erosion of Confidence in the Justice System". Usccr.gov. Retrieved June 5, 2012. ^ "Lawless Lands" Archived
March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine article by Michael Riley in The Denver Post Posted: June 25, 2010 01:00:00 AM MDT Updated: June 25, 2010 02:13:47 AM MDT
Accessed June 25, 2010 ^ "President Obama signs tribal-justice changes" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine article by Michael Riley in The Denver Post, Posted: July 30, 2010 01:00:00 AM MDT, accessed July 30, 2010 06:00:20 AM MDT, acc
CONTAINING INDIAN COUNTRY" Memorandum by David W. Ogden Deputy Attorney General, Monday, January 11, 2010, Accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law 280 an
 Scourge of Rape, Rare Justice". The New York Times. Retrieved May 23, 2012. ^ "Study: 12 percent of Indian deaths due to alcohol" Associated Press article by Mary Clare Jalonick Washington, D.C. (AP) 9-08 News From Indian Country accessed October 7, 2009 ^ "Native American reservation lifts alcohol ban". Al Jazeera America. August 15, 2013.
 ^ "Gang Violence On The Rise On Indian Reservations". NPR: National Public Radio. August 25, 2009. ^ "Indian Gangs Grow, Bringing Fear and Violence to Reservation". The New York Times. December 13, 2009 ^ "Most Wanted - City of Great Falls Montana". greatfallsmt.net. Archived from the original on August 21, 2017. Retrieved August 20,
2017. ^ a b c d e f g h i j k Lenane, Rita (2015). "It Doesn't Seem Very Fair, Because We Were Here First: Resolving the Sioux Nation Black Hills Land Dispute and the Potential for Restorative Justice to Facilitate Government-to-Government Negotiations" (PDF). Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution. 16 (2): 651-683. Archived from the original (PDF)
on December 12, 2019. Retrieved June 21, 2019. ^ a b c d Streshinsky, Maria (February 9, 2011). "Saying No to $1 Billion". The Atlantic. ^ "Why the Sioux Are Refusing $1.3 Billion". PBS NewsHour. Retrieved March 22, 2017. ^ a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o Treaty and Land Transaction of 1784, National Park Service ^ Dongoske, Kurt E. (January 1,
1996). "The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis—A Hopi Perspective". American Indian Quarterly. 20 (2): 287-296. doi:10.2307/1185706. Stock Protection and Repatriation Act: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis—A Hopi Perspective". American Indian Quarterly. 20 (2): 287-296. doi:10.2307/1185706. Stock Protection and Repatriation Act: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis—A Hopi Perspective". American Indian Quarterly. 20 (2): 287-296. doi:10.2307/1185706. Stock Protection and Repatriation Act: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis—A Hopi Perspective". American Indian Quarterly. 20 (2): 287-296. doi:10.2307/1185706. Stock Protection and Repatriation Act: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis—A Hopi Perspective". American Indian Quarterly. 20 (2): 287-296. doi:10.2307/1185706. Stock Protection and Repatriation Act: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis—A Hopi Perspective Indian Quarterly. 20 (2): 287-296. doi:10.2307/1185706. Stock Protection and Repatriation Act: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis—A Hopi Perspective Indian Quarterly. 20 (2): 287-296. doi:10.2307/1185706. Stock Protection and Repatriation Act: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis—A Hopi Perspective Indian Repatriation Act: A New Beginning In
 (2001). "Long Walk of the Navajos". Wild West. Vol. 14, no. 4. pp. 24-30. Mudd, V. (Director). (1985). Broken Rainbow [DVD]. United States: Earthworks Films. Bolton, Marie; Unger, Nancy (2015). "'Mother Nature is Getting Angrier': Turning Sacred Navajo Land into a Toxic Environment". In Gavillon, François; Ozdag, Ufuk (eds.). Environmental
Crisis and Human Costs. Universidad de Alcalá. pp. 31-45. ^ Moret, Leuren. "Population Exposed to Environmental Uranium: Increased Risk of Infertility and Reproductive Cancers!". Namaste Publishing UK. Retrieved June 1, 2023. ^ Morales, Laurel (April 10, 2016). "For The Navajo Nation, Uranium Mining's Deadly Legacy Lingers". NPR.
 Retrieved June 16, 2020. ^ Pasternak, J. (2010). Yellow, David; Roberts, J. Timmons (October 15, 2009). "Environmental Justice". Annual Review of Environment and Resources. 34: 405-430. doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-082508-094348
^ Donovan, Bill (May 14, 2009). "Obama signs Bennett Freeze repeal". Navajo Times. Retrieved December 16, 2016. ^ "Congress.gov". Library of Congress.gov". Library of Congress. Retrieved April 6, 2017. ^ "US Supreme Court rules half of Oklahoma is Native American land". BBC News. July 10, 2020. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ McGirt v. Oklahoma (PDF), Supreme Court
of the United States, July 9, 2020, retrieved July 26, 2021 ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation". NonDoc. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 12, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 7, 2024. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 12, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals."
Court of Criminal Appeals has recognized that the Wyandotte Reservation was never disestablished". KOSU. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ "Health of American Indian or Alaska Native
 Population". National Center for Health Statistics. www.cdc.gov. April 14, 2021. ^ Johansen, Bruce E., and Barry Pritzker. 2008. Encyclopedia of American Indian history. Santa Barbara, Calif: ABC-CLIO. p. 156. ISBN 9781851098170. ^ a b Singer, Merrill, ed. (June 8, 2016). A Companion to the Anthropology of Environmental Health.
 doi:10.1002/9781118786949. hdl:1854/LU-8522620. ISBN 9781118786949. ^ Whyte, Kyle (March 1, 2017). "Indigenous Climate Change Studies: Indigenizing Futures, Decolonizing the Anthropocene". English Language Notes. 55 (1-2): 153-162. doi:10.1215/00138282-55.1-2.153. ISSN 0013-8282. S2CID 132153346. ^ Lee., Schweninger (January 1801). "Indigenous Climate Change Studies: Indigenizing Futures, Decolonizing the Anthropocene". English Language Notes. 55 (1-2): 153-162. doi:10.1215/00138282-55.1-2.153. ISSN 0013-8282. S2CID 132153346. ^ Lee., Schweninger (January 1801). "Indigenous Climate Change Studies: Indigenizing Futures, Decolonizing the Anthropocene". English Language Notes. 55 (1-2): 153-162. doi:10.1215/00138282-55.1-2.153. ISSN 0013-8282. S2CID 132153346. ^ Lee., Schweninger (January 1801). "Indigenous Climate Change Studies: Indigenous Change Studies: Indigenous Change Studie
2008). Listening to the Land: Native American literary responses to the landscape. University of Georgia Press. ISBN 9780820330587. OCLC 812757112. ^ Goode, Ron W. (Spring 2015). "Tribal-Traditional Ecological Knowledge". News from Native California. 28 (3): 23. ^ a b Voyles, Traci Brynne (May 15, 2015). Wastelanding. University of
Minnesota Press. doi:10.5749/minnesota/9780816692644.001.0001. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land And Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land And Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land And Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land And Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for La
Pass highlights how federal courts routinely dismiss Indigenous concerns". www.hcn.org. Retrieved June 10, 2022. {{cite web}}: |first2= has generic name (help)CS1 maint: numeric names: authors list (link) ^ a b Flin, Briana (December 2, 2021). "'Like putting a lithium mine on Arlington cemetery': the fight to save sacred land in Nevada". The
Guardian. Retrieved June 10, 2022. ^ a b c d Turner, Kelsey (December 10, 2021). "Tribes Claim BLM Violated Multiple Federal Laws in Permitting Thacker Pass Lithium Mine in Nevada". Native News Online. Retrieved June 10, 2021. Retrieved June 10, 2021. Retrieved June 10, 2021.
10, 2022. ^ Trainor, Sarah F.; Stuart Chapin, F.; Huntington, Henry P.; Natcher, David C.; Kofinas, Gary (December 1, 2007). "Arctic Climate Impacts: Environment. 12 (6): 627-643. Bibcode: 2007LoEnv.. 12.. 627T. doi:10.1080/13549830701657414. ISSN 1354-9839. S2CID 17730412.
 Hooks, Gregory; Smith, Chad L. (2004). "The Treadmill of Destruction: National Sacrifice Areas and Native Americans". American Sociological Review. 69 (4): 558-575. doi:10.1177/000312240406900405. ISSN 0003-1224. JSTOR 3593065. S2CID 145428620. "Terri Hansen: Far too many Superfund sites in Indian Country". Indianz.com. June 19,
2014. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ "Tribal Superfund Case Studies". Tribal Superfund Case Studies, California State University, Northridge, 2002).
George Pierre Castle and Robert L. Bee, eds., State and Reservation: New Perspectives on Federal Indian Policy (Tucson: University Press of Colorado, 2001). Wade Davies and Richmond L.
Clow, American Indian Sovereignty and Law: An Annotated Bibliography (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2009). T. J. Ferguson and E. Richard Hart, A Zuni Atlas (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985) David H. Getches, Charles F. Wilkinson, and Robert A. Williams, Cases and Materials on Federal Indian Law, 4th ed. (St. Paul: West Group,
1998). Klaus Frantz, "Indian Reservations in the United States", Geography Research Paper 241 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). James M. Goodman, The Navajo Atlas: Environments, Resources, People, and History of the Diné Bikeyah (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Wonst
 Indian Land Tenure in America (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1937) Francis Paul Prucha, Atlas of American Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Nebraska Press, 1990). C. C. Royce, comp., Indian Land Cessions in the United States, 18th Annual Report, 1896-97, pt. 2 (Wash., D. C.: Bureau of American Ethnology; GPO 1899) Imre
 Sutton, "Cartographic Review of Indian Land Tenure and Territoriality: A Schematic Approach", American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 26:2 (2002): 63-113. Imre Sutton, ed., "The Political Geography of Indian Country",
American Indian Culture and Resource Journal, vol. 15, no. 2 (1991):1-169. Imre Sutton, "Sovereign States and the Changing Definition of the Indian Reservation", Geographical Review, vol. 66, no. 3 (1976): 281-95. Veronica E. Velarde Tiller, ed., Tiller's Guide to Indian Country: Economic Profiles of American Indian Reservations (Albuquerque
BowArrow Pub., 1996/2005) David J. Wishart and Oliver Froehling, "Land Ownership, Population and Jurisdiction: the Case of the 'Devils Lake Sioux Tribe v. North Dakota Public Service Commission'", American Indian Reservation
1803-1902 (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2004) Wikimedia Commons has media reservations in the United States - National Park Service U.S. Census Bureau,
Geographic Areas Reference manual (PDF) Tribal Leaders Directory Native American Technical Corrections Act of 2003 Gambling on the reservation April 2004 Christian Science Monitor articles on the topic Henry Red Cloud of Oglala Lakota Tribe on the Recession's Toll on Reservations—video report by Democracy
Now! Tribal Justice & Safety. at the U.S. Department of Justice "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities" Retrieved from "Bureau of Indian Affairs map of reservations in the United States. An Indian reservation in the United States.
Department of the Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs. There are more than 300 Indian reservations in the United States, all established either by treaty or decree. Indian removal was a policy pursued by President Andrew Jackson after the passage of
the Indian Removal Act of 1830. The act led to the creation of Indian Appropriations Act of 1851 authorized the establishment of legally recognized reservations in the U.S. While in the twenty-first century reservation travel is unrestricted, at
the time of establishment indigenous residents were forbidden from traveling outside the reservation boundaries. The Dawes Act of 1887, also known as the General Allotment Act, ended the general policy of granting land parcels to tribes as-a-whole by granting small parcels of land to individual tribe members. This system of fragmentation rendered
much of reservation land unusable and had a catastrophic effect upon native societies. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 reversed the Dawes Act's privatization of common holdings of Indian lands
and supported the return to local self-government on a tribal basis. In 1983, President Ronald Reagan issued a policy statement which reaffirmed the government relationship of Indian tribes with the United States; expressed the primary role of tribal governments in reservation affairs; and called for special efforts to develop
reservation economies. Most reservations have suffered high rates of poverty, unemployment, and substance abuse. However in recent years they have come to represent an oasis of tribal and cultural identity, providing a base of support for the expansion of Native American rights. While the history of this system has been tragic, the Indian
 reservation has protected the indigenous peoples from complete assimilation and loss of identity. Tribal sovereignty: Map of the United States, with reservation land shown in white. Historical background Thomas Jefferson, who initially believed Native Americans should live like settlers or be pushed aside, eventually came to support the concept that
they should move westward and maintain a separate society. In order to more fully understand the process through which Native Americans were "placed" in designated lands known as reservations, it is necessary to understand the broader scope of the fledgling United States. Continental expansion usually meant the occupation of Native American
land. The U.S. continued the European practice of recognizing only limited land rights of indigenous peoples. In a policy formulated largely by Henry Knox, Secretary of War in the Washington Administration, the U.S. government initially sought to expand into the west only through the legal purchase of Native American land in treaties. Indians were
encouraged to sell their vast tribal lands and become "civilized," which necessitated (among other things) Native American men to abandon hunting and become farmers, and for their society to reorganize around the family unit rather than the clan or tribe. While Thomas Jefferson believed that American Indians were the intellectual equals of whites
he also believed it necessary that they learn to live like the settlers or inevitably be pushed aside by them. Jefferson's beliefs, rooted in Age of Enlightenment thinking, which held that settlers and Native Americans would merge to create a single nation, did not survive his lifetime. Jefferson grew to believe that the natives should emigrate across the
Mississippi River and maintain a separate society, an idea formulated and made possible by the Louisiana Purchase of 1803. First land acquisitions As the new nation expanded westward, the U.S. government's initial means of acquiring land was through a treaty-purchase process. There were various reasons the tribes agreed to signing treaties,
which in most cases they could not read, and whose translations were often lacking. In numerous cases, government representatives procured the signatures of those not authorized to speak for the tribes, yet required them, to obey the conditions of the ill-begotten agreements. In other cases, tribes agreed to treaties in order to appearse the
government in the hopes of retaining some of their land, and to avoid conflicts with settlers. The signing of a treaty often followed a resignation of defeat and served as a last resort effort to bring peace. Prior to the American Revolution, various colonies created unofficial reservations, some of which were later formally recognized as "Indian
reservations." The first such reserve in North America was established on August 1, 1758, in Burlington County New Jersey by the New Jerse
employed, such as "discovery," right of conquest, coercion, and military force. In 1823 the Supreme Court handed down a decision (Johnson v. M'Intosh), which stated that Indians could occupy lands within the United States, but could not hold title to those lands. This was because their "right of occupancy" was subordinate to the United States, but could not hold title to those lands. This was because their "right of occupancy" was subordinate to the United States, but could not hold title to those lands.
of discovery."[1] Creation of Indian agencies In 1775 a trio of Indian agencies were created by the Second Continental Congress. Benjamin Franklin and Patrick Henry were among the early commissioners, who were charged with negotiating treaties with Native Americans and obtaining their neutrality during the American Revolutionary War. In
1789, the United States Congress placed Native American relations within the newly-formed War Department. By 1806, the Congress had created a Superintendent of Indian Trade within the fur trade. The post was held by Thomas L. McKenney from 1816 until the
abolition of the factory system in 1822. In 1824 the Office of Indian Affairs (now known as the Bureau of Indian Affairs) was formed. In 1832, Congress established the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs (now known as the Bureau of Indian Affairs) was formed. In 1832, Congress established the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs (now known as the Bureau of Indian Affairs) was formed.
Andrew Jackson called for an Indian Removal Act in his 1829 "State of the Union" message. Indian removal Act, part of a government policy known as Indian removal, which was signed into law by President Andrew Jackson on May 26, 1830.[2] The
 Removal Act was strongly supported in the South, where states were eager to gain access to lands inhabited by the "Five Civilized Tribes" (the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole) In particular, Georgia was involved in a contentious jurisdictional dispute with the Cherokee nation. President Jackson hoped removal would resolve the
Georgia crisis. The Indian Removal Act met with great controversy. Indian removal was in theory intended to be voluntary, in practice great pressure was put on Indian leaders to sign removal treaties. Most observers, whether they were in favor of the Indian removal policy or not, realized that the passage of the act meant the inevitable removal of
most Indians from the eastern states. After Jackson's landslide reelection in 1832, some Native American leaders who had previously resisted removal eventually began to reconsider their positions. While many Americans favored the passage of the Indian Removal Act, there was significant opposition. Many Christian missionaries, most notably
missionary organizer Jeremiah Evarts, agitated against passage of the Act. In Congress, New Jersey Senator Theodore Frelinghuysen and Congressman David Crockett of Tennessee spoke out against the legislation. Despite these efforts the Removal Act was passed following bitter debate in Congress. The Removal Act paved the way for the reluctant
and often forcible, emigration of tens of thousands of American Indians to the West. The first removal treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek on September 27, 1830 which Choctaws in Mississippi ceded land east of the river in exchange for payment and land in the West. The Treaty of New Echota, signed in 1835,
resulted in the removal of the Cherokee via the Trail of Seminoles did not leave peacefully as did other tribes; along with fugitive slaves they resisted the removal. The Second Seminoles were killed resisting.[3] Only a small group of Seminoles did not leave peacefully as did other tribes; along with fugitive slaves they resisted the removal.
 Indian reservations in modern day Oklahoma. Relations between settlers and natives had grown increasingly worse as the settlers encroached on territory and natural resources in the West. President Ulysses S. Grant pursued a stated "Peace Policy" as a possible solution to the conflict. The policy included a reorganization of the Indian Service, with
 the goal of relocating various tribes from their ancestral homes to parcels of lands established specifically for their inhabitation. The policy called for the replacement of government officials by religious men, nominated by churches, to oversee the Indian agencies on reservations in order to teach Christianity to the native tribes. In many cases the
lands granted to tribes were hostile to agricultural cultivation, leaving many tribes who accepted the policy in a state bordering on starvation. Reservation treaties sometimes included stipend agreements, in which the federal government promised to grant a certain amount of goods to a tribe yearly. The implementation of the policy was erratic,
 however, and in many cases the stipend goods were not delivered. Controversy The policy was controversial from the start. Reservations were generally established by executive order. In many cases, settlers objected to the size of land parcels, which were subsequently reduced. A report submitted to Congress in 1868 found widespread corruption
 among the federal Indian agencies and generally poor conditions among the relocated tribes. Many tribes ignored the United States Army to restrict the movements of various tribes. The pursuit of tribes in order to force them back
 primarily because it had resulted in some of the bloodiest wars between Native Americans and the United States. By 1877, President Rutherford B. Hayes began phasing out the policy, and by 1882 all religious organizations had religious organizations had religious organizations for the bloodiest wars between Native Americans and the United States. By 1877, President Rutherford B. Hayes began phasing out the policy, and by 1882 all religious organizations had religious organizations had religious organizations for the bloodiest wars between Native Americans and the United States. By 1877, President Rutherford B. Hayes began phasing out the policy, and by 1882 all religious organizations had religious organizations had religious organizations for the bloodiest wars between Native Americans and the United States. By 1877, President Rutherford B. Hayes began phasing out the policy, and by 1882 all religious organizations had religious organizations had religious organizations and the United States.
 Elias C. Boudinot began a campaign to open the land "unoccupied by any Indian" to settlement by non-Indians. He pointed out in a letter published in 1879 that four of the Five Civil War and received full payment. He put forth the view that that
area had thus become Public Land and suggested the names Unassigned Lands and Oklahoma for the district. In an attempt to prevent encroachment, President Rutherford B. Hayes issued a proclamation on April 26, 1879, forbidding trespass into the area, "...which Territory is designated, organized, and described by treaties and laws of the United
States and by executive authorities as the Indian's country...." His proclamation had little effect; almost immediately following Boudinot's letter, speculators and landless citizens began organizing and agitating for the opening of the land to settlement. The newspapers generally referred to these pro-settlement forces as Boomers and followed
 Boudinot's lead in referring to the area as the Unassigned Lands or Oklahoma. The Boomers planned excursions, which they called raids, into the area and surveyed town sites, built homes, and planted crops. The United States sent troops to round them up and expel them. The Boomer raids continued for several years. In 1885, Congress passed a
new Indian Appropriations Act which allowed Indian tribes to sell unoccupied lands in their possession. 1889 Act After years of trying to open Indian Territory, President Grover Cleveland, authorized a new Indian Appropriations Act on March 2, 1889, which officially opened the Unassigned Lands to settlers via homestead. Cleveland signed the Act
into law days before his successor, Benjamin Harrison, took over as President of the United States. This led to what became known as the Oklahoma Land Run of 1889, as the previously restricted land was opened for homesteading on a first arrival basis. The Dawes Act Henry L. Dawes, sponsor of the disastrous Dawes Act. On February 8, 1887,
Congress undertook a significant change in reservation policy by the passage of the Dawes Act, named after its sponsor, U.S. Senator Henry L. Dawes of Massachusetts. Also known as the General Allotment Act (GAA), it ended the general policy of granting land parcels to tribes as a whole by granting small parcels of land to individual tribe members
In some cases, for example the Umatilla Indian Reservation, after the individual parcels were granted out of reservation land, the reservation land, the reservation area was reduced by giving the excess land to settlers. The act was amended in 1891 and again in 1906 by the Burke Act. The individual allotment policy continued until 1934, when it was terminated by the
Indian Reorganization Act. Effects The land granted to most was not sufficient for economic viability, and division of land between heirs upon inheritance resulted in land fractionation. Most allotment land, which could be sold after a statutory period of 25 years, was eventually sold to non-Native buyers at bargain prices. Additionally, land deemed to
be "surplus" beyond what was needed for allotment was opened to settlers. The profits from the sales of these lands were often invested in programs purported to aid the American Indians. Native Americans lost, over the 47 years of the Act's life, about 90 million acres (360,000 km²) of treaty land, or about two-thirds of the 1887 land base. The resulting the sales of the Act's life, about 90 million acres (360,000 km²) of treaty land, or about two-thirds of the 1887 land base. The resulting the sales of the sales of the sales of the sales of the Act's life, about 90 million acres (360,000 km²) of treaty land, or about two-thirds of the sales of th
 was that almost 90,000 Indians were made landless.[4] The Dawes Act, with its emphasis on individual land ownership, had a negative impact on the unity, self-government, and culture of Indian tribes.[4] By dividing reservation lands into privately-owned parcels, the communal life-style of the Native societies was abruptly changed into a nuclear
family system. Cultural values and economic dependency, previously on the tribal level, fell strictly within this small household unit.[5] The allotment policy depleted the land base and ended hunting as a means of subsistence. The males were then forced out of their traditional hunter role into the fields—previously the woman's role as gatherer—and
the women were domesticated. Thus this Act imposed a patrilineal nuclear household onto many traditional matrilineal nuclear household onto many traditional nuclear household onto ma
issue a patent in fee simple to people classified "competent and capable." The criteria for this determination is unclear but meant that those deemed "competent by the Secretary of the Interior would have their land taken out of trust status, subject to taxation, and could then be sold by the person to whom it was allotted. The allotted lands of Indians
determined to be incompetent by the Secretary of the Interior were automatically leased out by the Federal Government. [6] The use of competence opened up categorization, and made allottee to decide
 whether to keep or sell the land, the harsh economic reality of the time, lack of access to credit and markets, liquidation of Indian lands was almost inevitable. As above, it was known by the Department of Interior that virtually 95 percent of fee patented land would eventually be sold.[7] Analysis of the Act Many reservations, such as the Laguna
Indian Reservation in New Mexico (pictured 1943), are in arid locations poorly suited to agriculture. In 1926, Secretary of the Interior Hubert Work commissioned a study of federal administration of Indian policy and the condition of Indian policy and the condition of Indian policy and the condition of Indian Problem of Indian Problem
 director, Lewis Meriam—documented years of fraud and misappropriation by government agents. In particular, the Meriam Report found that the General Allotment Act had been used almost since its inception to illegally deprive Native Americans of their land rights. [8] After considerable debate, the United States Congress in 1934 terminated the
allotment process under the Dawes Act by enacting the Indian Reorganization Act ("Wheeler-Howard Act"). (However, the allotment process in Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.) Despite termination of the allotment process in 1934, effects of the
General Allotment Act continue. For example, one provision of the Act was the establishment of a trust fund, administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to collect and distribute revenues from oil, mineral, timber, farming, and grazing leases on Native American lands. The BIA's alleged improper management of the trust fund resulted in litigation, in
particular the ongoing case Cobell v. Kempthorne, to force a proper accounting of the Five Civilized Tribes (completed 1936, published 1940), detailed how the allotment policy of the Dawes Act (as later extended to apply to the Five Civilized Tribes through such devices
 as the Dawes Commission and the Curtis Act of 1898) was systematically manipulated to deprive the Native Americans of their lands and resources.[9] Historian Ellen Fitzpatrick described Debo's book as having, "advanced a crushing analysis of the corruption, moral depravity, and criminal activity that underlay white administration and execution of
the allotment policy."[10] The "Indian New Deal" The administration of President Herbert Hoover reorganized the Bureau of Indian Affairs and also provided it with major funding increases. However, lasting reform of federal Indian Policies. As
a reform-minded president, Roosevelt nominated John Collier as Commissioner of Indian Civilian Corps. The Corps provided jobs to Native Americans in soil erosion control, forestation, range development, and other public works
projects. Coinciding with Roosevelt's New Deal, Collier introduced the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 which became one of the most influential and lasting pieces of legislation relating to federal Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 which became one of the most influential and lasting pieces of legislation relating to federal Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 which became one of the most influential and lasting pieces of legislation relating to federal Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 which became one of the Indian Reorganization Reorgani
by emphasizing Indian self-determination and a return of communal Indian land which was in direct contrast with the objectives of the Indian General Allotment Act of 1887. Collier was also responsible for getting the Johnson-O'Malley Act passed which allowed the United States Secretary of the Interior to sign contracts with state governments in an
effort to share responsibility for the social and economic well-being of American Indians. The Indian Reorganization Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Wheeler-Howard Act or informally, the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, also known as the Indian Reorganization Act of Indian Reorg
[11] These included a reversal of the Dawes Act's privatization of common holdings of American Indians and a return to local self-government on a tribal basis. The Act also restored to Native Americans the management of their assets (being mainly land) and included provisions intended to create a sound economic foundation for the inhabitants of
 Indian reservations. Section 18 of the IRA conditions application of the IRA was perhaps the most significant initiative of John Collier Sr., a social reformer and Indian advocate who was Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian
State, and local governments The act slowed the practice of assigning tribal lands to individual tribal members and reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members within tribal areas, of native holdings. Owing to this Act and to other actions of federal courts and the government, over two million acres (8,000 km²) of the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members within tribal areas, of native holdings. Owing to this Act and to other actions of federal courts and the government, over two million acres (8,000 km²) of the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the practice of checkerboard land sales to non-members are not reduced the loss, through the loss of the loss
land were returned to various tribes in the first 20 years after passage of the act. The Indian termination policy was set by the United States Congress in the 1950s and 1960s to assimilate the Native Americans into mainstream American society. The intention was to terminate the U.S. government's trusteeship of Indian
 reservations and induce Native Americans to assume all responsibilities of full citizenship. Congress passed termination acts on a tribe by tribe basis, but most included the end of federal recognition and all the federal aid that came along with being federally recognized tribes. The government terminated its recognition of a total of 109 tribes and
bands as sovereign dependent nations. Their population totaled over 11,000 Indians or 3 percent of the total Indian population totaled over 11,000 Indians or 3 percent of the last terminations, including that of the Ponca Tribe, which culminated in 1966.
 Presidents Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard Nixon decided to encourage Indian self-determination rather than termination. Some tribes resisted the policy by filing civil lawsuits. The litigation lasted until 1980, when the issue made its way to the US Supreme Court. The 1974 Boldt Decision was upheld in 1980 to recognize those treaty rights that were
lost. With problems arising in the 1960s several organizations were formed, such as the American Indian Movement (AIM) and other organizations that sought to protect the rights of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act
 which increased the tribal control over reservations and helped with the funding of building schools closer to the reservations. On January 24, 1983, President Ronald Reagan issued an American Indian policy statement that supported explicit repudiation of the termination policy and which reaffirmed the government-to-government relationship of
 Indian tribes with the United States; expressed the primary role of tribal governments in reservation affairs; and called for special efforts to develope the 1970 national Indian policy of self-determination for Indian tribes. [14] Twenty first century Today there are about 310 Indian
reservations in the United States, with a collective geographical area of 52.7 million acres (82,343.75 mi<sup>2</sup>)[15], representing 2.21 percent of the country's 562 recognized tribes have more than one reservation, others have none. In
 addition, because of past land sales and allotments, most reservations are severely fragmented to the point of being non-usable. Each piece of tribal, trust, and privately held land is a separate enclave. The Navajo tribe owns the largest amount of land (15,573,760 acres; 24,334 mi²), roughly the size of West Virginia.[16] There are twelve Indian
 reservations that are larger than the state of Rhode Island (776,960 acres; 1,214 mi2) and nine reservations are unevenly distributed throughout the country with some states
having none. Notably, Missouri and Arkansas are the only two states that are a part of the Contiguous 48 states west of the Mississippi River without Indian reservations. The tribal council, not the local or federal government, which may or may not
replicate the forms of government found outside the reservation. These conflicting jurisdictions and rules, as established by the Indian Reorganization Act, have resulted in confusion, frustration, antagonism, and litigation that severely reduces the quality of life, the potential for economic development, and the prospect for social harmony on
reservations.[17] Legacy The forced cultural loss and fragmented land base resulting from the General Allotment Act, compounded by the economic, social, and physical isolation from the majority society, has produced extreme poverty, high unemployment, unstable families, low rates of high school graduation, and high rates of alcoholism and/or
drug abuse and crime on many reservations.[18] While reservation life has historically been faced with challenges, it has also offered a strong sense of place and cultural identity, supporting a resurgence in tribal identity and a renaissance of traditions. They have emerged as the focal point for the retention of unique cultural identities and for issues
of sovereignty and self-determination. They provide a geographical and political platform to expand Native American expansionism, they are viewed by many as the last remaining stronghold of sovereignty and cultural
traditions, ensuring the perpetuation of Native American survival.[19] Notes ↑ Public Broadcasting Service, People & Events: Indian removal, 1814 - 1858. Retrieved January 27, 2009. ↑ Francis Paul Prucha, The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 206. ↑ Eric Foner
Give me Liberty!: An American History (New York: W.W. Norton, 2004 ISBN 9780393978728). ↑ 4.0 4.1 David S. Case and Davi
David Bartecchi, The History of "Competency" as a Tool to Control Native American Lands, Village Earth - Pine Ridge Project. Retrieved January 27, 2009. ↑ Paul Robertson, The Power of the Land: Identity, Ethnicity, and Class Among the Oglala Lakota (New York: Routledge, 2002, ISBN 9780815335917). ↑ Brookings Institution and Lewis Merian.
The Problem of Indian Administration; Report of a Survey Made at the Request of Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, and submitted to Him, February 21, 1928 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press). 1 Angie Debo, And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1991, ISBN 0691046158). 1
 Ellen Fitzpatrick, History's Memory: Writing America's Past, 1880-1980 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002, ISBN 067401605X), 133. ↑ Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, The Indian Reorganization Act (W'heeler-Howard Act)—June 18, 1934 Retrieved January 26, 2009. ↑ David E. Wilkins, American Indian Politics and the
 American Political System (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002, ISBN 9780847693061). ↑ Indian Education Coordination Program, The Millennium Is Now Here To Celebrate But We Should Also Celebrate 1900s. Retrieved February 25, 2009. ↑ United States Environmental Protection Agency, American Indian Policy. Retrieved February 25,
2009. ↑ 15.0 15.1 Bureau of Indian Affairs, Quick Facts. Retrieved January 28, 2009. ↑ 16.0 16.1 Klaus Frantz, 1999, Indian reservations in the United States: territory, sovereignty, and socioeconomic change (Chicago: University of Chicago: University 
Equal Rights Alliance. ↑ Gary D. Sandefur, American Indian reservations: The first underclass areas? Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved January 28, 2009. ↑ Answers Corporation, Indian Reservations: The first underclass areas? Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved January 28, 2009. ↑ Answers Corporation, Indian Reservations: The first underclass areas? Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved January 28, 2009. ↑ Answers Corporation, Indian Reservations: The first underclass areas? Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved January 28, 2009. ↑ Answers Corporation, Indian Reservations.
 Here. Retrieved January 28, 2009. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes. The Indian Reorganization Act (W'heeler-Howard Act) - June 18, 1934. Retrieved January 26, 2009. Debo, Angie. 1991. And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press. ISBN 0691046158. The Denver Post. November
21, 2007. Indian Justice. Retrieved January 28, 2009. Frazier, Ian. 2000. On the rez. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. ISBN 9780374226381. Olund, E. N. 2002. "Public Domesticity during the Indian Reform Era; or, Mrs. Jackson
 is induced to go to Washington." Gender Place and Culture 9: 153-166. OCLC 196633589. O'Neill, Terry. 2002. The Indian Reservations: America's Model of Destruction. Citizens Equal Rights Alliance. Retrieved January 28, 2009. Stremlau,
 Rose. 2005. "To Domesticate and Civilize Wild Indians: Allotment and the Campaign to Reform Indian Families, 1875-1887." Journal of Family History. 30 (3): 265-286. U.S. Census Bureau, Geographic Areas Reference manual. Chapter 5: American Indian and Alaska Native Areas. Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or formation for the material in any medium or for the material i
for any purpose, even commercially. Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially. The license terms. Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any
reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. ShareAlike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original. No additional restrictions — You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others
from doing anything the license permits. You do not have to comply with the license for elements of the material in the public domain or where your use is permitted by an applicable exception or limitation. No warranties are given. The license may not give you all of the permissions necessary for your intended use. For example, other rights such as
publicity, privacy, or moral rights may limit how you use the material. At Hearst Networks EMEA, we share stories are global and local, we reach audiences in over 100 countries, including the UK, Nordics, Benelux, Central & Eastern Europe, Spain, Italy, Germany, Africa and the Middle East. Our stories are global and local,
 linear and digital, and always compelling. Personalities shine at Hearst Networks EMEA. Our culture embraces individuals, in all their daring, passionate, ambitious glory. Our people are our strength, and our differences are celebrated. We challenge each other, collaborate and come together, just as a family does; winning as a team and celebrating
as one too. Everyone has a voice and should feel proud and free to run with their ideas, enjoying their successes and journey with us. And in such an evolving industry, tomorrow brings. We want to be famous for creating and sharing
stories that matter - unique, trusted, entertaining, everywhere. Whether our stories challenge and inspire intellectually or simply entertain, we know that we are making a positive contribution to our audiences across the many diverse regions and countries in the UK, Europe, The Middle East and Africa. Striving to always do so requires passion. And
it's with just as much passion that we strive to gain new audiences with our creativity and by using innovative technology, by partnering with leading and emerging local platforms. With our diverse line-up of original, high-quality programming, our distribution partners across EMEA recognise the benefits of offering Hearst Networks EMEA's
 distinctive, high quality brands on their platforms and services. We understand the opportunity to grow engagement with new audiences of all ages and through new partnerships with Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, TikTok and Snapchat, along with our podcasts and on-demand SVOD services, we ensure our programming and unique stories
reach audiences across the full demographic spectrum. Join our global team of talent. At Hearst Networks EMEA you'll find a team of innovative, creative and collaborative people who embrace change and want to continually try new things. With offices in London, Rome, Madrid, Warsaw, Munich and Johannesburg, we are a truly international
company that celebrates difference and diversity. We offer a range of benefits such as a generous pension plan, life assurance and holiday allowance, and there are useful local perks in various offices, and summer Fridays across the whole company. But most of all, we will support you to develop and grow throughout your time with us. Learning is
recognized American Indian Reservation Trust Lands. For information about these geographic entities, refer to Geographic Pribal Block Group Tribal Block Group Tribal
22 680 0050 Alabama-Coushatta Reservation 0 1 1 52 0080 Allegany Reservation 0 1 1 1 0140 Bad River Reservation 0 1 1 1 0110 Annette Island Reservation 0 1 1 1 0140 Bad River Reservation 0 1 1 1 0140 Bad River Reservation 0 1 1 1 015 Barona Reservation 0 1 1 1 0140 Bad River Reservation 0 1 1 1 015 Barona Reservation 0 1 1 1 015 Barona Reservation 0 1 1 1 0170 Bay Mills Reservation 0 1 1 1 1 0170 Bay Mills Reservation 0 1 1 1 0170 Bay Mills Reservation 0 1 1 1 0170 B
 Reservation Trust Land 0 2 2 48 0185 Benton Paiute Reservation 0 1 1 7 0200 Berry Creek Rancheria 0 1 1 2 0250 Big Pine Reservation 0 1 1 1 9 0265 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 2 2 6 0275 Big Valley Rancheria 0 1 1 2 0250 Big Pine Reservation 0 1 1 1 9 0265 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 1 1 2 0250 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 2 2 6 0275 Big Valley Rancheria 0 1 1 2 0250 Big Pine Reservation 0 1 1 2 0250 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 2 2 6 0275 Big Valley Rancheria 0 1 1 2 0250 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 1 1 1 0250 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 1 1 2 0250 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 1 1 1 1 0250 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 1 1 1 1 0250 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 1 1 1 1 1 0250 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 1 1 1 1 1 0250 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 1 1 1 1 1 0250 Big Sandy Rancheria 0 1 1 1 
1 2 0290 Bishop Reservation 0 1 1 26 0305 Blackfeet Reservation 3 4 5 125 0350 Bridgeport Reservation 0 1 1 5 0360 Brighton Reservation 0 1 1 5 0360 Brighton Reservation 0 1 1 29 0400 Burns Paiute Colony and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 2 5 73 0415 Cabazon Reservation
  5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 6.435 Cahuilla Reservation 0.2 3.25 0.440 Campbell Ranch 0.1 1.1 0.450 Campo Reservation 0.1 1.1 0.545 Capitan Grande Reservation 0.1 1.1 0.540 Cattaraugus Reservation 0.1 1.1 0.555 Cedarville Rancheria 0.1 1.1 0.560 Celilo Village 0.1 1.2 0.575 Chehalis Reservation 0.2 3.25 0.440 Campbell Ranch 0.1 1.1 0.540 Cattaraugus Reservation 0.1 1.1 0.540 C
2 31 0585 Chemehuevi Reservation 0 1 1 68 0605 Cheyenne River Reservation 0 1 2 12 0680 Cochiti Pueblo 0 1 3 176 0690 Coconut Creek Reservation 0 1 1 1 0695 Cocopah Reservation 0 2 3 64 0705 Coeur d'Alene Reservation 0 2 10
855 0720 Cold Springs Rancheria 0 2 2 10 0735 Colorado River Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 5 7 14 0775 Coquille Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 5 7 14 0775 Columb Reservation Trust Land 0 5 7 14 0775 Coquille Reservation Trust Land 0 5 8
60 0780 Cortina Rancheria 0 1 1 2 0795 Coushatta Reservation 0 1 2 13 0815 Cow Creek Reservation 0 4 5 15 0825 Coyote Valley Reservation 0 1 1 6 0845 Crow Reservation 0 1 2 13 0815 Cow Creek Reservation 0 1 2 13 0815 Cow Creek Reservation 0 1 1 6 0845 Crow Reservation 0 1 2 17 0955 Dry Creek
Rancheria 0 1 1 1 0965 Duck Valley Reservation 0 1 2 406 0975 Duckwater Reservation 0 1 1 2 1070 Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Colony 0 1 2 2 8 1075 Fallon Paiute-Shoshone
Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 2 2 50 1100 Flandreau Reservation 0 1 2 30 1110 Flathead Reservation Trust Land 0 6 10 279 1135 Forest County Potawatomi Community and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 5 7 101 1140 Fort Apache Reservation 0 3 9 1,314 1150 Fort
Belknap Reservation and Off-Reservation 0 1 1 18 1185 Fort Hall Reservation 0 1 1 18 1185 Fort Hall Reservation 0 2 4 156 1220 Fort McDowell Reservation 0 1 1 18 1185 Fort Independence Reservation 0 1 1 18 1185 Fort Hall Reservation 0 2 4 156 1220 Fort McDowell Reservation 0 1 1
60 1235 Fort Mojave Reservation and Off-Reservation 7 3 8 512 1340 Goshute Reservation 0 3 79 1355 Grand Portage Reservation and Off-Reservation 0 3 6 340 1310 Gila River Reservation 7 3 8 512 1340 Goshute Reservation 0 3 79 1355 Grand Portage Reservation and Off-Reservation 0 3 6 340 1310 Gila River Reservation 7 8 8 512 1340 Goshute Reservation 0 3 79 1355 Grand Portage Reservation and Off-Reservation 0 3 6 340 1310 Gila River Reservation 0 3 6 340 1310 Gila River Reservation 0 3 6 340 1310 Gila River Reservation 0 3 79 1355 Grand Portage Reservation 0 3 6 340 1310 Gila River Reservation 0 3 6 340 1310 Gila River Reservation 0 3 79 1355 Grand Portage Reservation 0 3 6 340 1310 Gila River Reservation 0 3 79 1355 Grand Portage Reservation 0 3 6 340 1310 Gila River Reservation 0 3 79 1355 Grand Portage Reservation 0 3 70 1350 Grand Portage Reservation 0 3 7
Reservation Trust Land 0 1 1 76 1365 Grand Ronde Community and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 2 2 78 1370 Grand Traverse Reservation Trust Land 0 1 1 3 1395 Grindstone Rancheria and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 1 2 3 1410 Hannahville Community and
Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 3 3 37 1440 Havasupai Reservation 0 1 1 6 1475 Hollywood Reservation 0 1 1 2 174 1505 Hopi Reservation 0 1 1 6 1475 Hollywood R
Rancheria and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 1 2 30 1530 Houlton Maliseet Trust Land 0 2 2 16 1545 Hualapai Reservation 0 1 1 2 1555 Immokalee Reservation 0 2 3 5 1560 Inaja and Cosmit Reservation 0 2 2 6 1575 Indian Township Reservation 0 1 1 53 1590 Iowa
Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 3 3 47 1610 Isabella Reservation Trust Land 0 8 24 1,024 1625 Isleta Pueblo 0 2 2 533 1640 Jackson Rancheria 0 1 1 3 1655 Jamestown S'Klallam Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 8 24 1,024 1625 Isleta Pueblo 0 2 2 533 1640 Jackson Rancheria 0 1 1 3 1655 Jamestown S'Klallam Reservation Trust Land 0 8 24 1,024 1625 Isleta Pueblo 0 2 2 533 1640 Jackson Rancheria 0 1 1 3 1655 Jamestown S'Klallam Reservation Trust Land 0 8 24 1,024 1625 Isleta Pueblo 0 2 2 533 1640 Jackson Rancheria 0 1 1 3 1655 Jamestown S'Klallam Reservation Trust Land 0 8 24 1,024 1625 Isleta Pueblo 0 2 2 533 1640 Jackson Rancheria 0 1 1 3 1655 Jamestown S'Klallam Reservation Trust Land 0 8 24 1,024 1625 Isleta Pueblo 0 8 24 1,024 1625 Is
Reservation 0 2 4 1,966 1720 Kaibab Reservation 0 2 4 29 1750 Karuk Reservation 0 1 1 5 1785 Klamath Reservation 0 2 4 21 1800 Kootenai Reservation 0 1 1 4 1815 Lac Courte Oreilles
241 1895 La Posta Reservation 0 1 2 21 1915 Las Vegas Colony 0 2 2 6 1925 Laytonville Rancheria 0 1 1 7 1940 Leech Lake Reservation 0 1 1 2 1963 Little Traverse Bay Reservation 0 1 1 1 1970 Lone Pine Reservation 0 1 1 7 1980 Lookout
Rancheria 0 1 1 1 1995 Los Coyotes Reservation 0 1 1 28 2015 Lower Sloux Reservation 0 1 1 28 2015 Lower Sloux Reservation 0 1 1 3 2030 Lower Brule Reservation 0 1 3 104 2085 Makah Reservation 0 2 3 189 2100
Manchester-Point Arena Rancheria 0 1 1 12 2115 Manzanita Reservation 0 1 1 18 2130 Maricopa (Ak Chin) Reservation on 0 1 1 88 2145 Mashantucket Pequot Reservation on 0 1 1 88 2145 Mashantucket Pequot Reservation on 0 1 1 88 2145 Mashantucket Pequot Reservation on 0 1 2 5 2205 Mescalero Reservation
0 2 3 277 2240 Miccosukee Reservation 0 3 3 17 2255 Middletown Rancheria 0 1 1 1 2270 Mille Lacs Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 16 19 273 2315 Moapa River Reservation 0 1 1 42 2320 Mohegan
Reservation 0 1 2 4 2330 Montgomery Creek Rancheria 0 1 1 5 2340 Mooretown Rancheria 0 1 1 5 2340 Morongo Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo And Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 6 11 58 2400 Nambe Pueblo A
Off-Reservation Trust Land 108 44 157 44,118 2445 Nez Perce Reservation 0 5 25 1,774 2460 Nisqually Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 5 6 531 2495 North Fork Rancheria 0 1 1 2 2505 Northwestern Shoshoni
0 7 7 65 2635 Pala Reservation 0 3 5 100 2680 Pascua Yagui Reservation 0 1 2 38 2695 Passamaquoddy Trust Land 0 6 7 134 2715 Pauma and Yuima Reservation 0 1 2 33 2760 Penobscot Reservation 0 1 2 38 2695 Passamaquoddy Trust Land 0 6 7 134 2715 Pauma and Yuima Reservation 0 1 2 38 2695 Passamaquoddy Trust Land 0 6 7 134 2715 Pauma and Yuima Reservation 0 1 2 38 2695 Passamaquoddy Trust Land 0 9 11 162 2775 Picayune Rancheria 0 1 1 3 2785 Picuris Pueblo 0 1 2 109 2810
Pine Ridge Reservation and Off-Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 8 11 19 2,383 2820 Pinoleville Rancheria 0 2 2 8 2835 Pit River Trust Land 0 6 6 33 2880 Pojoaque Pueblo 0 2 5 119 2910 Port Gamble Reservation 0 1 1 11 2925 Port Madison
Reservation 0 2 5 126 2980 Prairie Band Potawatomi Reservation 0 1 1 350 3020 Quartz Valley Reservation 0 1 1 24 3030 Quileute Reservation 0 1 1 24 3030 Quileute Reservation 0 1 1 21 3040
Quinault Reservation 0 2 2 451 3070 Ramona Village 0 1 2 8 3085 Red Cliff Reservation 4 14 20 962 3115 Redwood Valley Rancheria 0 2 2 3100 Red Lake Reservation 0 1 2 5 3130 Reno-Sparks Colony 0 4 4 36 3145 Resignini Rancheria 0 1 1 8 3165 Rincon Reservation 0
3 3 23 3185 Roaring Creek Rancheria 0 1 1 3 3195 Robinson Rancheria and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 5 8 329 3220 Rohnerville Rancheria 0 2 2 2 3235 Rosebud Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation and Off-Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 5 8 329 3220 Rohnerville Rancheria 0 2 2 2 3235 Rosebud Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 5 8 329 3220 Rohnerville Rancheria 0 2 2 2 3235 Rosebud Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 5 8 329 3220 Rohnerville Rancheria 0 2 2 2 3235 Rosebud Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250 Round Valley Reservation Trust Land 20 8 22 2,571 3250
Trust Land 0 2 4 186 3265 Rumsey Rancheria 0 1 1 5 3280 Sac and Fox/Meskwaki Reservation Trust Land 0 4 6 58 3285 Sac and Fox Reservation Trust Land 0 3 4 46 3305 St. Croix Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 4 6 58 3285 Sac and Fox Reservation Trust Land 0 3 4 46 3305 St. Croix Reservation Trust Land 0 4 6 58 3285 Sac and Fox Reservation Trust Land 0 4 6 58 3285 Sac and Fox Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservation Trust Land 0 5 10 53 3320 St. Regis Mohawk Reservati
7 4 5 311 3355 San Carlos Reservation 0 2 10 584 3370 Sandia Pueblo 0 2 6 224 3385 Sandy Lake Reservation 0 2 1 1 3400 San Felipe Pueblo 0 1 1 141 3415 San Ildefonso Pueblo 0 1 3 129 3430 Santa Ana Pueblo 0 3 3 126 3495 Santa
Clara Pueblo 0 2 8 433 3520 Santa Rosa Rancheria 0 1 1 4 3525 Santa Rosa Reservation 0 1 2 61 3565 Santa Rosa Reservation 0 1 2 15 3585 Santo Domingo Pueblo 0 1 3 140 3625 Sauk-Suiattle Reservation 0 2 2 3 3635 Sault Ste. Marie Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust
Land 0 11 13 91 3665 Seminole Trust Land 0 1 1 1 3680 Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 2 3 29 3735 Sherwood Valley Rancheria 0 1 1 6 3780 Shoalwater Bay Reservation Trust Land 0 1 2 10 3795 Siletz Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust
Land 0 1 3 68 3825 Skokomish Reservation 0 1 1 48 3840 Skull Valley Reservation 0 1 1 31 3885 Sokaogon Chippewa Community and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 1 1 34 3925 Southern Ute Reservation 0 1 1 34 3925 Southern Ute Reservation 0 1 1 31 3885 Sokaogon Chippewa Community and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 2 3
82 3935 Spirit Lake Reservation 4 5 10 758 3940 Spokane Reservation 0 2 4 434 3955 Squaxin Island Reservation 8 9 10 1,385 3980 Stewart Community 0 2 3 61 3985 Stewarts Point Rancheria 0 1 2 3 4000 Stillaguamish Reservation 0 1 1 1 4015 Stockbridge-Munsee
Community 0 2 3 116 4030 Sulphur Bank Rancheria 0 1 1 12 4045 Summit Lake Reservation 0 1 1 32 4060 Susanville Rancheria 0 1 1 1 4130 Tampa Reservation 0 1 1 1 4130 Tampa Reservation 0 1 1 1 4095 Table Bluff Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 1 1 5 4110 Table Mountain Rancheria 0 1 1 1 4130 Tampa Reservation 0 1 1
1 4140 Taos Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 1 8 328 4170 Tesuque Pueblo and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 1 2 53 4200 Tohono O'odham Reservation 0 1 1 3 4255 Torres-Martinez Reservation 0 6 9 170 4275 Trinidad
 Rancheria and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 1 1 3 4290 Tulalip Reservation 0 7 14 180 4300 Tule River Reservation 0 1 2 73 4315 Tunica-Biloxi Reservation Trust Land 0 1 1 3 4290 Tulalip Reservation Trust Land 0 1 1 3 4290 Tulalip Reservation 0 1 2 73 4315 Tunica-Biloxi Reservation 0 1 2
4375 Twenty-Nine Palms Reservation 0 4 4 12 4390 Uintah and Ouray Reservation 0 1 1 12 4445 Upper Sioux Reservation 0 1 1 12 4445 Upper Sioux Reservation 0 2 2 13 4470 Ute Mountain Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 3 5
690 4500 Viejas Reservation 0 3 3 21 4515 Walker River Reservation 0 7 11 830 4580 Wells Colony 0 1 1 6 4595 White Earth Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation And Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation And Off-Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4610 Wind River Reservation Trust Land 0 7 18 1,487 4
Reservation Trust Land 0 6 29 3,764 4625 Winnebago Reservation Trust Land 0 9 32 3,764 4625 Winnebago Reservation 0 1 1 1 4680 XL Ranch 0 1 3 63 4690 Yakama Reservation Trust Land 0 9 32 3,192 4700 Yankton Reservation 0 2 10 1,066 4708 Yavapai-Apache Nation
9 644 4910 Kickapoo (KS)/Sac and Fox joint use area 0 1 1 1 4915 Menominee/Stockbridge-Munsee joint use area 0 1 1 14 4930 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4930 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana joint use area 0 1 1 14 4940 San Felipe/Santa Ana jo
Subjects A to Z | Search | Product Catalog | Data Tools | FOIA | Quality | Privacy · Policies | Contact Us | Home Land managed by Native American reservations in the United States of America. For similar entities in Canada, see Indian reserve. For
similar terms, see Indian reserve (disambiguation). Not to be confused with Reservation in India. Indian reservations Also known as:Domestic dependent nationsCategoryPolitical divisionsLocationUnited StatesCreated1758 (Brotherton)-PresentNumber326[1]PopulationsAbout 1 million (total)[2][3] Largest: Navajo Nation (165,158)[4]Areas1.32 acres
(0.53 ha) (Cemetery of the Pit River Tribe in California) - 27,413 sq mi (71,000 km2) (Navajo Nation Reservation located in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)[1] This article is part of a series on Political divisions of the United States First level State (Commonwealth) Federal district Territory (Commonwealth) Indian reservation (list) / Hawaiian home
land / Alaska Native tribal entity / Pueblo / Off-reservation trust land / Tribal Jurisdictional Area Second level County / Parish / Borough Unorganized Borough / Census area / Villages / District (USVI) / Dist
Coterminous municipality Census-designated place Barrio Chapter State-recognized tribes Fourth level Ward Other areas (Conservation district, National monument, Nati
town United States portalyte An American Indian reservation is an area of land held and government. The reservation is autonomous but subject to regulations passed by the United States Congress, and is administered by the United States Bureau of
Indian Affairs. It is not subject, however, to a state or local government of the U.S. state in which it is located. Some of the country's 574[5] federally recognized tribes govern more than one of the 326[6] Indian reservations in the United States, while some share reservations, and others have no reservation at all. Historical piecemeal land allocations
under the Dawes Act facilitated sales to non-Native Americans, resulting in some reservations becoming severely fragmented, with pieces of tribal and privately held land being treated as separate enclaves. This intersection of private and public real estate creates significant administrative, political, and legal difficulties.[7] The total area of all
reservations is 56,200,000 acres (22,700,000 ha; 87,800 sq mi; 227,000 km2), approximately 2.3% of the total area of the United States and about the size of the state of Rhode Island. The largest reservation, the
Navajo Nation Reservation, is similar in size to the Mississippi River and occupying lands that were first reserved by treaty (Indian Land Grants) from the public domain.[10] Because recognized Native American nations possess
tribal sovereignty, albeit of a limited degree, laws within tribal lands may vary from those of the surrounding and adjacent states.[11] For example, these laws can permit casinos on reservation over the reservation, not the U.S.
state it is located in, but is subject to federal law. Court jurisdiction in Indian country is shared between tribes and the federal government, depending on the tribal affiliation of the parties involved and the specific crime or civil matter. Different reservations have different systems of government, which may or may not replicate the forms of
```

```
government found outside the reservation. Most Native American reservations were established by the federal government but a small number, mainly in the East, owe their origin to state recognition. [12] The term "reservation" is a legal designation. It comes from the conception of the Native American nations as independent sovereigns at the time
the U.S. Constitution was ratified. Thus, early peace treaties (often signed under conditions of duress or fraud), in which Native American nations, as sovereigns, "reserved" to themselves, and those parcels came to be called "reservations".[13][14] The
term remained in use after the federal government began to forcibly relocate nations to parcels of land to which they often had no historical or cultural connection. Compared to other population centers in the U.S., reservations are disproportionately located on or near toxic sites hazardous to the health of those living or working in close proximity,
including nuclear testing grounds and contaminated mines.[15] The majority of American Indians and Alaska Natives live outside the reservations, mainly in the larger western cities such as Phoenix and Los Angeles.[16][17] In 2012, there were more than 2.5 million Native Americans, with 1 million living on reservations.[2][3] From the beginning of
the European colonization of the Americas, Europeans often removed Indigenous peoples from their homelands. The means varied, including treaties made under considerable duress, forceful ejection, violence, and in a few cases voluntary moves based on mutual agreement. The removal caused many problems such as tribes losing the means of
livelihood by being restricted to a defined area, poor quality of land for agriculture, and hostility between tribes as a method of legitimizing their conquests in the face of competing claims by the Spanish Empire and violent resistance from the tribes
themselves.[19] Applying the term "treaty" to such unequal relationships may seem paradoxical from a modern perspective because in modern English, the word "treaty" usually connotes an agreement between two states of theoretically equal sovereignty, not an agreement between conquered people and a conqueror.[19] However, in premodern
times, it was common for European princes to routinely enter into unequal treaties with lesser dependent powers.[19] The first reservation was established by Easton Treaty with the colonial governments of New Jersey and Pennsylvania on August 29, 1758. Located in southern New Jersey, it was called Brotherton Indian Reservation[20] and also
Edgepillock[21] or Edgepelick.[22] The area was 3,284 acres (13.29 km2).[21] Today it is called Indian Mills in Shamong Township.[21][22] In 1764 the British government's Board of Trade proposed the "Plan for the Future Management of Indian Affairs".[23] Although never adopted formally, the plan established the British government's expectation
that land would only be bought by colonial governments, not individuals, and that land would only be purchased at public meetings. [23] Additionally, this plan dictated that the Indians would be properly consulted when ascertaining and defining the boundaries of colonial settlement. [23] The private contracts that once characterized the sale of Indian
land to various individuals and groups—from farmers to towns—were replaced by treaties between sovereigns.[23] This protocol was adopted by the United States Government after the American Revolution.[23] On March 11, 1824, U.S. Vice President John C. Calhoun founded the Office of Indian Affairs (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division
of the United States Department of War (now the United States Department of War (now the United States Department of Defense), to solve the land problem with 38 treaties with American Indian Treaties, and Laws and Regulations Relating to Indian Affairs (1825) was a document signed by President Andrew Jackson[25] in which he states that "we have placed the land
reserves in a better state for the benefit of society" with approval of Indigenous reservations before 1850.[26] The letter is signed by Isaac Shelby and Jackson. It discusses several regulations regarding the Native Americans and the approval of Indigenous reservation system. President Martin Van Buren negotiated a treaty with
the Saginaw Chippewas in 1837 to build a lighthouse. The President of the United States of America was directly involved in the creation of new treaties regarding Indian Reservations before 1850. Van Buren stated that indigenous reservations are "all their reserves of land in the state of Michigan, on the principle of said reserves being sold at the
public land offices for their benefit and the actual proceeds being paid to them. "[27] The agreement dictated that the indigenous tribe sell their land to build a lighthouse. [27] A treaty signed by John Forsyth, the Secretary of State on behalf of Van Buren, also dictates where indigenous peoples must live in terms of the reservation system in America
 between the Oneida People in 1838. This treaty allows the indigenous peoples five years on a specific reserve "the west shores of Saganaw bay".[28] The creation of reservations for indigenous people of America could be as little as a five-year approval before 1850. Article two of the treaty claims "the reserves on the river Angrais and at Rifle river, of
which said Indians are to have the usufruct and occupancy for five years." Indigenous people had restraints pushed on them by the five-year allowance. Scholarly author Buck Woodard used executive papers from Governor William H. Cabell in his article, "Indian Land sales and allotment in Antebellum Virginia" to discuss Indigenous reservations in
America before 1705, specifically in Virginia. [29] He claims "the colonial government again recognized the Nottoway's land rights by treaty in 1713, at the conclusion of the Tuscaro War." [29] The indigenous peoples of America had land treaty agreements as early as 1713. [29] The British colonies in North America from 1763 to 1775, at the outbreak
of the American Revolutionary War, including the locations of Indian Reserve (highlighted in grey) and the proposed colonies of Charlotiana, Transylvania, and Vandalia The American Indigenous Reservation system started with "the Royal Proclamation of 1763, where Great Britain set aside an enormous resource for Indians in the territory of the
present United States."[30] The United States put forward another act when "Congress passed the Indian Removal Act in 1830".[31] A third act pushed through was "the federal government relocated "portions of [the] 'Five Civilized Tribes' from the southeastern states in the Non-Intercourse Act of 1834."[32] All three of these laws set into motion the
Indigenous Reservation system in the United States of America, resulting in the forceful removal of Indigenous peoples into specific land Reservations and the United States "[33] in his article, "Decision on Duck Creek: Two Green Bay Reservations and Indigenous Reservations and Indigenous Reservations (Indigenous Reservations).
Their Boundaries, 1816-1996", showing yet another treaty regarding Indigenous Reservations before 1850. There is a conflict between the lands of the Oneida, known in the Treaty as the "New York Indians".[33] This Treaty from 1831 is the
cause of conflicts and is disputed because the land was good hunting grounds. The Indian Country (highlighted in red) in 1834 The Trade and Intercourse Act, the United States defined the boundaries of Indian County."[34] Also, "For Unrau, Indigenous Country is less on Indigenous
homeland and more a place where the U.S. removed Indians from east of the Mississippi River and applied unique laws."[34] The United States of America applied laws on Indigenous Reservations depending on where they were located like the Mississippi River. This act came too, because "the federal government began to compress Indigenous lands
because it needed to send troops to Texas during the Mexican-American War and protect American immigration traveling to Oregon and California."[35] The Federal Government of America had their own needs and desires for Indigenous Land Reservations. He says, "the reconnaissance of explorers and other American officials understood that
Indigenous Country possessed good land, bountiful game, and potential mineral resources."[35] The American Government claimed Indigenous Land Reservations of Indigenous land for their own policy when it came to Indian Reservations in America before 1850. Scholarly author
George D. Harmon discusses Texas' own reservation system as seen in Harmon's article, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845-1860."[37] The State of
"Texas had given only a few hundred acres of land in 1840, for the purpose of colonization".[36] However, "In March 1847, ... [a] special agent [was sent] to Texas to manage the Indian affairs in the State until Congress should take some definite and final action."[38] The United States of America allowed its states to make up their own treaties such
as this one in Texas for the purpose of colonization. Main article: Indian removal The passage of the Indian Removal Act of 1830 marked the systematization of a U.S. federal government policy of moving Native populations away from European-populated areas, whether forcibly or voluntarily. One example was the Five Civilized Tribes, who were
removed from their historical homelands in the Southeastern United States and moved to Indian Territory, in a forced mass migration that came to be known as the Trail of Tears. Some of the lands these tribes were given to inhabit following the removals eventually became Indian reservations. In 1851, the United States Congress passed the Indian
Appropriations Act which authorized the creation of Indian reservations in Indian reservations (which became Oklahoma). Relations between white settlers and Natives had grown increasingly worse as the settlers encroached on territory and natural resources in the West.[39] Most Indian reservations, like the Laguna Indian reservation in New Mexico
(pictured here in March 1943), are in the western United States, often in regions suitable more for ranching than farming. Paul Brodie's Map Showing the Location of the United States and Territories, 1885 In 1868, President Ulysses S. Grant pursued a "Peace Policy" as an attempt to avoid violence.[40]
The policy included a reorganization of the Indian Service, with the goal of relocating various tribes from their ancestral homes to parcels of lands established specifically for their inhabitation. The policy called for the replacement of government officials by religious men, nominated by churches, to oversee the Indian agencies on reservations in order
to teach Christianity to the Native American tribes. The Quakers were especially active in this policy on reservations.[41] The policy was controversial from the start. Reservations were generally established by executive order. In many cases, white settlers objected to the size of land parcels, which were subsequently reduced. A report submitted to
Congress in 1868 found widespread corruption among the federal Native American agencies and generally poor conditions among the relocated tribes. Many tribes ignored the United States Army to restrict the movements of various
tribes. The pursuit of tribes in order to force them back onto reservations led to a number of wars with Native Americans which included the Battle of Little Bighorn. Other famous wars in this regard included the
Nez Perce War and the Modoc War, which marked the last conflict officially declared a war. By the late 1870s, the policy established by President Rutherford B. Hayes began phasing
out the policy, and by 1882 all religious organizations had relinquished their authority to the federal Indian agency. In 1887, Congress undertook a significant change in reservation policy by the passage of the Dawes Act, or General Allotment (Severalty) Act. The act ended the general policy of granting land parcels to tribes as-a-whole by granting
small parcels of land to individual tribe members. In some cases, for example, the Umatilla Indian Reservation, after the individual parcels were granted out of reservation land, the reservation area was reduced by giving the "excess land" to white settlers. The individual allotment policy continued until 1934 when it was terminated by the Indian
Reorganization Act. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, also known as the Howard-Wheeler Act, was sometimes called the Indian New Deal and was initiated by John Collier. It laid out new rights for Native Americans, reversed some of the earlier privatization of their common holdings, and encouraged tribal sovereignty and land management by
tribes. The act slowed the assignment of tribal lands to individual members and reduced the assignment of "extra" holdings to nonmembers. For the following 20 years, the U.S. government invested in infrastructure, health care, and education on the reservations. Likewise, over two million acres (8,000 km2) of land were returned to various tribes.
Within a decade of Collier's retirement the government's position began to swing in the opposite direction. The new Indian Commissioners Myers and Emmons introduced the idea of the "withdrawal program" or "termination", which sought to end the government's responsibility and involvement with Indians and to force their assimilation. The Indians
would lose their lands but were to be compensated, although many were not. Even though discontent and social rejection killed the idea before it was fully implemented, five tribes were terminated—the Coushatta, Ute, Paiute, Menominee and Klamath—and 114 groups in California lost their federal recognition as tribes. Many individuals were also
relocated to cities, but one-third returned to their tribal reservations in the decades that followed. Federally recognized Native American tribes possess limited to the ability to pass laws, regulate power and energy, create treaties, and hold tribal court
hearings.[42] Laws on tribal lands may vary from those of the surrounding area.[11] The laws passed can, for example, permit legal casinos on reservations. The tribal council, not the local government, which example, permit legal casinos on reservations. The tribal council, not the local government, which example, permit legal casinos on reservations.
may or may not replicate the forms of government found outside the reservation.[43] With the establishment of reservations, tribal territories diminished to a fraction of their original areas; customary Native American practices of land tenure were sustained only for a time, and not in every instance. Instead, the federal government established
regulations that subordinated tribes to the authority, first, of the military, and then of the Bureau (Office) of Indian Affairs.[44] Under federal law, the government patented reservations to tribes, which became legal entities that at later times have operated in a corporate manner. Tribal tenure identifies jurisdiction over land-use planning and zoning,
negotiating (with the close participation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs) leases for timber harvesting and mining. [45] Tribes generally have authority over other forms of economic development such as ranching, agriculture, tourism, and casinos. Tribes hire both members, other Indians and non-Indians in varying capacities; they may run tribal stores
gas stations, and develop museums (e.g., there is a gas station and general store at Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, and a museum at Foxwoods, on the Mashantucket Pequot Indian Reservation in Connecticut).[45] Tribal citizens may utilize several resources held in tribal tenures such as grazing range and some cultivable lands. They may also
construct homes on tribally held lands. As such, members are tenants-in-common, which may be likened to communal tenure. Even if some of this pattern emanates from pre-reservation tribal customs, generally the tribe has the authority to modify tenant-in-common practices. Wagon loaded with squash, Rosebud Indian Reservation, ca. 1936 With the
General Allotment Act (Dawes), 1887, the government sought to individualize tribal lands by authorizing allotments held in individual tenure. [46] Generally, the allocation process led to grouping family holdings and, in some cases, this sustained pre-reservation clan or other patterns. There had been a few allotment programs ahead of the Dawes Act.
