

unified, docile, and 'make it.'" Much of the book is dedicated to analyzing the images which perpetuate this assumption. Although many of these images are false, the author gives unique insights on how the foundations of such images are legitimate but how the interpretation of these foundations can be inaccurate. Kwong weaves commonly held notions regarding Chinese-Americans with substantiated interpretations of how and why these notions have evolved. His analysis provides an appreciable understanding of dominant culture white America and how a particular ethnic group is frequently interpreted and misinterpreted.

—Jim Schnell  
University of Cincinnati

**Gail H. Landsman. *Sovereignty and Symbol: Indian-White Conflict at Ganienkeh.* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988) xii, 239 pp., \$19.95.**

Anthropologist Landsman has written a fascinating study about the events surrounding the seizure of a 612-acre abandoned girls' camp in upstate New York in May 1974 by a group of Mohawks who named their settlement Ganienkeh. The ensuing Indian-white land dispute eventually culminated in the relocation of the Indians to parkland near the Canadian border in 1978 as a result of a unique arrangement, the Turtle Island Trust Agreement, which for "charitable, religious and educational purposes" under New York State law established "a permanent, non-reservation settlement of Indians claiming sovereign status."

In exploring the events surrounding the establishment of the Trust, Landsman utilized a variety of techniques of data collecting. Her fieldwork included open-ended interviewing, participant observation, and the analysis of documents and tapes produced by participants throughout the dispute; she also examined archival materials and reports of the "outside" news media.

Landsman writes from the point of view of "a neutral scholar" who managed to maintain good relations with both Indian and non-Indian informants because she was "unthreatening, honest, and respectful toward informants." Also, the dispute between the two groups was actually "the intersection of two preexisting controversies: the struggle for sovereignty by traditional Mohawks, and the upstate-downstate controversy in New York State politics." Various groups that became involved in the controversy viewed the dispute over Ganienkeh quite differently. By attempting to demonstrate what the dispute really meant to its various participants, Landsman not only provides a model for anthropological field work in a dispute setting but also offers many valuable insights for scholars of Indian-white relations, journalism, and

public administration as well.

The occupation of Ganienkeh was the outgrowth of a long history of factionalism on Iroquois reservations in Canada and the United States. It was accomplished by Mohawk traditionalists who refused to participate in the reservations' Canadian and American government-supported elective system of tribal government and who viewed the U.S.-Canadian border as artificial. Citing treaties made in 1784, 1789, and 1794, the Mohawks claimed Iroquois ownership of nine million acres in the states of New York and Vermont.

Although the Mohawk presence at Ganienkeh surpassed in duration the much publicized seizure by Indian militants of Wounded Knee in South Dakota in 1971 and the occupation of a vacant Catholic novitiate near Gresham in Shawano County, Wisconsin, on New Year's Eve, 1974, it did not attract attention from the national news media for many months until an unfortunate act of violence finally made the Mohawks "part of a [news] beat." Landsman's analysis of the coverage provided by two major newspapers demonstrates how the press's frame of reference for covering the story did not promote the recording of reality but "helped to create it" and to divert attention from the profound political questions raised by the "repossession." Such press coverage contributed to local whites' perceptions of the Indians as beneficiaries of a lopsided system of justice which favored minorities.

The author skillfully handles several issues that frequently surface in contemporary disputes over Indian treaty rights. She notes, for example, that many whites have an image of Indian culture that is frozen in time assuming that either Indians should live exactly like their ancestors did two hundred years ago if they are going to claim "special privileges" (treaty rights), or they should become assimilated into mainstream culture and subject to the same rules and laws as other Americans. Landsman also observes that disputes over treaty rights have sometimes been exacerbated by efforts of well-meaning white liberals who have sought an accommodation of such conflicts within the American judicial system. Such efforts have led other whites to view the Mohawks at Ganienkeh, or Indians elsewhere who have treaty rights enabling them to fish or hunt out of season or to cut wood in wilderness areas, as benefitting from a "double standard of justice" as opposed to enjoying the rights and privileges which the United States recognized and their ancestors retained after ceding land to the federal government.

This well-documented study is enhanced by maps, illustrations depicting the perceptions of Mohawk and local white participants in the dispute, appendices, a list of references, and a fairly complete index. Although the author tends to be repetitious at times, the book is generally well written. It is highly recommended for college and university libraries.

—Ronald N. Satz  
University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire