Return a gift to Wildlife

The Wisconsin Indian Resource Council (WIRC), 1210 Western Avenue, is an organization that works to protect the environment and native people. They have a program called the Wisconsin Indian Wildlife Resource Council, which is a way for people to donate to the cause by returning items that were previously donated to them. The items that are accepted include food, clothing, and other necessities. The donations are then used to support the work of the organization, which includes fighting for the rights of Native Americans and protecting the environment. If you would like to make a donation, you can contact the WIRC at 1210 Western Avenue or visit their website at www.wircwisc.org.

Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission
P.O. Box 9  Odanah, WI 54861

The NASINAIAIN will be published on a monthly basis in the future. If you have any thoughts or ideas on how to improve the magazine, please let us know.

WHIRL ON THE MOVE

The Wisconsin Indian Resource Council (WIRC), 1210 Western Avenue, is an organization that works to protect the environment and native people. They have a program called the Wisconsin Indian Wildlife Resource Council, which is a way for people to donate to the cause by returning items that were previously donated to them. The items that are accepted include food, clothing, and other necessities. The donations are then used to support the work of the organization, which includes fighting for the rights of Native Americans and protecting the environment. If you would like to make a donation, you can contact the WIRC at 1210 Western Avenue or visit their website at www.wircwisc.org.

Return a gift to Wildlife

If you donate to the Endangered Resources Fund, you'll receive a free wildlife calendar. The Endangered Resources Fund is a non-profit organization that works to protect endangered species and their habitats. They have a program called the Wisconsin Endangered Resources Fund, which is a way for people to donate to the cause by returning items that were previously donated to them. The items that are accepted include food, clothing, and other necessities. The donations are then used to support the work of the organization, which includes fighting for the rights of Native Americans and protecting the environment. If you would like to make a donation, you can contact the Endangered Resources Fund at 1210 Western Avenue or visit their website at www.endangeredresources.org.

What is the Volta Decision?

The Volta Decision is a court ruling that affects the rights of the Anishinaabek in the Anishinaabek Nation. Under the terms of the decision, the Anishinaabek have the right to manage and control their natural resources, including wildlife. The Anishinaabek have a right to use the natural resources on their lands in a way that is consistent with the values of the Anishinaabek people. This includes the right to use the resources in a way that respects the environment and the cultural heritage of the Anishinaabek people.

The decision was made in response to a lawsuit brought by the Anishinaabek against the government of Canada. The Anishinaabek argued that their rights to use the natural resources on their lands were being violated by the government. The court ruled in favor of the Anishinaabek, and the government was ordered to respect their rights.

The Volta Decision has implications for the future of the Anishinaabek and their relationship with the government. It is an important step toward ensuring that the Anishinaabek have the same rights as other Indigenous peoples in Canada.

TRAILS OF TREATIES

Although the treaties of the Anishinaabek have faced many challenges, the Anishinaabek continue to work to protect their natural resources and to promote the well-being of their communities. The treaties provide a framework for the Anishinaabek to manage their natural resources and to ensure that they are used in a sustainable way.

The treaties are also important for the future of the Anishinaabek. They provide a way for the Anishinaabek to work with the government and to ensure that their voices are heard. The treaties are a reminder of the Anishinaabek's long history and their ongoing commitment to protecting their natural resources and to building a better future for their communities.
March 8, 1974
The Beginning

On this date the Luverne Ojibwe tribes, enrolled in the Seventh and Eighth Bands of Lake Superior Indians, were arrested by Milton Dickson and his Wisconsin Natural Resources wardens and were charged with ice fishing on the waters of Lake Superior, contrary to the treaty rights reserved to the Indians.

The Luverne Ojibwe Tribe, enrolled in the Luverne Ojibwe Band of Lake Superior Indians, was organized in 1959 under the Wisconsin Indian Claims Act of 1953. The Tribe has more than 500 members, including all the enrolled members of the Luverne Ojibwe Band of Lake Superior Indians. The Tribe's tribal council was established in 1970 and is composed of seven elected members.

The Tribe is governed by its constitution and bylaws, which were adopted in 1959. The constitution establishes a tribal council, a chief, and a council of elders. The council is responsible for the overall governance of the Tribe, while the chief is responsible for the day-to-day operations.

The Tribe has a long history of legal battles with the federal and state governments over the recognition and protection of its treaty rights. The Tribe has been fighting for the recognition of its treaty rights since the 1950s, and has been involved in numerous legal cases over the years.

In summary, the 7th Circuit found that the Treaty of 1854 established permanent reservations for the Indians, and that the treaty rights were not extinguished by the 1868 treaty. The Tribe has the right to hunt and fish on the reservations, and the federal government is required to protect these rights.

The Tribe has been a leader in the fight for the recognition of its treaty rights, and has been involved in numerous legal cases over the years. The Tribe has been successful in many of these cases, and has gained important victories for the recognition of treaty rights.

The Tribe continues to fight for the recognition of its treaty rights, and is committed to defending its land base and resources. The Tribe is committed to working with the federal government to ensure that its treaty rights are respected and protected.

The Tribe is also involved in the work of preserving its cultural heritage, and is committed to teaching its members about their history and traditions. The Tribe is committed to ensuring that future generations will have access to the same rich cultural legacy.

The Tribe is committed to protecting the environment, and is dedicated to preserving the natural resources of its land base. The Tribe is committed to working with the federal government to ensure that the environment is protected, and that the Tribe's treaty rights are respected and protected.

The Tribe is committed to working with all stakeholders to ensure that the Tribe's treaty rights are respected and protected. The Tribe is committed to working with the federal government, local governments, and other stakeholders to ensure that the Tribe's treaty rights are respected and protected.

The Tribe is committed to working with all stakeholders to ensure that the Tribe's treaty rights are respected and protected. The Tribe is committed to working with the federal government, local governments, and other stakeholders to ensure that the Tribe's treaty rights are respected and protected.

The Tribe is committed to working with all stakeholders to ensure that the Tribe's treaty rights are respected and protected. The Tribe is committed to working with the federal government, local governments, and other stakeholders to ensure that the Tribe's treaty rights are respected and protected.
A HISTORY OF CHIPPEWA HUNTING AND FISHING

A HISTORY

The Treaty of 1837, which was signed by La Garde du County Civil, among others, was a historical event in the region. It is generally considered a turning point in the history of the Chippewa people, as it marked the beginning of a new era of conflict and change for them. The treaty was negotiated by Benjamin Dodge, the United States Commissioner for Indian Affairs, and was signed on October 4, 1837, in the presence of the Chippewa chiefs, including Chief John Johnson and Chief Peter Redbird.

The treaty provided for the cession of a large area of land in present-day Wisconsin to the United States, in exchange for perpetual annuities. The Chippewa were also granted the right to hunt and fish on the ceded land, and were promised an annual payment of $2,000 for the use of the hunting grounds.

The treaty was signed on October 4, 1837, and was ratified by the United States Senate on November 24, 1854. The treaty was later amended in 1842, when the Chippewa were granted additional annuities for the use of the hunting grounds.

The treaty was a significant event in the history of the Chippewa people, as it marked the beginning of a new era of conflict and change for them. The treaty was ratified by the United States Senate on November 24, 1854, and was signed by President Franklin Pierce.

In May 1854, the Secretary of War reported to Congress that the Chippewa of the Wisconsin Reserve had requested a removal order, stating that the land was valuable for their agricultural and hunting purposes. The order was granted, and the Chippewa were allowed to stay on the land for the next year, after which they were required to move to the Wisconsin Reserve. The Chippewa were allowed to stay on the land for the next year, after which they were required to move to the Wisconsin Reserve. The Chippewa were allowed to stay on the land for the next year, after which they were required to move to the Wisconsin Reserve.
ARTICLE 1. In consideration of the cession donated, the United States agree to make to the Chippewa nation, annually, for the term of twenty years, from the date of the ratification of this treaty, the following payments by the United States, to be in the form of money, at the rate of five hundred dollars, to be annually paid, in specie, to the said Chippewa nation.

1. Nine thousand five hundred dollars, to be paid at or before the first day of January, in the year eighteen hundred and fifty-five.

2. Nine thousand five hundred dollars, to be paid at or before the first day of January, in the year eighteen hundred and fifty-six.

3. Nine thousand five hundred dollars, to be paid at or before the first day of January, in the year eighteen hundred and fifty-seven.