However, the vast fragmentation of reservations occurred from the enactment of this act up to 1934, when the Endian Reorganization Act was passed. However, Congress authorized some allotment set in motion a number of
circumstances: individuals could sell (alienate) the allotment - under the Dawes Act, it was not to happen until after twenty-five years. individual allottees who would die intestate would encumber the land under prevailing state devisement laws, leading to complex patterns of heirship. Congress has attempted to mollify the impact of heirship by
granting tribes the capacity to acquire fragmented allotments owing to heirship by financial grants. Tribes may also include such parcels in long-range land use planning. With alienation to non-Indians, their increased presence on numerous reservations has changed the demography of Indian Country. One of many implications of this fact is that
tribes can not always effectively embrace the total management of a reservation, for non-Indian owners and users of allotted lands contend that tribes have no authority over lands that fall within the tax and law-and-order jurisdiction of local government. [48] The demographic factor, coupled with landownership data, led, for example, to litigation
between the Devils Lake Sioux and the State of North Dakota, where non-Indians owned more acreage than tribal members even though more Native Americans resided on the reservation than non-Indians. The court decision turned, in part, on the perception of Indian character, contending that the tribe did not have jurisdiction over the alienated
allotments. In a number of instances—e.g., the Yakama Indian Reservation—tribes have identified open and closed areas within reservations. One finds the majority of non-Indian landownership and residence in the open areas and, contrariwise, closed areas represent exclusive tribal residence and related conditions. [49] Spring roundup of Paiute-
owned cattle begins at Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, 1973. Indian country today consists of tripartite government—i. e., federal, state and/or local, and tribal. Where state and local governments may exert some, but limited, law-and-order authority, tribal sovereignty is diminished. This situation prevails in connection with Indian gaming, because
federal legislation makes the state a party to any contractual or statutory agreement. [50] Finally, occupancy on reservations; most would occupy tribal land by consent of the federal government or the tribe. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) agency offices, hospitals,
schools, and other facilities usually occupy residual federal parcels within reservations. Many reservations include one or more sections (about 640 acres) of land for schools, but such land typically remains part of the reservations include one or more sections (about 640 acres) of land for schools, but such land may sit idle or be used for cattle grazing by
tribal ranchers. Main article: Native American gaming In 1979, the Seminole tribe in Florida operation down but was stopped in the courts. In the 1980s, the case of California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians established the right of reservations to
operate other forms of gambling operations. In 1988, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which recognized the right of Native American tribes to establish gambling and gaming facilities on their reservations as long as the states in which they are located have some form of legalized gambling. Today, many Native American casinos
are used as tourist attractions, including as the basis for hotel and conference facilities, to draw visitors and revenue to reservations. Successful gaming operations on some reservations, and health for their people. Main article:
Indian country jurisdiction Serious crime on Indian reservations has historically been required (by the federal government, usually the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and prosecuted by United States Attorneys of the United States federal judicial district
in which the reservation lies.[52] Tribal courts were limited to sentences of one year or less,[53] until on July 29, 2010, the Tribal Law and Order Act was enacted which in some measure reforms the system permitting tribal courts to impose sentences of up to three years provided proceedings are recorded and additional rights are extended to
defendants.[54][55] The Justice Department on January 11, 2010, initiated the Indian Country Law Enforcement Initiative which recognizes problems with law enforcement on Justice recognizes the unique legal relationship that the United States has with
federally recognized tribes. As one aspect of this relationship, in much of Indian Country, the Justice Department alone has the authority to seek a conviction that carries an appropriate potential sentence when a serious crime has been committed. Our role as the primary prosecutor of serious crimes makes our responsibility to citizens in Indian
Country unique and mandatory. Accordingly, public safety in tribal communities is a top priority for the Department of Justice. Emphasis was placed on improving prosecution of crimes involving Indians in India
Country to certain States and allowed other States to assume jurisdiction. Subsequent legislation allowed States to retrocede jurisdiction, which has occurred in some areas. Some PL 280 reservations have experienced jurisdiction, which has occurred in some areas.
response.[57] As of 2012, a high incidence of rape continued to impact Native Americans and Methamphetamine and and Met
general U.S. population and are often due to traffic collisions and liver disease with homicide, suicide, and falls also contributing. Deaths due to alcohol among American Indians are more common in men and among Northern Plains Indians. Alaska Natives showed the least incidence of death.[59] Under federal law, alcohol sales are prohibited on
 Indian reservations unless the tribal councils allow it.[60] Gang violence has become a major social problem.[61] A December 13, 2009, article in The New York Times about growing gang violence on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation estimated that there were 39 gangs with 5,000 members on that reservation alone.[62] As opposed to traditional
 "Most Wanted" lists, Native Americans are often placed on regional Crime Stoppers lists offering rewards for their whereabouts.[63] When the Europeans encountered the New World, the America through treaties between countries. This precedent
was upheld by the United States government. As a result, most Native American land was purchased by the United States government and Native Peoples do not always agree on how land should be governed, which has resulted in a series of
disputes over sovereignty. Main article: Seizure of the Black Hills The Federal Government and The Lakota Sioux tribe members have been involved in sorting out a legal claim for the Black Hills and nearly half of
 western South Dakota.[64] This treaty was acknowledged and respected until 1874 when General George Custer discovered gold,[64] sending a wave of settlers into the area and leading to the realization of the value of the land from United States President Grant.[64] President Grant used tactical military force to remove the Sioux from the land and
assisted in the development of the Congressional appropriations bill for Indian Services in 1876, a "starve or sell" treaty signed by only 10% of the Fort Laramie Treaty that relinquished the Sioux's rights to the Black Hills. [64] Following this treaty, the Agreement of 1877 was passed by
Congress to remove the Sioux from the Sioux from the Sioux from the Sioux as a place central to their spirituality and identity, [64] and contest of
ownership of the land has been pressured in the courts by the Sioux Nation since they were allowed legal avenue in 1920.[64] Beginning in 1923, the Sioux made a legal claim that their relinquishment from the Black Hills was illegal under the Fifth Amendment, and no amount of money can make up for the loss of their sacred land.[64] This claim
went all the way up to the Supreme Court United States v. Sioux Nation of Indians case in 1979 after being revived by Congress, and the Sioux were awarded over $100 million as they ruled that the seizure of the Black Hills was in fact illegal. The Sioux were awarded over $100 million as they ruled that the seizure of the Black Hills was in fact illegal.
accounts and amounts to about $1 billion in 2015.[65] During President Barack Obama's campaign, he made indications that the case of the Black Hills was guestioned when White House Counsel Leonard Garment sent a note to The Ogala people saving. "The days of
Black Hills to the tribe. To this day, the dispute of the Black Hills is ongoing with the trust estimated to be worth nearly $1.3 billion[66] and sources believe principles of restorative justice[64] may be the best solution to addressing this century-old dispute. Fort Stanwix, New York While the 1783 Treaty of Paris, which ended the American Revolution
addressed land sovereignty disputes between the British Crown and the colonies, it neglected to settle hostilities between Indigenous people—specifically those who fought on the side of the British, as four of the Haudenosaunee did—and colonists.[67] In October 1784 the newly formed United States government facilitated
negotiations with representatives from the Six Nations in Fort Stanwix, New York.[67] The treaty produced in 1784 resulted in Indians giving up their territory within the Ohio River Valley and the U.S. guaranteeing the Haudenosaunee six million acres—about half of what is present-day New York—as permanent homelands.[67] Unenthusiastic about
the treaty's conditions, the state of New York secured a series of 26 "leases", many of them lasting 999 years on all Native territories within its boundaries.[67] Led to believe that they had already lost their land to the New York Genesee Company, the Haudenosaunee agreed to land leasing which was presented by New York Governor George Clinton
as a means by which the Indigenous nations could maintain sovereignty over their land. [67] On August 28, 1788, the Oneida people leased five million acres to the state in exchange for $2,000 in clothing, $1,000 in provisions and $600 annual rent. The other two tribes followed with similar arrangements. [67] The Holland Land
Company gained control over all but ten acres of the Native land leased to whites, allegedly ending the Native title to land. Despite Iroquois protests, federal authorities did virtually nothing to correct the injustice. [67] Certain of losing all of
their lands, in 1831 most of the Oneidas asked that what was left of their holdings be exchanged for 500,000 acres purchased from the Menominees in Wisconsin.[67] President Andrew Jackson, committed to Indian Removal west of the Mississippi, agreed.[67] The Treaty of Buffalo Creek signed on 15 January 1838, directly ceded 102,069 acres of
Indian complaints, a second Treaty of Buffalo was written in 1842 in attempts to mediate tension.[67] Under this treaty the Haudenosaunee were given the right to reside in New York and small areas of reservations were restored by the U.S. government.[67] These agreements were largely ineffective in protecting Native American land. By 1889
eighty percent of all Iroquois reservation land in New York was leased by non-Haudenosaunees.[67] See also: Hopi § Hopi-Navajo land disputes The modern-day Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations are located in Northern Arizona, near the Four Corners area. The Hopi reservation is 2,531.773 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies
surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (71,000 km2) and extends slightly into the states of New Mexico and Utah. The Hopi, also known as the Pueblo people, made many spiritually motivated migrations throughout the Southwest before settling in present-day Northern Arizona. [68] The Navajo people also
migrated throughout western North America following spiritual commands before settling near the Grand Canyon area. The two tribes peacefully coexisted and exchanged ideas with each other. Their way of life was threatened when the "New people", what the Navajo called white settlers, began conquering native tribes across the
continent and claiming their land, as a result of Andrew Jackson's Indian Removal Act.[69] War ensued between the Navajo people, who call themselves the Diné, and new Americans. The result was the Long Walk in the early 1860s in which the entire tribe was forced to walk roughly 400 miles (640 km) from Fort Canby (present-day Window Rock,
Arizona) to Bosque Redondo in New Mexico. This march is similar to the well-known Cherokee Trail of Tears and like it, many of the tribe did not survive the trek. The roughly 11,000 tribe members were imprisoned here in what the United States government deemed an experimental Indian reservation that failed because it became too expensive.
there were too many people to feed, and they were continuously raided by other Native tribes.[70] Consequently, in 1868, the Navajo were allowed to return to their homeland after signing the Treaty of Bosque Redondo. The treaty of Bosque Redondo. The treaty of Bosque Redondo. The treaty of Bosque Redondo.
territorialities or claims on places. This treaty gave them the right to the land and semi-autonomous governance of it. The Hopi reservation, on the other hand, was created through an executive order by President Arthur in 1882. A few years after the two reservations were established, the Dawes Allotment Act was passed under which communal
more than the tribes needed. This "surplus" land was then made available for purchase by American citizens. The land designated to the Navajo and Hopi reservation was originally considered barren and unproductive by white settlers until 1921 when prospectors scoured the land for oil. The mining companies pressured the U.S. government to set up
Native American councils on the reservations so that they could agree to contracts, specifically leases, in the name of the tribe.[71] During World War II, uranium was mined on the Diné and Hopi reservations. The dangers of radiation exposure were not adequately explained to the Native people, who made up almost all the workforce of these mines,
and lived in their immediate adjacency. As a result, some residents who lived near the uranium projects used the quarried rock from the mines to build their houses, these materials were radioactive and had detrimental health effects on the residents, including increased rates of kidney failure and cancer. [72][73] During extraction some Native
children would play in large water pools which were heavily contaminated with uranium created by mining activities. [74] The companies also failed to properly dispose of the radioactive waste which did and will continue to pollute the environment, including the Natives' water sources. Many years later, these same men who worked the mines died
from lung cancer, and their families received no form of financial compensation. In 1979, the Church Rock uranium mill spill was the largest release of radioactive waste and 93 million gallons of acidic, radioactive tailings solution which flowed
downstream into the Navajo Nation. The Navajos used the water from this river for irrigation and their livestock but were not immediately informed about the contamination and its danger. [75] After the war ended, the American population boomed and energy demands soared. The utility companies needed a new source of power so they began the
construction of coal-fired power plants. They placed these power plants in the four corners region. In the 1960s, John Boyden, an attorney working for both Peabody Coal and the Hopi tribe, the nation's largest coal producer, managed to gain rights to the Hopi land, including Black Mesa, a sacred location to both tribes which lay partially within the
Joint Use Area of both tribes. Some consider this to be an example of environmental racism and injustice, per the principles established by the Participants of the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit, [76] because the Navajo and Hopi people, which are communities of color, low income, and political alienation, were
disproportionately affected by the proximity and the resulting pollution of these power plants which disregard their right to clean air, their land was degraded, and because the related public policies are not based on mutual respect of all people. The mining companies, however, wanted more land but the joint ownership of the land made negotiations are not based on mutual respect of all people.
difficult. At the same time, Hopi and Navajo tribes were squabbling over land rights while Navajo livestock continuously grazed on Hopi land. Boyden took advantage of this situation, presenting it to the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs claiming that if the government did not step in and do something, a bloody war would ensue between the
tribes. Congressmen agreed to pass the Navajo-Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 which forced any Hopi and Navajo people living on the other's land to relocate. This affected 6,000 Navajo people and ultimately benefitted coal companies the most who could now more easily access the disputed land. Instead of using military violence to deal with
those who refused to move, the government passed what became known as the Bennett Freeze to encourage the people to leave. The Bennett Freeze banned 1.5 million acres (6,100 km2) of Navajo land from any type of development, including paving roadways and even roof repair. This was meant to be a temporary incentive to push tribe
negotiations but lasted over forty years until 2009 when President Obama lifted the moratorium. [77][78] The legacy of the Bennett Freeze looms over the region as seen by the nearly third-world conditions on the reservation - seventy-five percent of people do not have access to electricity and housing situations are poor. See also: McGirt v. Oklahomaetricity and housing situations are poor.
The reservations of the Five Civilized Tribes that were the subject of McGirt v. Oklahoma Much of what is now Oklahoma Much of what 
were merged into Oklahoma with the Enabling Act of 1906. This act had been taken to disestablish the reservation in order for the foundation of the state to proceed. In July 2020, the Supreme Court ruled in McGirt v. Oklahoma that the area, about half of the modern state, never lost its status as a Native reservation. This includes the city of Tulsa.
The area includes lands of the Chickasaw, Chordaw, Cherokee, Muscogee, and Seminole. [79] The ruling is based on an 1832 treaty, which the court ruled was still in force, adding that "Because Congress has not said otherwise, we hold the government to its word." [80] In 2021, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals upheld a lower court ruling that
the Quapaw Nation's reservation in Ottawa County in northeastern Oklahoma was never disestablished.[82][83] Court rulings also confirmed the existence of the reservations of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, Peoria Tribe
of Indians of Oklahoma, and Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma. [84] Red Cliff Indian Reservation in Wisconsin during their annual powwow See also: Modern social statistics of Native Americans Part of a series on Native Americans in the United States History Paleo-Indians Lithic stage Archaic period in the Americans Formative stage Classic stage Post-Classic
stage Woodland period Age of Discovery European colonization of the Americas Population history of the Indian Removal Act Trail of Tears Native American slave ownership Indian Territory American Civil War Dawes Rolls
Cultural assimilation of Native Americans Racism against Native Americans Indian Appropriations Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Native Americans Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 Jim Crow laws Blood quantum laws Blood quantum laws Blood quantum laws Blood quantum laws 
American rights Alcohol and Native Americans Native American Craves Protection and Repatriation Act Film Indigenous Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty Wars
Beaver Wars Anglo-Powhatan Wars Pequot War Kieft's War Peach Tree War Esopus Wars King Philip's War Tuscarora War Yamasee War Dummer's War Pontiac's War American Revolutionary War Cherokee-American Wars King Philip's War Tuscarora War Seminole War Osage
Indian War American Civil War Texas-Indian wars (1836-1877) / Comanche Wars (1836-1877) / Comanche Wars (1860-1876) / Comanche Wars (1860-1876) / Comanche Wars (1860-1876) / Comanche Wars (1860-1876) / Comanche Wars (1871-1875) / Comanche Campaign (1867-1875) / Comanche Wars (1860-1886) / Tonto War (1871-1875) / Comanche Wars (1860-1876) / Comanche Wars (1876-1877) / Comanche Wars (1876-187
1875) / Victorio's War (1879-1880) / Geronimo's War (1881-1886) / Post 1887 Apache Wars period (1887-1824) / Ute War (1853-1854) / Tintic War (1853-1854) / Black Hawk War (1853-1854) / Black
 War (1923) Sioux Wars (1854-1891) / First Sioux War (1854-1856) / Dakota War (1854-1856) / Dokota War (1863-1865) / Powder River War (1863-1868) / Great Sioux War (1866-1877) / Northern Cheyenne Exodus (1878-1879) / Ghost Dance War (1890-1891) Rogue River Wars (1855-1856) Yakima War (1855-1858) / Powder River Wars (1868-1868) / Great Sioux War (1868-1868) / Great
Sound War (1855-1856) / Coeur d'Alene War (1858-1859) Mohave War (1858-1859) Mohave War (1858-1859) Mohave War (1864-1869) Hualapai Wars (1865-1870) Modoc War (1872-1873) Nez Perce War (1877) Bannock War (1878) Crow War (1887) Bannock Uprising (1895) Yaqui Uprising (1896) Battle of Sugar
Point (1898) Crazy Snake Rebellion (1909) Last Massacre (1911) Battle of Kelley Creek (1911) Battle of Bear Valley (1918) Political movement (AIM) Red Power Movement Occupation of Alcatraz Trail of Broken Treaties Wounded Knee Occupation
MMIW Red handprint Dakota Access Pipeline protests Religion Sun Dance Keetoowah Society Midewiwin Wabunowin Wocekiye Groups National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
(NAACP) Native American Rights Fund (NARF) National Congress of American Indian Treaty Council (IITC) Ethnic subdivisions Black Indians Indians Red National Indian Treaty Council (IITC) Ethnic subdivisions Black Indians Indians Red National Indian Treaty Council (IITC) Ethnic subdivisions Black Indians Indians Red National Indian Treaty Council (IITC) Ethnic subdivisions Black Indians In
languages Demographics Neighborhoods Societal statistics Reservations Tribal disenrollment Reservation poverty Geography by region Great Basin Northeastern Woodlands Southwest by state Alaska Arizona California Colorado Florida Hawaii Iowa Maryland Michigan
Nebraska North Carolina Oklahoma Oregon Virginia Wisconsin Lists Native Americans artists actors war leaders musicians congressional politicians Native American Medal of Honor recipients List of federally recognized tribes by state List of federally recognized tribes by state List of Indian reservations in the United States vte Many Native Americans who
live on reservations interact with the federal government through two agencies: the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service. The standard of living on some reservations is comparable to that in the developing world, with problems of infant mortality,[85] low life expectancy, poor nutrition, poverty, and alcohol and drug abuse. The two
poorest counties in the United States are Buffalo County, South Dakota, home of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, according to data compiled by the 2000 census. [86] This disparity in living standards can partly be explained by centuries-long instances of settler
colonialism which have systematically harmed Indigenous peoples' relations with land, and have attempted to erase their cultural ways of life.[87] Potawatomi scholar Kyle Powys Whyte has stated, "While Indigenous peoples, as any society, have long histories of adapting to change, colonialism caused changes at such a rapid pace that many society, have long histories of adapting to change at such a rapid pace that many society.
Indigenous peoples became vulnerable to harms, from health problems related to new diets to erosion of their cultures to the destruction of Indigenous diplomacy, to which they were not as susceptible prior to colonization."[88]This has resulted in an ever widening disparity between Native peoples and the rest of the United States. It is commonly
believed that environmentalism and a connectedness to nature are ingrained in the Native American culture. However, this is a generalization. In recent years, cultural historians have set out to reconstruct and complicate this notion as what they claim to be a culturally inaccurate romanticism. [89] Others recognize the differences between the
attitudes and perspectives that emerge from a comparison of Western European philosophy and Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) of Indigenous peoples, especially when considering natural resource conflicts and management strategies involving multiple parties. [90] The lands on which reservations are located are disproportionately low in
natural resources and quality soil conducive to fostering economic prosperity. Starting in the mid-20th century reservations came to be increasingly located by outside entities including private corporations as well as the federal government.[15]
According to anthropologists Merrill Singer and Derrick Hodge: "The toxic and poor land quality of Native American lands is neither a historical accident nor the result of aggressive westward economic expansion. This process was calculated and unconcerned with indigenous wellbeing
[...] Thus, federal policy, including the Indian Removal Act of 1830, was designed to displace Native Americans from coveted land and to relocate them to areas seen as relatively "valueless by nineteenth century standards" [87] Due to them
being deemed as "undesirable", lands on and near reservations are often used by the U.S. government and private industries as areas for environmentally hazardous activities. These activities have been subjected to adverse health
issues. Specifically, according to scholar Traci Lynn Voyles, the Navajo Nation has been affected for decades by uranium mining and nuclear waste dumping: "Radiation-related diseases are now endemic to many parts of the Navajo Nation, claiming the health and lives of former miners to be sure but also those of Navajos who would never see the
inside of a mine. Diné children have a rate of testicular and ovarian cancer fifteen times the national average, and a fatal neurological disease called Navajo neuropathy has been closely linked to ingesting uranium-contaminated water during pregnancy".[91]Other reservation communities have been subjected to instances like this as well. According
to scholar Winona LaDuke, the Paiute- Shoshone community was deliberately exposed to radiation throughout the latter half of the 20th century: "In 1951 the Atomic Energy Commission set up the Nevada Test Site within Western Shoshone territory as a proving grounds for nuclear weapons. Between 1951 and 1992, the U.S. and UK exploded 1,054
nuclear devices above and below ground [...] According to Sanchez, the Atomic Energy Commission would deliberately wait for clouds to blow north before conducting tests, so that the fallout would avoid any heavily populated areas such as Las Vegas and Los Angeles. This meant that the Shoshones would get a larger dose. [92] "Many Indigenous Indigenous
communities have also been subjected to the degradation of sacred lands in favor of resource extraction. [93][94][95] Around 79 percent of the lithium deposits on U.S. soil are within 35 miles of Indian reservations. [96] Thacker Pass is home to both one of the largest lithium deposits in the world [94] and home to a sacred burial site of multiple tribes
including the Pitt River and Paiute.[95] The mining company, Lithium Nevada, was recently granted permits were unlawfully issued, and that "the BLM notified only three of Nevada's 27 tribes about the mine".[95] Historically, Indigenous groups
have had little say when it comes to which land they are designated to occupy, as well as what happens to the land. This can be explained by the following excerpt from an academic journal on the impacts of climate change in the Arctic: "While a government relationship is now officially required, these cases (which continue to define
the indigenous/federal relationship in the U.S.) instituted a federal 'trust responsibility' for indigenous people in the U.S., codifying a legal relationship of paternalism that limits the autonomy of tribal governments. The United States government is thus under a legal obligation to protect the lands, resources and traditionally used areas of indigenous
peoples, and government agencies are required to consult with tribal governments and Alaska Native Corporations in natural resource decision-making. While some view this form of representation as the best and only practical means of influencing Northern policy, the actual involvement of tribal governments has been limited, and seen as
perfunctory, and may be precluded by the procedural and structural mandates of federal law and legal precedent."[97] We can see this with the amount of reservations placed near massive construction projects that lead to occupy
by the federal government typically have difficulties already. As explained by scholars Gregory Hooks and Chad Smith in their academic journal connecting the focus on production to environmental issues, "Federally owned and Native American lands tended to be in close proximity, and they had a great deal in common: they were concentrated in the
states west of the Mississippi, and they tended to be lands that were too dry, remote, or barren to attract the attention of settlers and corporations."[98] Reservations are often designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as polluted and hazardous to live in and requiring action
to clean up. In 2014, of 1,322 Superfund sites in the United States, 532 or almost 25% where in Indian Country, [99] Some of these include the Jackpile-Paquate Uranium Mine on the Elem Band of Pomo Indians'
reservation.[100] Hawaiian home land Indian Claims Commission Indian country List of historical Indian reservations in the United States List of Indian reservations in the United States Native American reservations in the United States List of Indian reservations in the United States Native American reservations in the United States Native Native
Columbia) Indigenous Protected Area in Australia Native Community Lands in Bolivia Indigenous territory (Colombia) Indigenous 
federal Indian reservation?". Department of the Interior. Retrieved June 2, 2024. ^ a b McGreal, Chris (May 4, 2012). "US should return stolen land to Indian tribes, says United States of America". IWGIA - International Work Group for
Indigenous Affairs. Retrieved November 25, 2023. ^ "Navajo Population Profile 2010 U.S. Census" (PDF). Retrieved August 26, 2023. ^ "What is a federal Indian reservation?". bia.gov.
Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. ^ Sutton, 1975 ^ a b Davies & Clow; Sutton 1975 ^ a b Davies & Clow; Sutton 1991. ^ For
general data, see Tiller (1996). ^ Frantz, Klaus (1999). Indian Reservations in the United States: Territory, Sovereignty, and Socioeconomic Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. p. 45. ISBN 0-226-26089-5. Retrieved September 30, 2020. ^ See, e.g., United States v. Dion, 476 U.S. 734 (1986); Francis v. Francis, 203 U.S. 233 (1906). ^ a b of the company of 
Hooks, Gregory; Smith, Chad L. (August 2004). "The Treadmill of Destruction: National Sacrifice Areas and Native Americans". American Sociological Review. 69 (4): 558–575. doi:10.1177/000312240406900405. ISSN 0003-1224. S2CID 145428620. ^ "Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980–2000". Census.gov. Retrieved
June 5, 2012. ^ For Los Angeles, see Allen, J. P. and E. Turner, 2002. Text and map of the metropolitan area show the widespread urban distribution of California and other Native Americans. ^ "40d. Life on the Reservations". U.S. History. Retrieved August 11, 2024. ^ a b c Glover, Jeffrey (2014). Paper Sovereigns: Anglo-Native Treaties and the Law
of Nations, 1604-1664. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. pp. 9-14. ISBN 9780812245967. ^ "This Day in Geographic History: First Indian Reservation". National Geographic Society, July 18, 2014. Archived from the original on July 12, 2018. Retrieved July 12, 2018. ^ a b c Thomas, JD (August 29, 2013). "The Colonies' First and New
Jersey's Only Indian Reservation". Accessible Archives Inc. Archived from the original on May 7, 2021. Retrieved July 12, 2018. In 1758, the Colonial Legislature
  ourchased land in Burlington County for a reservation. It was the first Indian Reservation in America and was called Edgepelick. Governor Francis Bernard called it Brotherton, with the proceeds used to send the remaining Lenape to the Stockbridg
Reservation near Oneida, New York. There they formed a settlement called Statesburg. November 7, 2010 ^ a b c d e Remarks on the Plan for Regulating the Indian Trade, September 1766, Founders Online ^ Belko, William S. (2004). "John C. Calhoun and the Creation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs: an Essay on Political Rivalry,
Ideology, and Policymaking in the Early Republic". South Carolina Historical Magazine. 105 (3): 170-97. JSTOR 27570693. Andrew Jackson, President of the United States of America, Indian Treaties and Laws and Regulations Relating to Indian Affairs: To Which Is Added, An Appendix. Way and Gideon, Printers", 1826
 ^ Andrew Jackson, "A letter by Andrew Jackson, President of the United States of America, Indian Treaties and Laws and Regulations Relating to Indian Affairs: To Which Is Added, An Appendix. Way and Gideon, Printers", 1826, 580. ^ a b Martin Van Buren, President of the United States of America, "Treaties between the United States and the
Saginaw tribe of Chippewas", 1837. ^ John Forsyth, the Secretary of State On behalf of, President Buren, "Treaty Between: The United States of America and the First Christian and Orchard Parties of the Oneida Indians," 1838. ^ a b c Buck Woodard, "Indian Land sales and allotment in Antebellum
Virginia: trustees, tribal agency, and the Nottoway Reservation", American Nineteenth Century History 17. no. 2 (2016): page number. 161-180. A Brief Review and Comparison of Indian Law in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, and Canada." American Indian Law Review
14, no. 1 (1988), 58. ^ a b James E Togerson "Indians against Immigrants: Old Rivals, New Rules: A Brief Review and Comparison of Indian Law Review 14, no. 1 (1988), 57-103. ^ James E Togerson "Indians against Immigrants: Old Rivals, New Rules: A Brief Review and
Comparison of Indian Law in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, and Canada." American Indian Culture & Research Journal 24, no. 3 (2000): 39-76. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and
Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 51. ^ a b George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845-1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review
17, no. 3 (1930): 379. George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845-1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 380. Bennett, Elmer (2008). Federal Indian Law. The
Lawbook Exchange. pp. 201-203. ISBN 9781584777762. ^ "President Grant advances "Peace Policy" with tribes". US National Library of Medicine. Retrieved April 8, 2014, at the Wayback Machine, Retrieved April 7, 2014. ^ "Tribal Governance". NCAI. Retrieved December 3,
2018. ^ "How Do Tribal Governments Work?". Southeastern Oklahoma State University. Retrieved December 3, 2018. ^ Kinney 1937 ^ a b Tiller (1996) ^ Getches et al, pp. 140-190. ^ The Equalization Act, 1959. ^ Sutton, ed., 1991. ^ Wishart and Froehling ^ Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, 1988 ^ "Enabling Act of 1910" (PDF). Retrieved February
8, 2013. ^ "Native Americans in South Dakota: An Erosion of Confidence in the Justice System". Usccr.gov. Retrieved June 5, 2012. ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-passes Senate (November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate (November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate (November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate (November 21
2016, at the Wayback Machine article by Michael Riley in The Denver Post Posted: June 25, 2010 01:00:00 AM MDT Updated: June 25, 2010 02:13:47 AM MDT Accessed June 25, 2010 02:13:47 AM MDT Accessed June 25, 2010 02:00:00 AM MDT Updated: June 25, 2010 02:13:47 AM MDT Accessed June 25, 2010 02:00:00 AM MDT Updated: June 25, 2010 02:00 AM MDT Updated: June 25, 2010 AM MDT Updated: June 25, 
01:00:00 AM MDT, Updated: July 30, 2010 06:00:20 AM MDT, accessed July 30, 2010 ^ "MEMORANDUM FOR UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS WITH DISTRICTS CONTAINING INDIAN COUNTRY" Memorandum by David W. Ogden Deputy Attorney General, Monday, January 11, 2010, Accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law
Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ Timonthy Williams (May 22, 2012). "For Native American Women, Scourge of Rape, Rare Justice". The New York Times. Retrieved May 23, 2012. ^ "Study: 12 percent of Indian deaths due to alcohol" Associated Press article by Mary Clare Jalonick
Washington, D.C. (AP) 9-08 News From Indian Gangs Grow, Bringing Fear and Violence On The Rise On Indian Reservations. Al Jazeera America. August 15, 2009. "Indian Gangs Grow, Bringing Fear and Violence to Reservation." The New
York Times. December 13, 2009 ^ "Most Wanted - City of Great Falls Montana". greatfallsmt.net. Archived from the original on August 21, 2017. ^ a b c d e f g h i j k Lenane, Rita (2015). "It Doesn't Seem Very Fair, Because We Were Here First: Resolving the Sioux Nation Black Hills Land Dispute and the Potential for
Restorative Justice to Facilitate Government-to-Government Negotiations" (PDF). Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution. 16 (2): 651-683. Archived from the original (PDF) on December 12, 2019. ^ a b c d Streshinsky, Maria (February 9, 2011). "Saying No to $1 Billion". The Atlantic. ^ "Why the Sioux Are Refusing $1.3".
Billion". PBS NewsHour. Retrieved March 22, 2017. ^ a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o Treaty and Land Transaction of 1784, National Park Service ^ Dongoske, Kurt E. (January 1, 1996). "The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis—A Hopi Perspective". American Indian Quarterly.
20 (2): 287-296. doi:10.2307/1185706. STOR 1185706. DeAngelis, T. (2004). The Navajos Weavers of the Southwest. Wankato, MN: Blue Earth Books. Marketo, MN: Blue Earth Books. MR: Blue Eart
Unger, Nancy (2015). "'Mother Nature is Getting Angrier': Turning Sacred Navajo Land into a Toxic Environmental Crisis and Human Costs. Universidad de Alcalá. pp. 31-45. ^ Moret, Leuren. "Population Exposed to Environmental Uranium: Increased Risk of Infertility and Reproductive
Cancers!". Namaste Publishing UK. Retrieved June 1, 2023. Morales, Laurel (April 10, 2016). "For The Navajo Nation, Uranium Mining's Deadly Legacy Lingers". NPR. Retrieved June 16, 2020. Pasternak, J. (2010). Yellow dirt: An American story of poisoned land and a people betrayed. New York, NY: Free Press. Mohai, Paul; Pellow, David;
Roberts, J. Timmons (October 15, 2009). "Environmental Justice". Annual Review of Environment and Resources. 34: 405-430. doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-082508-094348. ^ Donovan, Bill (May 14, 2009). "Obama signs Bennett Freeze repeal". Navajo Times. Retrieved December 16, 2016. ^ "Congress.gov". Library of Congress. Retrieved April 6,
2017. ^ "US Supreme Court rules half of Oklahoma is Native American land". BBC News. July 10, 2020. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation". NonDoc. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation". NonDoc. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation". NonDoc. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation". NonDoc. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation". NonDoc. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation". NonDoc. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation". NonDoc. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation". NonDoc. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation". NonDoc. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ Bartle, David (October 22, 2021). "Court affirms existence of Quapaw Nation Reservation".
November 29, 2024. ^ "State v. Fuller". Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 7, 2024. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 12, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals has recognized that the Wyandotte Reservation was never disestablished". KOSU. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 13, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals has recognized that the Wyandotte Reservation was never disestablished". KOSU. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ University of Criminal Appeals has recognized that the Wyandotte Reservation was never disestablished.
2024). "Future 'Bracker' test teased as appellate court affirms Wyandotte Reservation 4-1". NonDoc. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ "Health of American Indian or Alaska Native Population". National Center for Health Statistics. www.cdc.gov. April 14, 2021. ^ Johansen, Bruce E., and Barry Pritzker. 2008. Encyclopedia of American Indian history.
Santa Barbara, Calif: ABC-CLIO. p. 156. ISBN 9781851098170. ^ a b Singer, Merrill, ed. (June 8, 2016). A Companion to the Anthropology of Environmental Health. doi:10.1002/9781118786949. ^ Whyte, Kyle (March 1, 2017). "Indigenous Climate Change Studies: Indigenizing Futures, Decolonizing the
Anthropocene". English Language Notes. 55 (1-2): 153-162. doi:10.1215/00138282-55.1-2.153. ISSN 0013-8282. S2CID 132153346. ^ Lee., Schweninger (January 1, 2008). Listening to the Land: Native American literary responses to the landscape. University of Georgia Press. ISBN 9780820330587. OCLC 812757112. ^ Goode, Ron W. (Spring Landscape).
2015). "Tribal-Traditional Ecological Knowledge". News from Native California. 28 (3): 23. ^ a b Voyles, Traci Brynne (May 15, 2015). Wastelanding. University of Minnesota Press. doi:10.5749/minnesota/9780816692644.001.0001. ISBN 978-0-8166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.)
South End Press. ISBN 978-0896085992. ^ October 20, Hallie Golden; Now, 2021 Like Tweet Email Print Subscribe Donate (October 20, 2021). "Nevada's Thacker Pass highlights how federal courts routinely dismiss Indigenous concerns". www.hcn.org. Retrieved June 10, 2022. {{cite web}}: |first2= has generic name (help)CS1 maint: numeric
names: authors list (link) ^ a b Flin, Briana (December 2, 2021). "Tribes Claim BLM Violated Multiple Federal Laws in Permitting Thacker Pass Lithium Mine in Nevada". The Guardian. Retrieved June 10, 2022. ^ a b c d Turner, Kelsey (December 10, 2021). "Tribes Claim BLM Violated Multiple Federal Laws in Permitting Thacker Pass Lithium Mine in Nevada".
Native News Online. Retrieved June 10, 2022. ^ "Mining Energy-Transition Metals: National Aims, Local Conflicts". www.msci.com. June 3, 2021. Retrieved June 10, 2022. ^ Trainor, Sarah F.; Stuart Chapin, F.; Huntington, Henry P.; Natcher, David C.; Kofinas, Gary (December 1, 2007). "Arctic Climate Impacts: Environmental Injustice in Canada and
the United States". Local Environment. 12 (6): 627-643. Bibcode: 2007LoEnv..12..627T. doi:10.1080/13549830701657414. ISSN 1354-9839. S2CID 17730412. ^ Hooks, Gregory; Smith, Chad L. (2004). "The Treadmill of Destruction: National Sacrifice Areas and Native Americans". American Sociological Review. 69 (4): 558-575.
doi:10.1177/000312240406900405. ISSN 0003-1224. JSTOR 3593065. S2CID 145428620. ^ "Terri Hansen: Far too many Superfund Case Studies". Tribal Superfund Case Studies". Tribal Lands Assistance Center. Retrieved November 29, 2024. Further reading J. P. Allen and E.
Turner, Changing Faces, Changing Places: Mapping Southern Californians (Northridge, CA: The Center for Geographical Studies, California State University, Northridge, 2002). George Pierre Castle and Robert L. Bee, eds., State and Reservation: New Perspectives on Federal Indian Policy (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1992) Richmond L.
Clow and Imre Sutton, eds., Trusteeship in Change: Toward Tribal Autonomy in Resource Management (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2001). Wade Davies and Richmond L. Clow, American Indian Sovereignty and Law: An Annotated Bibliography (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2009). T. J. Ferguson and E. Richard Hart, A Zuni Atlas
(Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985) David H. Getches, Charles F. Wilkinson, and Robert A. Williams, Cases and Materials on Federal Indian Reservations in the United States, Geography Research Paper 241 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). James M. Goodman
The Navajo Atlas: Environments, Resources, People, and History of the Diné Bikeyah (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987). Francis Paul Prucha, Atlas of American Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Civilization Won: Indian Affairs (Norman: University Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Civilization Won: Indian Affa
Nebraska Press, 1990). C. C. Royce, comp., Indian Land Cessions in the United States, 18th Annual Report, 1896-97, pt. 2 (Wash., D. C.: Bureau of American Ethnology; GPO 1899) Imre Sutton, "Cartographic Review of Indian Land Tenure and Territoriality: A Schematic Approach", American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 26:2 (2002): 63-113.
Imre Sutton, Indian Land Tenure: Bibliographical Essays and a Guide to the Literature (NY: Clearwater Publ. 1975). Imre Sutton, ed., "The Political Geography of Indian Country", American Indian Culture and Resource Journal, vol. 15, no. 2 (1991):1-169. Imre Sutton, "Sovereign States and the Changing Definition of the Indian Reservation"
Geographical Review, vol. 66, no. 3 (1976): 281-95. Veronica E. Velarde Tiller, ed., Tiller's Guide to Indian Reservations (Albuquerque: BowArrow Pub., 1996/2005) David J. Wishart and Oliver Froehling, "Land Ownership, Population and Jurisdiction: the Case of the 'Devils Lake Sioux Tribe v. North
Dakota Public Service Commission'", American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 20(2): 33-58 (1996). Laura Woodward-Ney, Mapping Identity: The Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservations in the United States. BIA full-size Indian
reservations in the continental United States - National Park Service U.S. Census tallies for Indian reservations Chapter 5: American Indian and Alaska Native American Technical Corrections Act of 2003 Gambling on the reservation April 2004
Christian Science Monitor article with links to other Monitor articles on the topic Henry Red Cloud of Oglala Lakota Tribe on the Recession's Toll on Reservations—video report by Democracy Now! Tribal Justice & Safety. at the U.S. Department of Justice and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities" Retrieved from 'Safety.
The history of Native American reserves is a complex and multifaceted topic, spanning centuries and encompassing a wide range of cultures, experiences, and governmental policies. Today, there are 326 Indian reservations in the United States, covering approximately 56 million acres of land, which is about 2.3% of the country's total land area.
These reservations are home to more than 700,000 Native Americans, representing over 200 distinct tribes. To understand the contemporary situation of Native American reserves, it's essential to delve into their historical context, the challenges they face, and the efforts being made towards preservation, self-governance, and economic development
Historical Evolution of Native American Reserves The concept of Native American reserves or reservations originated from the desire of the U.S. government to relocate Native American tribes from their ancestral lands to areas deemed less desirable or less valuable for white settlement and economic development. This process was formalized
through various treaties, executive orders, and legislation, starting with the Indian Removal Act of 1830. The most notorious example of this policy is the Trail of Tears, where thousands of Native Americans were forcibly relocated from their homelands in the southeastern United States to Indian Territory (present-day Oklahoma), resulting in
significant loss of life and cultural disruption. Over time, the management and administration of the BIA was tasked with overseeing the welfare of Native Americans, managing the land and resources
of the reservations, and providing educational and healthcare services. However, the history of the BIA has been marked by controversy, with criticisms of paternalistic policies, mismanagement of resources, and failure to protect Native American rights and interests. Challenges Facing Native American Reserves Despite the progress made in recent
years, Native American reserves continue to face numerous challenges. One of the most significantly lower than the national average,
```

```
and unemployment rates are often several times higher. For example, on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, one of the largest reservations in the country, the unemployment rate is estimated to be around 80%, and the average household income is less than $3,000 per year. Another critical challenge is access to quality education and
healthcare. Schools on reservations often lack resources, resulting in lower graduation rates and limited opportunities for higher education. Similarly, healthcare facilities on reservations are frequently underfunded and understaffed, leading to poorer health outcomes for Native American communities. The life expectancy on some reservations is up
to 20 years lower than the national average, with higher rates of diabetes, heart disease, and other health conditions. Preservation of Cultural Heritage is a vital aspect of life on Native American reserves. Despite the historical trauma and ongoing challenges, Native American communities are working diligently to
preserve their languages, traditions, and cultural practices. Many reservations have established their own cultural centers, museums, and educational programs aimed at passing down traditional knowledge and skills to younger generations. For instance, the Navajo Nation has developed a comprehensive language and culture preservation program,
 including language immersion schools and cultural camps, to ensure the continuation of the Navajo language and way of life. Self-Governance and economic development on Native American reserves. The Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 and
subsequent amendments have allowed tribes to take more control over their affairs, including the management of their lands, resources, and services. This has led to the development of various tribal enterprises, such as casinos, hotels, and retail businesses, which generate revenue and create employment opportunities for tribal members. Moreover
tribes are increasingly engaging in renewable energy projects, such as wind and solar farms, to reduce their dependence on fossil fuels and generate additional income. The potential for economic development on reservations is vast, with opportunities in agriculture, manufacturing, and tourism, among other sectors. However, these efforts are often
hampered by regulatory barriers, lack of infrastructure, and limited access to capital. Conclusion The story of Native American reserves is one of resilience, adaptation, and the unwavering communities are moving forward,
driven by a vision of self-determination and prosperity. As the United States continues to grapple with its complex history and the legacy of colonialism, it is essential to recognize the rights and interests of Native American tribes, support their efforts towards self-governance and economic development, and work towards a future that honors the
principles of justice, equality, and mutual respect. Healthcare on Native American reservations is a significant concern, with many communities facing limited access to quality medical care. The Indian Health Service (IHS), a federal agency, is responsible for providing healthcare services to eligible American Indians and Alaska Natives. However, the
IHS often struggles with underfunding, staff shortages, and outdated facilities, leading to poorer health outcomes for Native American communities. Native American communities, including the establishment of tribal enterprises such as casinos, hotels, and retail businesses. Many tribes are also
exploring opportunities in renewable energy, agriculture, and manufacturing. Furthermore, tribes are working to develop their infrastructure, including roads, telecommunications, and utilities, to support economic growth and attract outside investment. There are numerous initiatives underway to preserve Native American languages and cultural
heritage. Many tribes have established language and culture preservation programs, which include language immersion schools, cultural camps, and traditional arts programs. Additionally, there are efforts to document and archive Native American languages, stories, and histories through digital platforms and community-based projects. In
conclusion, the future of Native American reserves depends on a multifaceted approach that addresses historical injustices, promotes self-governance, and supports economic development, while preserving cultural heritage and promoting social justice. By working together and acknowledging the complexities of this issue, we can move towards a
brighter future for Native American communities and honor the rich cultural diversity of the United States. In order to continue enjoying our site, we ask that you confirm your identity as a human. Thank you very much for your cooperation. Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially.
Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially. The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms. Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way
that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. ShareAlike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original. No additional restrictions — You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.
You do not have to comply with the license for elements of the material in the public domain or where your use is permitted by an applicable exception or limitation. No warranties are given. The license may not give you all of the permissions necessary for your intended use. For example, other rights such as publicity, privacy, or moral rights may
limit how you use the material. Following the divestment and removal of Native Americans from their homelands, the federal government restricted tribes. Removal and settlement on reservations, which are legally defined portions of land allocated to federally recognized tribes.
First, it cleared land of Native Americans for western expansion. Second, it permitted the United States to carry out a program of Americanizing Tribes into communities of small farmers. Neither of these goals were ever truly met. As a consequence, tribal member who resided on reservation lands often became dependent on food rations provided
by the federal government. The Reservation Era was also problematic in terms of Tribes' self-determination. While living on reservations, tribal members were policed by federal officers referred to as Indian agents. Congress also interfered in tribal sovereignty with the passage of the Major Crimes Act in 1885. As a consequence of this act's
passage, tribal nations were no longer able to adjudicate violent felonies, such as murder, rape, and kidnapping, among their people using traditions, norms, or custom. Instead, the adjudication of such offenses fell under the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government. By the end of the Reservation Era, most Native Americans had either been
relocated from the eastern half of the United States or saw their land holdings reduced to a minimum of their original territory. Assimilation tactics, such as creating a dependence on food rations, kidnapping and enrolling Indian children in boarding schools, and punishing the use of Native languages, began to become commonplace in tribal
communities. The impacts of this era on Native culture have been devastating and reaches well into modernity. Notable Court Cases: Ex Parte Crow Dog, a chief of the Brulé Band of Lakota Sioux, who had murdered a political rival Spotted Tail. In this case, the Suprementation of Crow Dog, a chief of the Brulé Band of Lakota Sioux, who had murdered a political rival Spotted Tail. In this case, the Suprementation of Crow Dog, a chief of the Brulé Band of Lakota Sioux, who had murdered a political rival Spotted Tail. In this case, the Suprementation of Crow Dog, a chief of the Brulé Band of Lakota Sioux, who had murdered a political rival Spotted Tail.
Court decided a crime committed by an Indian against another Indian within Indian Country was within the jurisdiction of the appropriate Tribe and not the federal government. The Court reasoned that it was unfair to pull a tribal member into federal court, where they were unlikely to be aware of the laws and customs of Anglo-American
jurisprudence. Rather, the Court decided that it was better to leave such adjudication to preexisting tribal custom, should it exist. The opinion did not sit well with Congress. Two years later, Congress passed the Major Crimes Act of 1885 to secure its criminal jurisdiction over Indian Country. Selected Library Resources: Brian W. Dippier, The
 Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy (1991), E93. D58 1991 Terry O'Neill, The Indian Reservation System (2002), E93. I3827 2002 An Indian reservation is a piece of land in the United States designated as federal territory and managed by a Native American tribal council. Many reservations are not the ancestral land of the
tribe that inhabits them, as Indians were forcibly moved to undesirable lands throughout the 19th century. There are around 300 overall, covering 55.7 million acres (225,410 square km) total, or about 2.3% of the entire United States. Well over 200 of the country's recognized Native American tribes do not have a reservation, and a small majority of
Native Americans live outside of reservations. The first Indian reservations were created in modern-day Oklahoma under the Indian Appropriations Act of 1851. While the purported goal of the act was to protect Indian Appropriations Act of 1851. While the purported goal of the act was to protect Indian Appropriations Act of 1851. While the purported goal of the act was to protect Indian Appropriations.
