



Consultation, IA &lt;consultation@bia.gov&gt;

---

**1076-AF18**

---

**Marlene Dawson** <marlenewildblue3@aol.com>

Sun, Jun 1, 2014 at 11:51 AM

To: consultation@bia.gov

This is my response to Interior's suggested rule changes for federal recognition. Please make them part of the record.

The historical review of an Indian groups should review whether they had a treaty. And then, only where Indian title to the reservation lands had "NOT" been ceded, where permanent reservations had been intended, should have any type of permanent trust relationship with the U.S.. What federal recognition is doing today is giving a special status to Indian groups where a special status was "never" intended. The revisions being suggested will just do more of the same by requiring less of a historical connection.

Those treaties where Indian tribes ceded "all" title, "all" rights, "all" interests and were given a sum total payment were reservations in transition. They were to be transitioned to State governance. As public lands, once the reservations were allotted, the natives were to be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the State. Such Indian groups were never intended to have permanent oversight and government to government relations. To ignore the treaty intent and distort it for some other purpose is not being transparent, accountable nor part of any process where integrity is expected to operate.

It is time to stop playing games with the public. It is time to recognize that the issue of creating public lands through treaties was to make citizens of the Indians, not special citizens.

Regards,

Marlene Dawson