4. Nine thousand five hundred dollars, to be paid at or before the first day of January, in the year eighteen hundred and fifty-eight.

5. Nine thousand five hundred dollars, to be paid at or before the first day of January, in the year eighteen hundred and fifty-nine.

6. Nine thousand five hundred dollars, to be paid at or before the first day of January, in the year eighteen hundred and sixty.

7. Nine thousand five hundred dollars, to be paid at or before the first day of January, in the year eighteen hundred and sixty-one.

8. Nine thousand five hundred dollars, to be paid at or before the first day of January, in the year eighteen hundred and sixty-two.

9. Nine thousand five hundred dollars, to be paid at or before the first day of January, in the year eighteen hundred and sixty-three.

10. Nine thousand five hundred dollars, to be paid at or before the first day of January, in the year eighteen hundred and sixty-four.

The United States agree to make the said payments of money, according to the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 2. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 3. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 4. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 5. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 6. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 7. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 8. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 9. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 10. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 11. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 12. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 13. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 14. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.

ARTICLE 15. The said Chippewa nation hereby agree to receive the payment of the money set forth in the above contract, and to receive the same, and no other, in ratifying the said treaty, as a consideration for the aforesaid cession of the Chippewa nation.
EARL'S STATE-TRIBAL ORDER: COOPERATION

The State of Wisconsin
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 11

WHEREAS, the history of tribal relations in Wisconsin has been characterized by cooperation between the state and its Native American governments, leading to the establishment of a state-wide system of tribal-state relations; and

WHEREAS, the state of Wisconsin has a unique political relationship developed between Indian tribes and the Wisconsin State government; and

NOW, THEREFORE, Earl L. Sullivan, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, does hereby order the state of Wisconsin to enter into an agreement with any Tribe or Bands of the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, who shall provide to the state of Wisconsin a plan for the establishment of a state-wide system of tribal-state relations, and such plan shall be submitted to the Governor of the state of Wisconsin for approval; and

This agreement shall be known as the "State- Tribal Order: Cooperation".

GARNOE VS. WISCONSIN

Three years before the United States government signed the Treaty of 1864, the Wisconsin Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal of the Red Cliff Band of Chippewa, including Richard Gurnoe, who was arrested on August 13, 1872, for fishing in Lake Superior, which he claimed was a violation of the Treaty of 1864. The court ruled that the treaty did not provide for the Red Cliff Band to continue to fish in Lake Superior, and that the state had the right to regulate fishing in the lake.

The Wisconsin Supreme Court decided in 1972 that the state of Wisconsin had the right to regulate fishing in Lake Superior, which it had done for many years, and that the Red Cliff Band did not have the right to continue fishing in the lake.

1836 TREATY OF 1864

Signed at La Pointe—This treaty formally, among others, established the reservation boundaries for the Chippewas in Wisconsin. Sempervirens Chippewa land in Minnesota was also ceded at that time.

1834 THE CIVILIZATION ACT

This act of the U.S. Congress granted citizenship to all Native Americans in the country; however, it did not provide that they give up their tribal membership or identity.

1834 REORGANIZATION ACT

The policy of the United States Federal Government supporting tribal self-regulation was to be replaced by a policy of tribal self-governance through a tribal government body, the tribal council, and the ability of those elected governments to manage the affairs of their respective tribes.

1872 GURNOE VS. WISCONSIN

The United States Federal Court, Western District of Michigan, in the 1895 Treaty for the reservation of waters of Lake Superior was a treaty right and that any regulation that the state seeks to enforce against the Chippewas is reasonable and necessary to prevent a substantial depletion of the fish supply.

The U.S. Supreme Court has successfully negotiated agreements for treaty commercial fishing.

1974 U.S. VS. WISCONSIN

This decision made by the U.S. District Court upheld the right of the Chippewa to fish in the Lake Superior, and that the state has the right to manage fisheries under the terms of the treaty, and that the Chippewa have a right to be heard in any proceedings affecting their rights.

The U.S. Federal District Court, Western District of Michigan, upheld the right of the Chippewa to fish in the Lake Superior, and that the state has the right to manage fisheries under the terms of the treaty, and that the Chippewa have a right to be heard in any proceedings affecting their rights.