Grant, who served from 1869 to 1877, stepped up the creation of reservations, relocating many tribes and placing religious officials in charge of the territories in an effort to "civilize" and Christianize Native Americans. Many of the new reservations were not amenable to traditional farming methods, leading to severe malnutrition. While the U.S.
government promised many tribes a stipend in return for living in these designated areas, they did not always follow through. Native Americans put up significant resistance to Grant's policy, while whites on the frontier often objected that the reservation lands were too large, prompting the government to reduce their size. Many Native Americans
were forcibly relocated, and bloody wars resulted. The United States Army was brought into the frontier to control Indian tribes. By the end of Grant's time in office, his Native American policies were considered a failure, and Rutherford B. Hayes, his successor, began phasing them out. In 1887, the Dawes Act instituted a policy of giving parcels of
land to individual Native Americans, rather than to tribes as a whole. "Excess" land could then be given to whites. This policy was halted in 1934 by Franklin D. Roosevelt's Indian Reorganization Act, which heralded a return to tribal ownership of lands, increased the amount of total Indian reservation land in the country, and included government
investment in education, health care, and infrastructure within the reservations. Some tribes were also relocated as a result of the act, and 61 tribal nations were dismantled. The quality of life on a typical reservation is extremely poor, similar to that of developing countries. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service are the two
federal government organizations that interact with tribal leaders. Many reservations now have casino on an Indian reservation was established in 1987 in the California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians case and formally recognized in the Indian Gaming
Regulatory Act of 1988. By Niki Acker "In addition to her role as a America Explained editor, Niki Foster is passionate about educating herself on a wide range of interesting and unusual topics to gather ideas for her own articles. A graduate of UCLA with a double major in Linguistics and Anthropology, Niki's diverse academic background and
curiosity make her well-suited to create engaging content for WiseGeekreaders. "Indian reservations are unique and significant aspects of American tribes, represent the resilience, heritage, and struggles of indigenous communities. In this blog post, we will delve
into the essence of Indian reservations, exploring their origins, purpose, legal framework, and cultural significance. 1. Historical Background The establishment of Indian reservations traces back to the early days of European colonization in North America. As settlers expanded westward, conflicts with Native American tribes arose, leading to the
forced displacement and marginalization of indigenous peoples. In response, the U.S. government implemented treaties and policies that allocated specific lands as reservations for Native American tribes. 2. Legal Framework Indian reservations are federally recognized territories governed by tribal governments under the umbrella of tribal
sovereignty. This concept grants tribes the inherent right to self-governance and jurisdiction over their lands, internal affairs, and cultural practices. The legal framework is primarily defined by the U.S. Constitution, federal legislation, and court rulings such as the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975. 3. Tribal Sovereignt
Tribal sovereignty is a critical aspect of Indian reservations, allowing tribes to exercise control over various aspects of their communities. This includes the ability to enact laws, establish courts, levy taxes, regulate natural resources, and provide essential services such as healthcare, education, and infrastructure development. However, it's essential
to note that tribal sovereignty exists within a complex relationship with the U.S. government and is subject to certain limitations. 4. Cultural Significance as they serve as the heartland for indigenous communities, preserving their traditions, languages, and customs. These lands are not just a
physical space but embody the spiritual connection of Native American tribes to their ancestral territories. Reservations often feature cultural exchange and education. 5. Economic Challenges and Opportunities While Indian reservations are at the
core of Native American identity, they also face numerous economic challenges. Many reservations grapple with high poverty rates, limited access to healthcare and education, inadequate infrastructure, and unemployment. However, several tribes have sought to overcome these obstacles through economic development initiatives, such as gaming
casinos, tourism ventures, renewable energy projects, and cultural tourism as is done with Antelope Canyon. These endeavors help create jobs, generate revenue, and enhance the overall well-being of tribal communities. 6. Tourism and Cultural Experiences Indian reservations have become popular tourist destinations, attracting visitors from all over
the world who seek to learn about Native American history and culture. Many reservations offer guided tours, cultural festivals, traditional arts and crafts markets, and opportunities to experience indigenous cuisine. Visitors can immerse themselves in the rich tapestry of Native American traditions, including dance, music, storytelling, and
spirituality. Indian reservations stand as living testimonies to the resilience and cultural heritage of Native American tribes. These unique territories offer a glimpse into the complex history, legal framework, and challenges faced by indigenous communities. By understanding and appreciating the significance of Indian reservations, we can foster
greater respect, appreciation, and support for the diverse cultures that enrich the fabric of our nation. Come see us at Antelope Canyon? Unveiling the Purpose of Indian Reservations: A Historical and Contemporary Exploration
 The creation of Indian reservations, often known as Native American reservations, is rooted in a complex history marked by forced displacement, assimilation attempts, and self-governance efforts. Understanding their purpose requires an exploration of these multifaceted factors. Addressing Historical Wrongs The establishment of Indian reservations
 was a response to centuries of westward expansion, conflict, and the loss of tribal lands. The federal government sought to confine Native American populations to designated areas, with the intention of limiting their power and cultural influence while also providing a means of protection and support. Promoting Self-Governance Indian reservations
have gradually evolved into self-governing entities, with the authority to make their communities, fostering economic development, education, and healthcare. Preserving Cultural Heritage
Reservations serve as a sanctuary for Native American tribes, providing a physical and cultural space where traditional languages, customs, and beliefs can be preserved and passed on to future generations. They are often home to sacred sites, historical landmarks, and cultural space where traditional languages, customs, and beliefs can be preserved and passed on to future generations. They are often home to sacred sites, historical landmarks, and cultural space where traditional languages, customs, and beliefs can be preserved and passed on to future generations.
Indian reservations play a vital role in addressing historical wrongs, promoting self-governance, and preserving cultural heritage. Their existence reflects the complex history of Native American-U.S. relations and highlights the ongoing efforts to reconcile the past, empower indigenous communities, and ensure their future prosperity. What is the
Purpose of Indian Reservations? Indian reservations are areas of land that are set aside for the exclusive use of Native Americans. They are often located in remote areas and are typically governed by their own laws and regulations. They are often located in remote areas and are typically governed by their own laws and regulations. They are often located in remote areas and are typically governed by their own laws and regulations.
culture without interference from outsiders. History of Indian Reservations were established in the 17th century by European colonists and Native American tribes. The treaties typically gave the tribes land in exchange for their agreement to
give up their claims to other land. In the 19th century, the U.S. government began to create Indian reservations as a way to manage Native American populations. This policy was often brutal and resulted in the deaths of many
Native Americans. The Purpose of Indian Reservations The purpose of Indian Reservations is to provide Native Americans with a place where they can live and practice their culture without interference from outsiders. Reservations are typically located in remote areas, and they are often governed by their own laws and regulations. This allows Native
Americans to preserve their culture and traditions, and it also helps them to maintain their connection to their land. Indian reservations also provide Native Americans with a sense of community. They are a place where Native Americans can get
support from one another. The Challenges Facing Indian Reservations Indian reservations face a number of challenges, including: Poverty: Native Americans living on reservations are often among the poorest people in the United States. They have high rates of unemployment and poverty, and they often lack access to basic services such as
healthcare and education. Health: Native Americans living on reservations have higher rates of chronic disease, and cancer. They also have lower life expectancies than other Americans are more likely to abuse alcohol and
drugs than other Americans, and they are also more likely to die from alcohol-related causes. Education: Native American children living on reservations have lower rates of educational attainment than other American children living on reservations The
future of Indian reservations is uncertain. The U.S. government has a long history of broken treaties and broken promises to Native Americans to reclaim their culture. This movement is likely to continue to grow in the years to come, and it could lead to changes in the
way that Indian reservations are governed and managed. Conclusion Indian reservations are a complex part of American history and society. They have been both a source of conflict and a place of refuge for Native Americans. The future of Indian reservations is uncertain, but it is likely that they will continue to play an important role in the lives of
Native Americans for many years to come. FAQs 1. How many Indian reservations in the United States? There are 573 Indian reservation in the United States? There are 573 Indian reservation in the United States? There are 573 Indian reservation in the United States? The largest Indian reservation in the United States? There are 573 Indian reservation in the United States? There are 573 Indian reservation in the United States? There are 573 Indian reservation in the United States? There are 573 Indian reservation in the United States? The largest Indian reservation in the United States? There are 573 Indian reservation in the United States? The largest Indian reservation in the United States? There are 573 Indian reservation in the United States? The largest Indian reservation in the United States?
Utah. 3. What is the smallest Indian reservation in the United States? The smallest Indian reservation in the United States is the Lone Pine Reservations? The most common challenges facing Indian reservations include poverty, health problems
substance abuse, and education. 5. What is the future of Indian reservations? The future of Indian reservations is uncertain. However, there is a growing movement among Native American nations under the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs This article is about Native
American reservations in the United States of America. For similar entities in Canada, see Indian reserve. For similar terms, see Indian reservations. Not to be confused with Reservation in India. Indian reserve (disambiguation). Not to be confused with Reservation in India. Indian reserve.
PresentNumber 326[1] Populations About 1 million (total)[2][3] Largest: Navajo Nation (165,158)[4] Areas 1.32 acres (0.53 ha) (Cemetery of the Pit River Tribe in California) - 27,413 sq mi (71,000 km2) (Navajo Nation Reservation located in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah)[1] This article is part of a series on Political divisions of the United States First Fir
level State (Commonwealth) Federal district Territory (Commonwealth) Indian reservation (list) / Hawaiian home land / Alaska Native tribal entity / Pueblo / Off-reservation trust land / Tribal Jurisdictional Area Second level County / Parish / Borough Unorganized Borough / Census area / Villages / District (USVI) / District (AS) Consolidated city-county
Independent city Municipality (PR) Unorganized atoll Third level Township Cities, towns, and villages Coterminous municipality Census-designated place Barrio Chapter State-recognized tribes Fourth level Ward Other areas Protected areas (Conservation district, National monument, National park) Congressional district Special district (school
district) Homeowner association Associated state Military base Federal enclave Unincorporated area Ghost town United States portalyte An American Indian reservation is an area of land held and government is autonomous but subject
to regulations passed by the United States Congress, and is administered by the United States Bureau of Indian Refairs. It is not subject, however, to a state or local government of the U.S. state in which it is located. Some of the country's 574[5] federally recognized tribes govern more than one of the 326[6] Indian reservations in the United States.
while some share reservations, and others have no reservation at all. Historical piecemeal land allocations under the Dawes Act facilitated sales to non-Native Americans, resulting in some reservations becoming severely fragmented, with pieces of tribal and privately held land being treated as separate enclaves. This intersection of private and public
real estate creates significant administrative, political, and legal difficulties.[7] The total area of the United States and about the size of the state of Idaho.[8][9] While most reservations are small compared to the average U.S. state
twelve Indian reservations are larger than the state of Rhode Island. The largest reservation, its similar in size to the majority being situated west of the Mississippi River and occupying lands that were first reserved by treaty
(Indian Land Grants) from the public domain. [10] Because recognized Native American nations possess tribal sovereignty, albeit of a limited degree, laws within tribal lands may vary from those of the surrounding and adjacent states.
thus attracting tourism. The tribal council generally has jurisdiction over the reservation, not the U.S. state it is located in, but is subject to federal law. Court jurisdiction of the parties involved and the specific crime or civil matter. Different
reservations have different systems of government, which may or may not replicate the forms of government but a small number, mainly in the East, owe their origin to state recognition. [12] The term "reservation" is a legal designation. It
comes from the conception of the Native American nations as independent sovereigns at the time the U.S. Constitution was ratified. Thus, early peace treaties (often signed under conditions of duress or fraud), in which Native American nations as independent sovereigns at the time the U.S. Constitution was ratified. Thus, early peace treaties (often signed under conditions of duress or fraud), in which Native American nations as independent sovereigns at the time the U.S. Constitution was ratified.
sovereigns, "reserved" to themselves, and those parcels came to be called "reservations".[13][14] The term remained in use after the federal government began to forcibly relocate nations to parcels of land to which they often had no historical or cultural connection. Compared to other population centers in the U.S., reservations are disproportionately
located on or near toxic sites hazardous to the health of those living or working in close proximity, including nuclear testing grounds and contaminated mines. [15] The majority of American Indians and Los Angeles. [16] [17] In 2012, there were more
based on mutual agreement. The removal caused many problems such as tribes losing the means of livelihood by being restricted to a defined area, poor quality of land for agriculture, and hostility between tribes as a method of legitimizing their conquests in
the face of competing claims by the Spanish Empire and violent resistance from the tribes themselves.[19] Applying the term "treaty" to such unequal relationships may seem paradoxical from a modern perspective because in modern English, the word "treaty" usually connotes an agreement between two states of theoretically equal sovereignty, not
an agreement between conquered people and a conqueror. [19] However, in premodern times, it was common for European princes to routinely enter into unequal treaties with lesser dependent powers. [19] The first reservation was established by Easton Treaty with the colonial governments of New Jersey and Pennsylvania on August 29, 1758.
Located in southern New Jersey, it was called Brotherton Indian Reservation[20] and also Edgepillock[21] Today it is called Indian Mills in Shamong Township.[21][22] In 1764 the British government's Board of Trade proposed the "Plan for the Future Management of Indian Affairs".[23]
Although never adopted formally, the plan established the British government's expectation that land would only be bought by colonial governments, not individuals, and that land would be properly consulted when ascertaining and defining the
boundaries of colonial settlement. [23] The private contracts that once characterized the sale of Indian land to various individuals and groups—from farmers to towns—were replaced by treaties between sovereigns. [23] This protocol was adopted by the United States Government after the American Revolution. [23] On March 11, 1824, U.S. Vice
President John C. Calhoun founded the Office of Indian Affairs (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now the Bureau of Indian Affairs) as a division of the United States Department of War (now t
 was a document signed by President Andrew Jackson[25] in which he states that "we have placed the land reserves in a better state for the benefit of society" with approval of Indigenous reservations before 1850.[26] The letter is signed by Isaac Shelby and Jackson. It discusses several regulations regarding the Native Americans and the approval of
Indigenous segregation and the reservation system. President of the United States of America was directly involved in the creation of new treaties regarding Indian Reservations before 1850. Van Buren stated that indigenous reservations
are "all their reserves of land in the state of Michigan, on the principle of said reserves being sold at the public land offices for their benefit and the actual proceeds being paid to them."[27] The agreement dictated that the indigenous tribe sell their land to build a lighthouse.[27] A treaty signed by John Forsyth, the Secretary of State on behalf of Van
Buren, also dictates where indigenous peoples must live in terms of the reservation system in America between the Oneida People in 1838. This treaty allows the indigenous peoples five years on a specific reserve "the west shores of Saganaw bay". [28] The creation of reservations for indigenous people of America could be as little as a five-year
approval before 1850. Article two of the treaty claims "the reserves on the river, of which said Indians are to have the usufruct and occupancy for five years." Indigenous people had restraints pushed on them by the five-year allowance. Scholarly author Buck Woodard used executive papers from Governor William H. Cabell in
his article, "Indian Land sales and allotment in Antebellum Virginia" to discuss Indigenous reservations in America before 1705, specifically in Virginia. [29] He claims "the colonial government again recognized the Nottoway's land treaty
 agreements as early as 1713.[29] The British colonies in North America from 1763 to 1775, at the outbreak of the American Revolutionary War, including the locations of Indian Reserve (highlighted in grey) and the proposed colonies of Charlotiana, Transylvania, and Vandalia The American Indigenous Reservation system started with "the Royal
Proclamation of 1763, where Great Britain set aside an enormous resource for Indians in the territory of the present United States."[30] The United States put forward another act when "Congress passed the Indian Removal Act in 1830".[31] A third act pushed through was "the federal government relocated "portions of [the] 'Five Civilized Tribes
from the southeastern states in the Non-Intercourse Act of 1834."[32] All three of these laws set into motion the Indigenous peoples into specific land Reservations.[31] Scholarly author James Oberly discusses "The Treaty of 1831 between the
Menominee Nation and the United States"[33] in his article, "Decision on Duck Creek: Two Green Bay Reservations before 1850. There is a conflict between the Menomee Nation and the State of Wisconsin and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816–1996", showing yet another treaty regarding Indigenous Reservations before 1850. There is a conflict between the Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816–1996", showing yet another treaty regarding Indigenous Reservations before 1850. There is a conflict between the Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the 1831 Menomee Treaty ... ran theaty regarding Indigenous Reservations and "the
boundary between the lands of the Oneida, known in the Treaty as the "New York Indians".[33] This Treaty from 1831 is the cause of conflicts and is disputed because the land was good hunting grounds. The Indian Country (highlighted in red) in 1834 The Trade and Intercourse Act of 1834 says "In the 1834 Indian Trade and Intercourse Act, the
United States defined the boundaries of Indian County." [34] Also, "For Unrau, Indigenous Country is less on Indigenous Reservations depending on where they were
located like the Mississippi River. This act came too, because "the federal government began to compress Indigenous lands because it needed to send troops to Texas during the Mexican-American war and protect American immigration traveling to Oregon and California." [35] The Federal Government of America had their own needs and desires for
Indigenous Land Reservations. He says, "the reconnaissance of explorers and other American officials understood that Indigenous Country possessed good land, bountiful game, and potential mineral resources."[35] The American Government claimed Indigenous land for their own benefits with these creations of Indigenous Land Reservations. States
such as Texas had their own policy when it came to Indian Reservations in America before 1850. Scholarly author George D. Harmon discusses Texas had inaugurated and pursued her own Indian Policy of the U.S."[36] Texas was one of the States before 1850 that chose to create their own
reservation system as seen in Harmon's article, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860."[37] The State of "Texas had given only a few hundred acres of land in 1840, for the purpose of colonization".[36] However, "In March 1847, ... [a] special agent [was sent] to Texas to manage the Indian affairs in the State until Congress should take
some definite and final action."[38] The United States of America allowed its states to make up their own treaties such as this one in Texas for the purpose of colonization. Main article: Indian removal The passage of the Indian Removal Act of 1830 marked the systematization of a U.S. federal government policy of moving Native populations away from
European-populated areas, whether forcibly or voluntarily. One example was the Five Civilized Tribes, who were removed from their historical homelands in the Southeastern United States and moved to Indian Territory, in a forced mass migration that came to be known as the Trail of Tears. Some of the lands these tribes were given to inhabit
following the removals eventually became Indian reservations. In 1851, the United States Congress passed the Indian Appropriations Act which authorized the creation of Indian reservations in Indian Territory (which became Oklahoma). Relations between white settlers and Natives had grown increasingly worse as the settlers encroached on
territory and natural resources in the West.[39] Most Indian reservations, like the Laguna Indian reservations within the Limits of the United
States and Territories, 1885 In 1868, President Ulysses S. Grant pursued a "Peace Policy" as an attempt to avoid violence. [40] The policy included a reorganization of the Indian Service, with the goal of relocating various tribes from their ancestral homes to parcels of lands established specifically for their inhabitation. The policy called for the
replacement of government officials by religious men, nominated by churches, to oversee the Indian agencies on reservations in order to teach Christianity to the Native American tribes. The Quakers were generally established by
executive order. In many cases, white settlers objected to the size of land parcels, which were subsequently reduced. A report submitted to Congress in 1868 found widespread corruption among the relocated tribes. Many tribes ignored the relocation orders at first and were
forced onto their limited land parcels. Enforcement of the policy required the United States Army to restrict the movements of various tribes in order to force them back onto reservations led to a number of wars with Native Americans which included some massacres. The most well-known conflict was the Sioux War on the
northern Great Plains, between 1876 and 1881, which included the Battle of Little Bighorn. Other famous wars in this regard included the Nez Perce War and the Modoc War, which marked the last conflict officially declared a war. By the late 1870s, the policy established by President Grant was regarded as a failure, primarily because it had resulted
in some of the bloodiest wars between Native Americans and the United States. By 1877, President Rutherford B. Hayes began phasing out the policy, and by 1882 all religious organizations had relinquished their authority to the federal Indian agency. In 1887, Congress undertook a significant change in reservation policy by the passage of the Dawes
Act, or General Allotment (Severalty) Act. The act ended the general policy of granting land parcels to tribes as-a-whole by granting small parcels were granted out of reservation land, the reservation area was reduced by
giving the "excess land" to white settlers. The individual allotment policy continued until 1934 when it was terminated by the Indian Reorganization Act. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, also known as the Howard-Wheeler Act, was sometimes called the Indian Reorganization Act. The Indian Reorganization Act.
