Websters definition: Federal recognition acknowledges a tribe's eligibility to receive federal services provided to tribes

In 1974 US congress came up with a classification for the corporate “n/Native Hawaiian” term.

S. 147 executive summary, describes the “bill” a bill to authorize the creation of a race-based government for Native Hawaiians living throughout the United States. This bill does this by shoehorning the native Hawaiian population , wherever located, under a federal Indian law system and calling the resulting government a “tribe”.

Making up a Pass through account as a corporation (25, 48 USC) admiralty - fabricating a substitution transfer that allows the f. US congress to add archipelagic revenues to the “native trusts” they operate – look at BIA.

25 CFR 83.7

§83 .7 Mandatory criteria for Federal acknowledgment.

[ Editorial note: the seven criteria are given the letters a,b,c,d,e,f,g. Some of these criteria have sub-parts, and sub-sub-parts. I have placed lines to separate the seven criteria from each other for greater clarity ]

The mandatory criteria are:

--------------------

(a) The petitioner has been identified as an American Indian entity on a substantially continuous basis since 1900. Evidence that the group's character as an Indian entity has from time to time been denied shall not be considered to be conclusive evidence that this criterion has not been met. Evidence to be relied upon in determining a group's Indian identity may include one or a combination of the following, as well as other evidence of identification by other than the petitioner itself or its members.

(1) Identification as an Indian entity by Federal authorities.

(2) Relationships with State governments based on identification of the group as Indian.

(3) Dealings with a county, parish, or other local government in a relationship based on the group's Indian identity.

(4) Identification as an Indian entity by anthropologists, historians, and/or other scholars.

(5) Identification as an Indian entity in newspapers and books.

(6) Identification as an Indian entity in relationships with Indian tribes or with national, regional, or state Indian organizations.

----------------------------------

I am writing on behalf of the National Congress of American Indians, the nation's largest and oldest organization of tribal governments, to express our strong support for H.R. 309, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2005, and to express our concern about some of the inaccurate criticisms of the bill that surfaced at the recent hearing in the House Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on the Constitution.

H.R. 309 would reaffirm the Native Hawaiian right to a limited form of self-governance. Some critics have misstated the effect of H.R. 309. The unique legal and political relationship that indigenous Hawaiians have with the United States is not race based but is based on their status as aboriginal people with pre-existing governments with whom the U.S. entered treaties and other agreements. It is this historical, political reality that provides the foundation for the unique relationship that has always existed--and continues to exist today--between the United States and its indigenous peoples.

The argument that recognition of a Native Hawaiian governing entity would establish a race-based government is antithetical to the very foundation of the United States government's relationship with its indigenous peoples. This argument was expressly repudiated by the Supreme Court in Morton v. Mancari and is worth quoting here:

Literally every piece of legislation dealing with Indian tribes and reservations, and certainly all legislation dealing with the B.I.A, single out for special treatment a constituency of tribal Indians living on or near reservations. If these laws, derived from historical relationships and explicitly designed to help only Indians, were deemed invidious racial discrimination, an entire Title of the United States Code (25 U.S.C.) would be effectively erased and the solemn commitment of the Government toward the Indians would be jeopardized. . . . As long as the special treatment can be tied rationally to the fulfillment of Congress' unique obligation toward the Indians, such legislative judgments will not be disturbed. Here, where the preference is reasonable and rationally designed to further Indian self- government, we cannot say that Congress' classification violates due process. 417 U.S. 535 (1974).

**con·sti·tu·tion·al**  (knst-tsh-nl, -ty-)

*adj.*

**1.** Of or relating to a constitution: *a constitutional amendment.*

**2.** Consistent with, sanctioned by, or permissible according to a constitution: *a law that was declared constitutional by the court; the constitutional right of free speech.*

**3.** Established by or operating under a constitution: *a constitutional government.*

**4.** Of or proceeding from the basic structure or nature of a person or thing; inherent: *a constitutional inability to tell the truth.*

**trib·al**  (trbl)

*adj.*

Of, relating to, or characteristic of a tribe.



LakotaEsquire

I see that there is very little discussion on many of these posting sites.  Many "Tribes" do not have the capacity to address these issues.  The media has a lot to do with this.  On the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, there is the KILI Radio station, and Oglala Lakota College television cable station.  In recent history the individuals running these entities, do not believe in the ability of "Indians" to run their own affairs, thus influencing what is aired.  Leaving a majority of the important issues at the mercy of 'smoke signal' or 'word of mouth'.  Tribal entities such as the Great Sioux Nation (Lakota) still retain their "Creation Story" as a basis for their existence.  The inception of the IRA in 1934, adopted versions of the US Constitution which doesn't recognize SPIRITUAL concepts of existence, and or lawful, principles and purpose.  As a result, a once spiritually connected, and prideful people of integrity are becoming just like non-indians and only see greed and individual ego related purpose.  There are many laws that one can make reference to, but the bottom line is the theft and duress of economic and legislative access.  On Pine Ridge, the BIA supports and affirms that the voting population are only those who have registered to vote within the boundaries.  The Constitution states, simple majority of %30 of all eligible.  This is a gimme, since the US operates at a little over 50%.  The Tribal Governance has passed several elections on the Pine Ridge with less than 4,000 votes where the Constitution establishes at least 7,200 votes to carry any election or 'special' secretarial based on 24,000 eligible.  Nowhere in recent history did a referendum of the eligible voters change this Constitutional requirement.  When confronted with these stats to the Federal Governing entities such as the House of Representatives or Senators, they tell us that the Tribe is Sovereign.  How convenient...When it comes to taking things from Indians, they say "Plenary Power".  Then when it comes to Treaty Entitlements, the Presidents issue "Unfunded Mandates".  Plenary Power over domestic Indian Nations is forbidden by the Constitution of the United States under "Previous Condition of Servitude", and Unilateral Acts of Congress DO NOT Supercede Treaty Agreements.  Also, holding Indian resources under duress, is a violation of Treaty Stipulations called, "Depredation" and is a violation of Federal Law by not awarding just and proper compensation to the Individual Members of each Tribe.

Homework –

See “Admissions Act “