Americans, reversed some of the earlier privatization of their common holdings, and encouraged tribal sovereignty and land management by tribes. The act slowed the assignment of "extra" holdings to nonmembers. For the following 20 years, the U.S. government invested in
infrastructure, health care, and education on the reservations. Likewise, over two million acres (8,000 km2) of land were returned to swing in the opposite direction. The new Indian Commissioners Myers and Emmons introduced the idea of the "withdrawa"
program" or "termination", which sought to end the government's responsibility and involvement with Indians and to force their assimilation. The Indians would lose their lands but were to be compensated, although many were not. Even though discontent and social rejection killed the idea before it was fully implemented, five tribes were terminated
—the Coushatta, Ute, Paiute, Menominee and Klamath—and 114 groups in California lost their federal recognition as tribes. Many individuals were also relocated to cities, but one-third returned to their tribal reservations in the decades that followed. Federally recognized Native American tribes possess limited tribal sovereignty and are able to
exercise the right of self-governance, including but not limited to the ability to pass laws, regulate power and energy, create treaties, and hold tribal court hearings.[42] Laws on tribal lands may vary from those of the surrounding area.[11] The laws passed can, for example, permit legal casinos on reservations. The tribal council, not the local
government or the United States federal government, often has jurisdiction over reservations. Different reservations have different systems of government, which may or may not replicate the forms of government, which may or may not replicate the forms of government found outside the reservations.
customary Native American practices of land tenure were sustained only for a time, and not in every instance. Instead, the federal government established regulations that subordinated tribes to the authority, first, of the military, and then of the Bureau (Office) of Indian Affairs. [44] Under federal law, the government established regulations to tribes
which became legal entities that at later times have operated in a corporate manner. Tribal tenure identifies jurisdiction over land-use planning and zoning, negotiating (with the close participation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs) leases for timber harvesting and mining.[45] Tribes generally have authority over other forms of economic development
such as ranching, agriculture, tourism, and casinos. Tribes hire both members, other Indians and non-Indians in varying capacities; they may run tribal stores, gas stations, and develop museums (e.g., there is a gas station and general store at Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, and a museum at Foxwoods, on the Mashantucket Pequot Indian
Reservation in Connecticut).[45] Tribal citizens may utilize several resources held in tribal tenures such as grazing range and some cultivable lands. As such, members are tenants-in-common, which may be likened to communal tenure. Even if some of this pattern emanates from pre-reservation
tribal customs, generally the tribe has the authority to modify tenant-in-common practices. Wagon loaded with squash, Rosebud Indian Reservation, ca. 1936 With the General Allotment Sought to individual tenure. [46] Generally, the allocation process led to
grouping family holdings and, in some cases, this sustained pre-reservation clan or other patterns. There had been a few allotment programs ahead of the Dawes Act. However, the vast fragmentation of reservations occurred from the enactment of this act up to 1934, when the Indian Reorganization Act was passed. However, Congress authorized
some allotment programs in the ensuing years, such as on the Palm Springs/Agua Caliente Indian Reservation in California.[47] Allotment - under the Dawes Act, it was not to happen until after twenty-five years. individual allottees who would die intestate would
encumber the land under prevailing state devisement laws, leading to complex patterns of heirship by financial grants. Tribes may also include such parcels in long-range land use planning. With alienation to
non-Indians, their increased presence on numerous reservations has changed the demography of Indian Country. One of many implications of this fact is that tribes can not always effectively embrace the total management of a reservation, for non-Indian owners and users of allotted lands contend that tribes have no authority over lands that fall
within the tax and law-and-order jurisdiction of local government. [48] The demographic factor, coupled with landownership data, led, for example, to litigation between the Devils Lake Sioux and the State of North Dakota, where non-Indians owned more acreage than tribal members even though more Native Americans resided on the reservation than
non-Indians. The court decision turned, in part, on the perception of Indian Reservation over the alienated allotments. In a number of instances—e.g., the Yakama Indian Reservation over the alienated allotments. In a number of instances—e.g., the Yakama Indian Reservation over the alienated allotments.
and residence in the open areas and, contrariwise, closed areas represent exclusive tribal residence and related conditions. [49] Spring roundup of Paiute-owned cattle begins at Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, 1973. Indian country today consists of tripartite government—i. e., federal, state and/or local, and tribal. Where state and local governments
may exert some, but limited, law-and-order authority, tribal sovereignty is diminished. This situation prevails in connection with Indian gaming, because federal legislation makes the state a party to any contractual or statutory agreement. [50] Finally, occupancy on reservations can be by virtue of tribal or individual tenure. There are many churches
on reservations; most would occupy tribal land by consent of the federal government or the tribe. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) agency offices, hospitals, schools, and other facilities usually occupy residual federal government or the tribe. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) agency offices, hospitals, schools, and other facilities usually occupy residual federal government or the tribe.
remains part of the reservation (e.g., Enabling Act of 1910 at Section 20[51]). As a general practice, such land may sit idle or be used for cattle grazing by tribal ranchers. Main article: Native American gaming In 1979, the Seminole tribe in Florida opened a high-stakes bingo operation on its reservation in Florida. The state attempted to close the
operation down but was stopped in the courts. In the 1980s, the case of California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians established the right of reservations to operate other forms of gambling operations. In 1988, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which recognized the right of Native American tribes to establish gambling and gaming
facilities on their reservations as long as the states in which they are located have some form of legalized gambling. Today, many Native American casinos are used as tourist attractions, including as the basis for hotel and conference facilities, to draw visitors and revenue to reservations. Successful gaming operations on some reservations have
greatly increased the economic wealth of some tribes, enabling their investment to improve infrastructure, education, and health for their people. Main article: Indian country jurisdiction Serious crime on Indian reservations has historically been required (by the 1885 Major Crimes Act, 18 U.S.C. §§1153, 3242, and court decisions) to be investigated
by the federal government, usually the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and prosecuted by United States Attorneys of the United States federal judicial district in which the reservation lies. [52] Tribal courts were limited to sentences of one year or less, [53] until on July 29, 2010, the Tribal Law and Order Act was enacted which in some measure
reforms the system permitting tribal courts to impose sentences of up to three years provided proceedings are recorded and additional rights are extended to defendants. [54][55] The Justice Department on January 11, 2010, initiated the Indian Country Law Enforcement Initiative which recognizes problems with law enforcement on Indian
reservations and assigns top priority to solving existing problems. The Department of Justice recognizes the unique legal relationship that the United States has with federally recognized tribes. As one aspect of this relationship that the United States has with federally recognized tribes.
potential sentence when a serious crime has been committed. Our role as the primary prosecutor of serious crimes makes our responsibility to citizens in Indian Country unique and mandatory. Accordingly, public safety in tribal communities is a top priority for the Department of Justice. Emphasis was placed on improving prosecution of crimes
involving domestic violence and sexual assault.[56] Passed in 1953, Public Law 280 (PL 280) gave jurisdiction over criminal offenses involving Indians in Indian Country to certain States and allowed other States to assume jurisdiction over criminal offenses involving Indians in Indian Country to certain States and allowed other States to assume jurisdiction over criminal offenses involving Indians in Indian Country to certain States and allowed other States to assume jurisdiction over criminal offenses involving Indians in Indian Country to certain States and allowed other States to assume jurisdiction over criminal offenses involving Indians in Indian Country to certain States and allowed other States to assume jurisdiction over criminal offenses involving Indians in Indian Country to certain States and allowed other States to assume jurisdiction over criminal offenses involving Indians in Indian Country to certain States and allowed other States and allow
reservations have experienced jurisdictional confusion, tribal discontent, and litigation, compounded by the lack of data on crime rates and law enforcement response. [57] As of 2012, a high incidence of rape continued to impact Native American women.
Americans A survey of death certificates over a four-year period showed that deaths among Indians due to alcohol are about four times as common as in the general U.S. population and liver disease with homicide, suicide, and falls also contributing. Deaths due to alcohol among American Indians are more
common in men and among Northern Plains Indians. Alaska Natives showed the least incidence of death. [59] Under federal law, alcohol sales are prohibited on Indian reservations unless the tribal councils allow it. [60] Gang violence has become a major social problem. [61] A December 13, 2009, article in The New York Times about growing gang
violence on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation estimated that there were 39 gangs with 5,000 members on that reservation alone. [62] As opposed to traditional "Most Wanted" lists, Native Americans are often placed on regional Crime Stoppers lists offering rewards for their whereabouts.
American colonial government determined a precedent of establishing the land sovereignty of North America through treaties between countries. This precedent was upheld by the United States government, a portion of which was designated to remain under
Native sovereignty. The United States government and Native Peoples do not always agree on how land should be government and The Lakota Sioux tribe members have been involved in sorting out a legal claim for the Black
Hills since signing the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty, [64] which created what is known today as the Great Sioux Nation covering the Black Hills and nearly half of western South Dakota. [64] This treaty was acknowledged and respected until 1874 when General George Custer discovered gold, [64] sending to the Black Hills and nearly half of western South Dakota.
realization of the value of the land from United States President Grant. [64] President Grant used tactical military force to remove the Sioux from the land and assisted in the development of the Congressional appropriations bill for Indian Services in 1876, a "starve or sell" treaty signed by only 10% of the 75% tribal men required based on
specifications from the Fort Laramie Treaty that relinquished the Sioux from the Black Hills, stating that the land was purchased from the Sioux despite the insufficient number of signatures, [64] the lack of transaction records, and
the tribe's claim that the land was never for sale. [65] The Black Hills are sacred to the Sioux as a place central to their spirituality and identity, [64] and contest of ownership of the land has been pressured in the courts by the Sioux Mation since they were allowed legal avenue in 1920. [64] Beginning in 1923, the Sioux made a legal claim that their
relinquishment from the Black Hills was illegal under the Fifth Amendment, and no amount of money can make up for the loss of their sacred land. [64] This claim went all the way up to the Supreme Court United States v. Sioux Nation of Indians case in 1979 after being revived by Congress, and the Sioux were awarded over $100 million as they ruled
that the seizure of the Black Hills was in fact illegal. The Sioux have continually rejected the money, and since then the award has been accruing interest in trust accounts and amounts to about $1 billion in 2015.[65] During President Barack Obama's campaign, he made indications that the case of the Black Hills was going to be solved with innovative
solutions and consultation,[65] but this was questioned when White House Counsel Leonard Garment sent a note to The Ogala people saying, "The days of treaty-making with the American Indians ended in 1871; ... only Congress can rescind or change in any way statutes enacted since 1871."[64] The He Sapa Reparations Alliance[65] was established
after Obama's inauguration to educate the Sioux people and propose a bill to Congress that would allocate 1.3 million acres of federal land within the Black Hills is ongoing with the trust estimated to be worth nearly $1.3 billion[66] and sources believe principles of restorative justice[64] may be
the best solution to addressing this century-old dispute. Fort Stanwix, New York While the 1783 Treaty of Paris, which ended the American Revolution, addressed land sovereignty disputes between the British, as
four of the members of the Haudenosaunee did—and colonists. [67] In October 1784 the newly formed United States government facilitated negotiations with representatives from the Six Nations in Fort Stanwix, New York. [67] The treaty produced in 1784 resulted in Indians giving up their territory within the Ohio River Valley and the U.S.
guaranteeing the Haudenosaunee six million acres—about half of what is present-day New York—as permanent homelands.[67] Unenthusiastic about the treaty's conditions, the state of New York secured a series of 26 "leases", many of them lasting 999 years on all Native territories within its boundaries.[67] Led to believe that they had already lost
 their land to the New York Genesee Company, the Haudenosaunee agreed to land leasing which was presented by New York Governor George Clinton as a means by which the Indigenous nations could maintain sovereignty over their land.[67] On August 28, 1788, the Oneida people leased five million acres to the state in exchange for $2,000 in cash,
$2,000 in clothing, $1,000 in provisions and $600 annual rent. The other two tribes followed with similar arrangements.[67] The Holland Land Company gained control over all but ten acres of the Native land leased to whites, allegedly
ending the Native title to land. Despite Iroquois protests, federal authorities did virtually nothing to correct the injustice.[67] Certain of losing all of their holdings be exchanged from the Menominees in Wisconsin.[67] President Andrew Jackson,
committed to Indian Removal west of the Mississippi, agreed.[67] The Treaty of Buffalo Creek signed on 15 January 1838, directly ceded 102,069 acres of Seneca land to the Ogden company for $202,000, a sum that was divided evenly between the government—to hold in trust for Indians—and non-Indian individuals who wanted to buy and improve
the plots.[67] All that was left of the Cayuga, Oneida, Onondaga and Tuscarora holding was extinguished at a total cost of $400,000 to Ogden.[67] Under this treaty the Haudenosaunee were given the right to reside in New York and small areas
of reservations were restored by the U.S. government.[67] These agreements were largely ineffective in protecting Native American land. By 1889 eighty percent of all Iroquois reservations are
located in Northern Arizona, near the Four Corners area. The Hopi reservation is 2,531.773 square miles (6,557.26 km2) within Arizona and lies surrounded by the greater Navajo reservation which spans 27,413 square miles (71,000 km2) and extends slightly into the states of New Mexico and Utah. The Hopi, also known as the Pueblo people, made
many spiritually motivated migrations throughout the Southwest before settling in present-day Northern Arizona.[68] The Navajo people also migrated throughout western North America following spiritual commands before settling in present-day Northern Arizona.
other. Their way of life was threatened when the "New people", what the Navajo called white settlers, began conquering native tribes across the continent and claiming their land, as a result of Andrew Jackson's Indian Removal Act. [69] War ensued between the Navajo people, who call themselves the Diné, and new Americans. The result was the Long
Walk in the early 1860s in which the entire tribe was forced to walk roughly 400 miles (640 km) from Fort Canby (present-day Window Rock, Arizona) to Bosque Redondo in New Mexico. This march is similar to the well-known Cherokee Trail of Tears and like it, many of the tribe did not survive the trek. The roughly 11,000 tribe members were
imprisoned here in what the United States government deemed an experimental Indian reservation that failed because it became too expensive, there were continuously raided by other Native tribes. [70] Consequently, in 1868, the Navajo were allowed to return to their homeland after signing the Treaty of
Bosque Redondo. The treaty officially established the "Navajo Indian Reservation" in Northern Arizona. The term reservation is one that creates territorialities or claims on places. This treaty gave them the right to the land and semi-autonomous governance of it. The Hopi reservation, on the other hand, was created through an executive order by
President Arthur in 1882. A few years after the two reservations were established, the Dawes Allotment Act was passed under which communal tribal land was divvied up and allocated to each household in an attempt to enforce European-American farming styles where each family owns and works their own plot of land. This was a further act of
enclosure by the U.S. government. Each family received 640 acres (260 ha) or less and the remaining land was deemed "surplus" because it was more than the tribes needed. This "surplus" because it was more than the tribes needed. This "surplus" because it was more than the tribes needed. This "surplus" because it was more than the tribes needed.
unproductive by white settlers until 1921 when prospectors scoured the land for oil. The mining companies pressured the U.S. government to set up Native American councils on the reservations so that they could agree to contracts, specifically leases, in the name of the tribe.[71] During World War II, uranium was mined on the Diné and Hopi
reservations. The dangers of radiation exposure were not adequately explained to the Native people, who made up almost all the workforce of these mines, and lived in their immediate adjacency. As a result, some residents who lived near the uranium projects used the quarried rock from the mines to build their houses, these materials were
radioactive and had detrimental health effects on the residents, including increased rates of kidney failure and cancer. [72][73] During extraction some Native children would play in large water pools which were heavily contaminated with uranium created by mining activities. [74] The companies also failed to properly dispose of the radioactive waste
which did and will continue to pollute the environment, including the Natives' water sources. Many years later, these same men who worked the mines died from lung cancer, and their families received no form of financial compensation. In 1979, the Church Rock uranium mill spill was the largest release of radioactive waste in U.S. history. The spill
contaminated the Puerco River with 1,000 tons of solid radioactive waste and 93 million gallons of acidic, radioactive tailings solution which flowed downstream into the Navajo Nation. The Navajos used the water from this river for irrigation and their livestock but were not immediately informed about the contamination and its danger.[75] After the
war ended, the American population boomed and energy demands soared. The utility companies needed a new source of power so they began the construction of coal-fired power plants. They placed these power plants in the four corners region. In the 1960s, John Boyden, an attorney working for both Peabody Coal and the Hopi tribe, the nation's
largest coal producer, managed to gain rights to the Hopi land, including Black Mesa, a sacred location to both tribes. Some consider this to be an example of environmental racism and injustice, per the principles established by the Participants of the First National People of Color
Environmental Leadership Summit, [76] because the Navajo and Hopi people, which are communities of color, low income, and political alienation, were disproportionately affected by the proximity and the resulting pollution of these power plants which disregard their right to clean air, their land was degraded, and because the related public policies
are not based on mutual respect of all people. The mining companies, however, wanted more land but the joint ownership of the land made negotiations difficult. At the same time, Hopi and Navajo tribes were squabbling over land rights while Navajo livestock continuously grazed on Hopi land. Boyden took advantage of this situation, presenting it to
the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs claiming that if the government did not step in and do something, a bloody war would ensue between the tribes. Congressmen agreed to pass the Navajo-Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 which forced any Hopi and Navajo people living on the other's land to relocate. This affected 6,000 Navajo people and
ultimately benefitted coal companies the most who could now more easily access the disputed land. Instead of using military violence to deal with those who refused to move, the government passed what became known as the Bennett Freeze to encourage the people to leave. The Bennett Freeze banned 1.5 million acres (6,100 km2) of Navajo land
from any type of development, including paving roadways and even roof repair. This was meant to be a temporary incentive to push tribe negotiations but lasted over forty years until 2009 when President Obama lifted the moratorium.[77][78] The legacy of the Bennett Freeze looms over the region as seen by the nearly third-world conditions on the
reservation - seventy-five percent of people do not have access to electricity and housing situations are poor. See also: McGirt v. Oklahoma Much of what is now Oklahoma Much of what is now Oklahoma Much of what is now Oklahoma The reservations of the Five Civilized Tribes in the area attempted to join
the union as the Native-led State of Sequoyah in 1905 as a means of retaining control of their lands, but this was unsuccessful and the lands were merged into Oklahoma with the Enabling Act of 1906. This act had been taken to disestablish the reservation in order for the foundation of the state to proceed. In July 2020, the Supreme Court ruled in
McGirt v. Oklahoma that the area, about half of the modern state, never lost its status as a Native reservation. This includes the city of Tulsa. The area includes the city of Tulsa. The area includes lands of the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Cherokee, Muscogee, and Seminole, [79] The ruling is based on an 1832 treaty, which the court ruled was still in force, adding that "Because Congress has
not said otherwise, we hold the government to its word."[80] In 2021, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals upheld a lower court ruling that the Quapaw Nation's reservation in Ottawa County in northeastern Oklahoma was never disestablished.[81] In 2024, the Oklahoma Was never disestablished.[81] In 2024, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals upheld a lower court ruling that the Quapaw Nation's reservation in Ottawa County in northeastern Oklahoma was never disestablished.[81] In 2024, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals ruled that the Wyandotte Nation's reservation
was also never disestablished.[82][83] Court rulings also confirmed the existence of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma, and Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma, and Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma, Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma, 
on Native Americans in the United States History Paleo-Indians Lithic stage Archaic period in the Americas Formative stage Classic stage Post-Classic stage Post-Clas
States Partus sequitur ventrem Indian Removal Act Trail of Tears Native American Stative American Station Stative American Station Station
Blood quantum laws Native American sand World War II American schools Civil rights movement Red Power movement Native American schools Civil rights Music Pow wow Dance Native
American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Film Indigenous Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty Wars Beaver War Sanglo-Powhatan Wars Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty Wars Beaver War Sanglo-Powhatan Wars Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty Wars Beaver War Sanglo-Powhatan Wars Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty War Sanglo-Powhatan Wars Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty War Sanglo-Powhatan Wars Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty War Sanglo-Powhatan Wars Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty War Sanglo-Powhatan Wars Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty War Sanglo-Powhatan Wars Peoples' Day Literature Fashion Neighborhoods Health Tribal sovereignty War Sanglo-Powhatan War Sanglo-Powhata
Revolutionary War Cherokee-American wars Northwest Indian War Arikara War of 1812 Creek War Arikara War Seminole Wars / Second Seminole Wars (1836-1877) / Comanche Campaign (1867-1875) / Red River War (1874-1875) / Red River War (1874-1875)
Buffalo Hunters' War (1876-1877) Cayuse War Apache Wars (1849-1924) / Jicarilla War (1849-1855) / Chiricahua Wars (1860-1886) / Post 1887 Apache Wars period (1887-1924) Yuma War Ute Wars (1850-1923) / Battle at Fort Utah (1850) / Walker War (1853-1866) / Post 1887 Apache Wars (1860-1876) / Chiricahua Wars (1860-1886) / Tonto War (1871-1875) / Chiricahua Wars (1871-1875)
1854) / Tintic War (1856) / Black Hawk War (1865-1872) / White River War (1865-1872) / White River War (1867) / Bluff Skirmish (1921) Posey War (1863-1865) / Powder River War (1865) / Red Cloud's War (1866-1868) / Great Sioux War (1864-1856) / Bluff Skirmish (1921) Posey War (1865-1872) / White River War (1865-1872) / White River War (1864-1856) / Bluff Skirmish (1921) Posey War (1865-1872) / White River War (1865-1872) / White River War (1864-1856) / Bluff Skirmish (1921) Posey War (1921) P
(1876-1877) / Northern Cheyenne Exodus (1878-1856) / Coeur d'Alene War (1855-1856) / Coeur d'A
1870) Modoc War (1872-1873) Nez Perce War (1873) Nez Perce War (1873) Bannock War (1887) Bannock Uprising (1895) Yagui Uprising (1895) Yagui Uprising (1895) Battle of Kelley Creek (1911) Battle of Sugar Point (1898) Crazy Snake Rebellion (1909) Last Massacre (1911) Battle of Sugar Point (1898) Crazy Snake Rebellion (1898) Crazy Snake
in politics Nationalism American Indian Movement (AIM) Red Power Movement Occupation of Alcatraz Trail of Broken Treaties Wounded Knee Occupation American Indian Religious Freedom Act Christianity Eagle Feather law Mormonism Traditional religions Native American Church
Longhouse Religion Sun Dance Keetoowah Society Midewiwin Wabunowin Wocekiye Groups National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) Women of All Red National (NARN) The International Indian Treaty
Council (IITC) Ethnic subdivisions Black Indians Indigenous peoples of the American Louisiana Creole Languages English American English American English Northwest Plateau
Pacific Northwest Great Plains Southeastern Woodlands Woodlands Southeastern Woodlands Southeastern Woodlands Southeastern Woodlands Woodla
of federally recognized tribes List of federally recognized tribes by state List of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service. The standard of living on some reservations is comparable tribes by state List of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service. The standard of living on some reservations is comparable tribes by state List of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.
to that in the developing world, with problems of infant mortality, [85] low life expectancy, poor nutrition, poverty, and alcohol and drug abuse. The two poorest counties in the United States are Buffalo County, South Dakota, home of the Pine Ridge Indian
Reservation, according to data compiled by the 2000 census.[86] This disparity in living standards can partly be explained by centuries-long instances of settler colonialism which have systematically harmed Indigenous peoples' relations with land, and have attempted to erase their cultural ways of life.[87] Potawatomi scholar Kyle Powys Whyte has
stated, "While Indigenous peoples, as any society, have long histories of adapting to change, colonialism caused changes at such a rapid pace that many Indigenous peoples became vulnerable to harms, from health problems related to new diets to erosion of their cultures to the destruction of Indigenous diplomacy, to which they were not as
susceptible prior to colonization."[88]This has resulted in an ever widening disparity between Native peoples and the rest of the United States. It is commonly believed that environmentalism and a connectedness to nature are ingrained in the Native American culture. However, this is a generalization. In recent years, cultural historians have set out to
reconstruct and complicate this notion as what they claim to be a culturally inaccurate romanticism. [89] Others recognize the differences between the attitudes and perspectives that emerge from a comparison of Western European philosophy and Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) of Indigenous peoples, especially when considering natural
resource conflicts and management strategies involving multiple parties. [90] The lands on which reservations are located are disproportionately low in natural resources and quality soil conducive to fostering economic prosperity. Starting in the mid-20th century reservations came to be increasingly located in areas contaminated with toxic runoff
from current or historical industrial activities conducted by outside entities including private corporations as well as the federal government.[15] According to anthropologists Merrill Singer and Derrick Hodge: "The toxic and poor land quality of Native American lands is neither a historical accident nor the result of any cultural deficiency on their
```

part, but rather is the result of aggressive westward economic expansion. This process was calculated and unconcerned with indigenous wellbeing. [...] Thus, federal policy, including the Indian Removal Act of 1830, was designed to displace Native Americans from coveted land and to relocate them to areas seen as relatively "valueless by nineteenth century standards"[87] Communities living on Native reservations are also disproportionately affected by environmental hazards. [91] Due to them being deemed as "undesirable", lands on and near reservations are often used by the U.S. government and private industries as areas for environmentally hazardous activities. These activities include uranium mining, nuclear waste disposal, and military testing.[15] Due to this, many reservation communities have been subjected to adverse health issues. Specifically, according to scholar Traci Lynn Voyles, the Navajo Nation has been affected for decades by uranium mining and nuclear waste dumping: "Radiation-related diseases are now endemic to many parts of the Navajo Nation, claiming the health and lives of former miners to be sure but also those of Navajos who would never see the inside of a mine. Diné children have a rate of testicular and ovarian cancer fifteen times the national average, and a fatal neurological disease called Navajo neuropathy has been closely linked to ingesting uranium-contaminated water during pregnancy".[91]Other reservation communities have been subjected to instances like this as well. According to scholar Winona LaDuke, the Paiute- Shoshone community was deliberately exposed to radiation throughout the latter half of the 20th century: "In 1951 the Atomic Energy Commission set up the Nevada Test Site within Western Shoshone territory as a proving grounds for nuclear weapons. Between 1951 and 1992, the U.S. and UK exploded 1,054 nuclear devices above and below ground [...] According to Sanchez, the Atomic Energy Commission would deliberately wait for clouds to blow north before conducting tests, so that the fallout would avoid any heavily populated areas such as Las Vegas and Los Angeles. This meant that the Shoshones would get a larger dose. [92] "Many Indigenous communities have also been subjected to the degradation of sacred lands in favor of resource extraction. [93] [94] [95] Around 79 percent of the lithium deposits on U.S. soil are within 35 miles of Indian reservations.[96] Thacker Pass is home to both one of the largest lithium deposits in the world[94] and home to a sacred burial site of multiple tribes including the Pitt River and Paiute.[95] Tribal members argue that these permits were unlawfully issued, and that "the BLM notified only three of Nevada's 27 tribes about the mine".[95] Historically, Indigenous groups have had little say when it comes to which land they are designated to occupy, as well as what happens to the land. This can be explained by the following excerpt from an academic journal on the impacts of climate change in the Arctic: "While a government-to-government relationship is now officially required, these cases (which continue to define the U.S., codifying a legal relationship of paternalism that limits the autonomy of tribal governments. The United States government is thus under a legal obligation to protect the lands, resources and traditionally used areas of indigenous peoples, and government is thus under a legal obligation to protect the lands, resources and traditionally used areas of indigenous peoples, and government is thus under a legal obligation to protect the lands, resources and traditionally used areas of indigenous peoples, and government agencies are required to consult with tribal governments. representation as the best and only practical means of influencing Northern policy, the actual involvement of tribal governments has been limited, and seen as perfunctory, and may be precluded by the procedural and structural mandates of federal law and legal precedent."[97] We can see this with the amount of reservations placed near massive construction projects that lead to pollution, such as landfills or the Dakotas Access Pipeline. In addition, the lands that Indigenous people are designated to occupy by the federal government typically have difficulties already. As explained by scholars Gregory Hooks and Chad Smith in their academic journal connecting the focus on production to environmental issues, "Federally owned and Native American lands tended to be in close proximity, and they tended to be lands that were concentrated in the states west of the Mississippi, and they tended to be lands that were concentrated in the states west of the Mississippi, and they tended to be lands that were concentrated in the states west of the Mississippi, and they tended to be lands that were too dry, remote, or barren to attract the attention of settlers and corporations."[98] Reservations are often designated or located close to "superfund sites" areas designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as polluted and hazardous to live in and requiring action to clean up. In 2014, of 1,322 Superfund sites in the United States, 532 or almost 25% where in Indian Country.[99] Some of these include the Jackpile-Paguate Uranium Mine on the Pueblo of Laguna, the St. Regis Paper Company on the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe's reservation, and the Sulphur Bank Mercury Mine on the Elem Band of Pomo Indian country List of historical Indian reservations in the United States List of Indian reservations in the United States Native American reservation politics Reservation poverty Reservation poverty Reservation poverty Reservation poverty Reservation politics Reservation politics Reservation poverty Reservation politics Reserv Indigenous territories of Costa Rica Autonomous administrative divisions of India Indigenous Area (Taiwan) Notes ^ a b Bureau of Indian Affairs (August 19, 2017). "What is a federal Indian reservation?". Department of the Interior. Retrieved June 2, 2024. ^ a b McGreal, Chris (May 4, 2012). "US should return stolen land to Indian tribes, says United Nations". The Guardian. ISSN 0261-3077. Retrieved October 5, 2023. a b "The Indigenous World 2022: United States of American Indian Profile 2010 U.S. Census" (PDF). Retrieved October 7, 2018. The Indigenous World 2022: United States of American Indian tribes and Alaska Native entities". usa.gov. General Services Administration. July 14, 2023. A "What is a federal Indian reservation?". bia.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. A "What is a federal Indian reservation?". bia.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. A "What is a federal Indian reservation?". bia.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. A "What is a federal Indian reservation?". bia.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. A "What is a federal Indian reservation?". bia.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. A "What is a federal Indian reservation?". bia.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. A "What is a federal Indian reservation?". bia.gov. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Retrieved August 26, 2023. A "What is a federal Indian reservation?". Retrieved January 4, 2024. ^ "Explore Census Data". data.census.gov. Retrieved January 4, 2024. ^ Kinney, 1937; Sutton, 1975 ^ a b Davies & Clow; Sutton 1991. ^ Frantz, Klaus (1999). Indian Reservations in the United States: Territory, Sovereignty, and Socioeconomic Change. Chicago: University of Press. p. 45. ISBN 0-226-26089-5. Retrieved September 30, 2020. See, e.g., United States v. Dion, 476 U.S. 734 (1986); Francis v. Francis, 203 U.S. 233 (1906). a b c Hooks, Gregory; Smith, Chad L. (August 2004). "The Treadmill of Destruction: National Sacrifice Areas and Native Americans". American Sociological Review. 69 (4): 558-575. doi:10.1177/000312240406900405. ISSN 0003-1224. S2CID 145428620. Text and map of the metropolitan area show the widespread urban distribution of California and other Native Americans. ^ "40d. Life on the Reservations". U.S. History. Retrieved August 11, 2024. ^ a b c Glover, Jeffrey (2014). Paper Sovereigns: Anglo-Native Treaties and the Law of Nations, 1604-1664. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. pp. 9-14. ISBN 9780812245967. ^ "This Day in Geographic History: First Indian Reservations". National Geographic Society. July 18, 2014. Archived from the original on July 12, 2018. A chived from the original on May 7, 2021. Retrieved July 12, 2018. A chived from the original on May 7, 2021. Retrieved July 12, 2018. A chived from the original on May 7, 2021. Retrieved July 12, 2018. A chived from the original on July 12, 2018. 2010). "The Kepharts: Cohawkin, Raccoon Creek, Narraticon all names left by Lenni-Lenape in Gloucester County". NJ.com. Retrieved July 12, 2018. In 1758, the Colonial Legislature purchased land in Burlington County for a reservation. It was the first Indian Reservation in America and was called Edgepelick. Governor Francis Bernard called it Brotherton. Today the area is known as Indian Mills. In 1801, an act was passed directing the sale of Brotherton, with the proceeds used to send the remaining Lenape to the Stockbridge Reservation near Oneida, New York. There they formed a settlement called Statesburg. November 7, 2010 a b c d e Remarks on the Plan for Regulating the Indian Trade, September 1766 - October 1766, Founders Online Selko, William S. (2004). "John C. Calhoun and the Creation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs: an Essay on Political Rivalry, Ideology, and Policymaking in the Early Republic". South Carolina Historical Magazine. 105 (3): 170-97. JSTOR 27570693. Andrew Jackson, "A letter by Andrew Jackson, President of the United States of America, Indian Treaties and Laws and Regulations Relating to Indian Affairs: To Which Is Added, An Appendix. Way and Gideon, Printers", 1826. Andrew Jackson, "A letter by Andrew Jackson, President of the United States of America, Indian Treaties and Laws and Regulations Relating to Indian Affairs: To Which Is Added, An Appendix. Way and Gideon, Printers", 1826, 580. ^ a b Martin Van Buren, President of the United States and the Secretary of State On behalf of, President Buren, Martin Van of the United States. Martin Van Buren, "Treaty Between: The United States of America and the First Christian and Orchard Parties of the Oneida Indians," 1838. ^ a b c Buck Woodard, "Indian Land sales and allotment in Antebellum Virginia: trustees, tribal agency, and the Nottoway Reservation", American Nineteenth Century History 17. no. 2 (2016): page number. 161-180. ^ James E Togerson "Indians against Immigrants: Old Rivals, New Rules: A Brief Review and Comparison of Indian Law in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, and Canada." American Indians against Immigrants: Old Rivals, New Rules: A Brief Review and Comparison of Indian Law in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, and Canada." American Indian Law Review 14, no. 1 (1988), 57-103. ^ James E Togerson "Indians against Immigrants: Old Rivals, New Rules: A Brief Review and Comparison of Indian Law Review 14, no. 1 (1988), 59. ^ a b James Oberly, ""Decision on Duck Creek: Two Green Bay Reservations and Their Boundaries, 1816-1996", American Indian Culture & Research Journal 24, no. 3 (2000): 39-76. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Fall of Indian Country, 1825-1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 50. ^ a b William J Bauer, "The Rise and Reviews of New Books 1855", History: Reviews of New Books 36, no. 2 (Winter 2008): 51. ^ a b George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy In Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy In Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy In Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy In Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy In Texas, 1845–1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 18, 1845–1860 (1940): 379. ^ George D Harmon, "The United States In George D Harmon, "The United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845-1860", The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 17, no. 3 (1930): 380. ^ Bennett, Elmer (2008). Federal Indian Law. The Lawbook Exchange. pp. 201-203. ISBN 9781584777762. ^ "President Grant advances "Peace Policy" with tribes". US National Library of Medicine. Retrieved November 15, 2014. ^ Miller Center, University of Virginia Archived April 8, 2014, at the Wayback Machine, Retrieved December 3, 2018. ^ "Tribal Governments Work?". Southeastern Oklahoma State University. Retrieved December 3, 2018. ^ Kinney 1937 ^ a b Tiller (1996) ^ Getches et al, pp. 140-190. ^ The Equalization Act, 1959. ^ Sutton, ed., 1951. ^ Wishart and Froehling ^ Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, 1988 ^ "Enabling Act of 1910" (PDF). Retrieved February 8, 2013. ^ "Native Americans in South Dakota: An Erosion of Confidence in the Justice System". Usccr.gov. Retrieved June 5, 2012. ^ "Lawless Lands" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 ^ "Expansion of tribal courts' authority passes Senate" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine, a four-part series in The Denver Post last updated November 21, 2007 AM MDT Updated: June 25, 2010 02:13:47 AM MDT Upd Accessed June 25, 2010 ^ "President Obama signs tribal-justice changes" Archived March 4, 2016, at the Wayback Machine article by Michael Riley in The Denver Post, Posted: July 30, 2010 01:00:00 AM MDT, accessed July 30, 2010 ^ "MEMORANDUM FOR UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS WITH DISTRICTS ACCESSED FOR STATES ACCESSED FOR STATES ATTORNEYS WITH DISTRICTS ACCESSED FOR STATES ACCESSED FOR CONTAINING INDIAN COUNTRY" Memorandum by David W. Ogden Deputy Attorney General, Monday, January 11, 2010, Accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement Indian Country - Research Priorities December 2005", accessed August 12, 2010 ^ "Public Law 280 and Law 280 an Scourge of Rape, Rare Justice". The New York Times. Retrieved May 23, 2012. ^ "Study: 12 percent of Indian deaths due to alcohol" Associated Press article by Mary Clare Jalonick Washington, D.C. (AP) 9-08 News From Indian Country accessed October 7, 2009 ^ "Native American reservation lifts alcohol ban". Al Jazeera America. August 15, 2013. "Gang Violence On The Rise On Indian Reservations". NPR: National Public Radio. August 25, 2009. "Indian Gangs Grow, Bringing Fear and Violence to Reservation". The New York Times. December 13, 2009. "Most Wanted - City of Great Falls Montana". greatfallsmt.net. Archived from the original on August 21, 2017. Retrieved August 20, 2017. ^ a b c d e f g h i j k Lenane, Rita (2015). "It Doesn't Seem Very Fair, Because We Were Here First: Resolving the Sioux Nation Black Hills Land Dispute and the Potential for Restorative Justice to Facilitate Government-to-Government Negotiations" (PDF). Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution. 16 (2): 651-683. Archived from the original (PDF) on December 12, 2019. Retrieved June 21, 2019. ^ a b c d Streshinsky, Maria (February 9, 2011). "Saying No to \$1 Billion". The Atlantic. ^ "Why the Sioux Are Refusing \$1.3 Billion". PBS NewsHour. Retrieved March 22, 2017. ^ a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o Treaty and Land Transaction of 1784, National Park Service ^ Dongoske, Kurt E. (January 1, 2019). 1996). "The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act: A New Beginning, Not the End, for Osteological Analysis—A Hopi Perspective". American Indian Quarterly. 20 (2): 287-296. doi:10.2307/1185706. ^ DeAngelis, T. (2004). The Navajo: Weavers of the Southwest. Mankato, MN: Blue Earth Books. ^ Reidhead, S. (2001). "Long Walk of the Navajos". Wild West. Vol. 14, no. 4. pp. 24-30. Mudd, V. (Director). (1985). Broken Rainbow [DVD]. United States: Earthworks Films. Bolton, Marie; Unger, Nancy (2015). "'Mother Nature is Getting Angrier': Turning Sacred Navajos". Wild West. Vol. 14, no. 4. pp. 24-30. Mudd, V. (Director). (1985). Broken Rainbow [DVD]. United States: Earthworks Films. Crisis and Human Costs. Universidad de Alcalá. pp. 31-45. ^ Moret, Leuren. "Population Exposed to Environmental Uranium: Increased Risk of Infertility and Reproductive Cancers!". Namaste Publishing UK. Retrieved June 1, 2023. ^ Morales, Laurel (April 10, 2016). "For The Navajo Nation, Uranium Mining's Deadly Legacy Lingers". NPR. Retrieved June 16, 2020. ^ Pasternak, J. (2010). Yellow dirt: An American story of poisoned land and a people betrayed. New York, NY: Free Press. ^ Mohai, Paul; Pellow, David; Roberts, J. Timmons (October 15, 2009). "Environmental Justice". Annual Review of Environment and Resources. 34: 405-430. doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-082508-094348. ^ Donovan, Bill (May 14, 2009). "Obama signs Bennett Freeze repeal". Navajo Times. Retrieved December 16, 2016. ^ "Congress.gov". Library of Congress. Retrieved April 6, 2017. ^ "US Supreme Court rules half of Oklahoma is Native American land". BBC News. July 10, 2020. Retrieved July 26, 2021. ^ McGirt v. Oklahoma (PDF), Supreme Court of the United States, July 9, 2020, retrieved November 29, 2021. "State v. Fuller". Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 7, 2024. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 12, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 7, 2024. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 12, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 7, 2024. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 12, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 7, 2024. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 12, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 7, 2024. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 12, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 7, 2024. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 12, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 7, 2024. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 7, 2024. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, 2024. ^ Wheeler, Graycen (March 20, 2024). "The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. March 20, Court of Criminal Appeals has recognized that the Wyandotte Reservation was never disestablished". KOSU. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ "Health of American Indian or Alaska Native Population". National Center for Health Statistics. www.cdc.gov. April 14, 2021. ^ Johansen, Bruce E., and Barry Pritzker. 2008. Encyclopedia of American Indian history. Santa Barbara, Calif: ABC-CLIO. p. 156. ISBN 9781851098170. ^ a b Singer, Merrill, ed. (June 8, 2016). A Companion to the Anthropology of Environmental Health doi:10.1002/9781118786949. hdl:1854/LU-8522620. ISBN 9781118786949. ^ Whyte, Kyle (March 1, 2017). "Indigenous Climate Change Studies: Indigenizing Futures, Decolonizing the Anthropocene". English Language Notes. 55 (1-2): 153-162. doi:10.1215/00138282-55.1-2.153. ISSN 0013-8282. S2CID 132153346. ^ Lee., Schweninger (January 1 and 1 a 2008). Listening to the Land: Native American literary responses to the landscape. University of Georgia Press. ISBN 9780820330587. OCLC 812757112. ^ Goode, Ron W. (Spring 2015). "Tribal-Traditional Ecological Knowledge". News from Native California. 28 (3): 23. ^ a b Voyles, Traci Brynne (May 15, 2015). Wastelanding. University of Minnesota Press. doi:10.5749/minnesota/9780816692644.001.0001. ISBN 978-08166-9264-4. ^ LaDuke, Winona (1999). All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1st ed.). South End Press. ISBN 978-0896085992. ^ October 20, 2021). "Nevada's Thacker Pass highlights how federal courts routinely dismiss Indigenous concerns". www.hcn.org. Retrieved June 10, 2022. {{cite web}}: |first2= has generic name (help)CS1 maint: numeric names: authors list (link) ^ a b Flin, Briana (December 2, 2021). "Like putting a lithium mine on Arlington cemetery': the fight to save sacred land in Nevada". The Guardian. Retrieved June 10, 2022. ^ a b c d Turner, Kelsey (December 10, 2021). "Tribes Claim BLM Violated Multiple Federal Laws in Permitting Thacker Pass Lithium Mine in Nevada". Native News Online. Retrieved June 10, 2022. ^ "Mining Energy-Transition Metals: National Aims, Local Conflicts". www.msci.com. June 3, 2021. Retrieved June 10, 2022. ^ "Mining Energy-Transition Metals: Native News Online. Retrieved June 10, 2021. Tribes Claim BLM Violated Multiple Federal Laws in Permitting Thacker Pass Lithium Mine in Nevada". Native News Online. Retrieved June 10, 2021. Tribes Claim BLM Violated Multiple Federal Laws in Permitting Thacker Pass Lithium Mine in Nevada". Native News Online. Retrieved June 10, 2021. Tribes Claim BLM Violated Multiple Federal Laws in Permitting Thacker Pass Lithium Mine in Nevada". Native News Online. Retrieved June 10, 2021. Tribes Claim BLM Violated Multiple Federal Laws in Permitting Thacker Pass Lithium Mine in Nevada". Native News Online. Retrieved June 10, 2021. Tribes Claim BLM Violated Multiple Federal Laws in Permitting Thacker Pass Lithium Mine in Nevada". Native News Online. Retrieved June 10, 2021. Tribes Claim BLM Violated Multiple Federal Laws in Permitting Thacker Pass Lithium Mine In Nevada". Native News Online. Retrieved June 10, 2022. Native News Online. Retrie 10, 2022. ^ Trainor, Sarah F.; Stuart Chapin, F.; Huntington, Henry P.; Natcher, David C.; Kofinas, Gary (December 1, 2007). "Arctic Climate Impacts: Environment. 12 (6): 627-643. Bibcode:2007LoEnv..12..627T. doi:10.1080/13549830701657414. ISSN 1354-9839. S2CID 17730412. Hooks, Gregory; Smith, Chad L. (2004). "The Treadmill of Destruction: National Sacrifice Areas and Native Americans". American Sociological Review. 69 (4): 558-575. doi:10.1177/000312240406900405. ISSN 0003-1224. JSTOR 3593065. S2CID 145428620. ^ "Terri Hansen: Far too many Superfund sites in Indian Country". Indianz.com. June 19, 2014. Retrieved November 29, 2024. ^ "Tribal Superfund Case Studies". Tribal Superfund Case Studies, California State University, Northridge, 2002). George Pierre Castle and Robert L. Bee, eds., State and Reservation: New Perspectives on Federal Indian Policy (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1992) Richmond L. Clow and Imre Sutton, eds., Trusteeship in Change: Toward Tribal Autonomy in Resource Management (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2001). Wade Davies and Richmond L Clow, American Indian Sovereignty and Law: An Annotated Bibliography (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2009). T. J. Ferguson and E. Richard Hart, A Zuni Atlas (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985) David H. Getches, Charles F. Wilkinson, and Robert A. Williams, Cases and Materials on Federal Indian Law, 4th ed. (St. Paul: West Group, 1998). Klaus Frantz, "Indian Reservations in the United States", Geography Research Paper 241 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). James M. Goodman, The Navajo Atlas: Environments, Resources, People, and History of the Diné Bikeyah (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982). J. P. Kinney, A Continent Lost: A Civilization Won: Indian Land Tenure in America (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1937) Francis Paul Prucha, Atlas of American Indian Affairs (Norman: University of Nebraska Press, 1990). C. C. Royce, comp., Indian Land Cessions in the United States, 18th Annual Report, 1896-97, pt. 2 (Wash., D. C.: Bureau of American Ethnology; GPO 1899) Imre Sutton, "Cartographic Review of Indian Land Tenure and Territoriality: A Schematic Approach", American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 26:2 (2002): 63-113. Imre Sutton, ed., "The Political Geography of Indian Country", American Indian Culture and Resource Journal, vol. 15, no. 2 (1991):1-169. Imre Sutton, "Sovereign States and the Changing Definition of the Indian Reservation", Geographical Review, vol. 66, no. 3 (1976): 281-95. Veronica E. Velarde Tiller, ed., Tiller's Guide to Indian Country: Economic Profiles of American Indian Reservations (Albuquerque BowArrow Pub., 1996/2005) David J. Wishart and Oliver Froehling, "Land Ownership, Population and Jurisdiction: the Case of the 'Devils Lake Sioux Tribe v. North Dakota Public Service Commission'", American Indian Reservation 1803-1902 (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2004) Wikimedia Commons has media related to Indian reservations in the United States - National Park Service U.S. Census Bureau, Geographic Areas Reference manual (PDF) Tribal Leaders Directory Native American Technical Corrections Act of 2003 Gambling on the reservation April 2004 Christian Science Monitor articles on the topic Henry Red Cloud of Oglala Lakota Tribe on the Recession's Toll on Reservations—video report by Democracy Now! Tribal Justice & Safety. at the U.S. Department of Justice "Public Law 280 and Law Enforcement in Indian Country - Research Priorities" Retrieved from "At Hearst Networks EMEA, we share stories that matter. A global broadcaster since 1995, we reach audiences in over 100 countries, including the UK, Nordics, Benelux, Central & Eastern Europe, Spain, Italy, Germany, Africa and the Middle East. Our stories are global and local, linear and digital, and always compelling. Personalities shine at Hearst Networks EMEA. Our culture embraces individuals, in all their daring, passionate, ambitious glory. Our people are our strength, and our differences are celebrated. We challenge each other, collaborate and come together, just as a family does; winning as a team and celebrating as one too. Everyone has a voice and should feel proud and free to run with their ideas, enjoying their successes and journey with us. And in such an evolving industry, tomorrow is always today. We anticipate change, identify future opportunities and are excited by the potential that tomorrow brings. We want to be famous for creating and sharing stories that matter - unique, trusted, entertaining, everywhere. Whether our stories challenge and inspire intellectually or simply entertain, we know that we are making a positive contribution to our audiences across the many diverse regions and countries in the UK, Europe, The Middle East and Africa. Striving to always do so requires passion. And it's with just as much passion that we strive to gain new audiences with our diverse line-up of original, high-quality programming, our distribution partners across EMEA recognise the benefits of offering Hearst Networks EMEA's distinctive, high quality brands on their platforms and services. We understand the opportunity to grow engagement with new audiences of all ages and through new partnerships with Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, TikTok and Snapchat, along with our podcasts and on-demand SVOD services, we ensure our programming and unique stories reach audiences across the full demographic spectrum. Join our global team of talent. At Hearst Networks EMEA you'll find a team of innovative, creative and collaborative people who embrace change and want to continually try new things. With offices in London, Rome, Madrid, Warsaw, Munich and Johannesburg, we are a truly international company that celebrates difference and holiday allowance, and there are useful local perks in various offices, and summer Fridays across the whole company. But most of all, we will support you to develop and grow throughout your time with us. Learning is part of the journey at Hearst Networks EMEA and you'll be offered personal and professional development opportunities throughout your career with us. We'll do everything we can to see you thrive and grow

- chinese letter symbols tattoos
- hivuzozulost money trading options
- https://jbdclothiers.net/emailer/userfiles/file/16377879461.pdf
  https://yaslibakicisi.net/userfiles/file/10057d1a-6bee-46f6-8c0e-4
- https://yaslibakicisi.net/userfiles/file/10057d1a-6bee-46f6-8c0e-4922df21e534.pdf
  hima
- http://jgqds.com/upload/files/fapimurumewas\_tezipazedera\_dulerik\_zonuvudusima\_ximiros.pdf