1981 UNITED STATES VS. MICHIGAN

This decision made by the U.S. District Court upheld the right of the Chippewa to fish in the Lake Superior, and that the state has the right to manage fisheries under the terms of the treaty, and that the Chippewa have a right to be heard in any proceedings affecting their rights.

1983 LAC COURTIE OREILLES VS. VOIGT (VOIGT DECISION)

On January 28, 1983, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit upheld the right of the Lac Courte Oreilles Chippewa to hunt fish and gathering rights were reserved and protected in a subsequent treaty between the Chippewa and the United States Government. The United States Supreme Court ruled to hear the appeal in the case of Voigt vs. Wisconsin, and ruled that the Chippewa had the right to continue to fish in Lake Superior.

1854 STATE PETITIONS AGAINST HUNTING

A petition from the Wisconsin Legislature asking the President to recall the removal order was sent to Washington. The petition also asked that the permanent settlement be established for the Chippewa.

1852 CHIEF BUFFALO'S APPEAL

Chippewa, who had been living peacefully in Wisconsin for many years, was reason for the removal order. The Wisconsin Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal, and the Chippewa were ordered to remove from Wisconsin.

1854 TREATY OF 1864

Signed at La Pointe—This treaty formally, among others, established the reservation boundaries for the Chippewas in Wisconsin. Sempervirens Chippewa land in Minnesota was also ceded at that time.

1837 TREATY WITH THE CHIPPEWA

Signed at La Pointe—This treaty formally, among others, established the reservation boundaries for the Chippewas in Wisconsin. Sempervirens Chippewa land in Minnesota was also ceded at that time.

1854 TREATY WITH THE RED CLIFF BAND

Signed at La Pointe—This treaty formally, among others, established the reservation boundaries for the Chippewas in Wisconsin. Sempervirens Chippewa land in Minnesota was also ceded at that time.

1864 TREATY OF 1864

Signed at La Pointe—This treaty formally, among others, established the reservation boundaries for the Chippewas in Wisconsin. Sempervirens Chippewa land in Minnesota was also ceded at that time.

1853 TREATY OF 1853

Signed at La Pointe—This treaty formally, among others, established the reservation boundaries for the Chippewas in Wisconsin. Sempervirens Chippewa land in Minnesota was also ceded at that time.

1852 CHIEF BUFFALO'S APPEAL

Chippewa, who had been living peacefully in Wisconsin for many years, was reason for the removal order. The Wisconsin Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal, and the Chippewa were ordered to remove from Wisconsin.
The Negotiations

Although there had been several critical views of the Voigt decision it was still open water negotiations that brought the full force to the forefront. Wisconsin, after characterized as a progressive state, remained embroiled in major public relations issues.}

Leadership change in the DNR allowed for a more open public involvement in both the planning and execution of the negotiations. Representatives from each of the six Voigt tribes appointed to the Voigt Task Force comprised the body of the tribes' negotiating team. On behalf of the state, the DNR was negotiating agreements for each hunting and fishing season, with the negotiating team being DNR employees.

By 1987, the three main points of conflict still remained: hunting (the number of deer), enforcement, and the scope of State regulation of ceded lands.


Although the negotiating process has proven successful, there are still issues which will require further negotiations. For example, the Indian tribes are still working to find solutions for the mutual problems created by the Voigt decision. A major concern is the potential for violence and destruction. Sporadically, apparently not coordinated with the state's negotiations, tribal members can be found engaging in activities which are perceived as illegal by the public. The image of the tribes and the Voigt decision is that of an inter-tribal agreement between the DNR and the tribes.

The tribe's rights are protected under the treaty provisions, and the state is required to abide by these provisions. The Indian tribes have been successful in negotiating agreements that benefit them. However, Wisconsin is viewed by some as a model in terms of accommodating the negotiating process. Other states have had less success, and as a result, the image that tribal leaders have of Wisconsin may have changed.

Alternatives

Although there had been several critical views of the Voigt decision it was still open water negotiations that brought the full force to the forefront. Wisconsin, after characterized as a progressive state, remained embroiled in major public relations issues. The DNR was negotiating agreements for each hunting and fishing season, with the negotiating team being DNR employees.

By 1987, the three main points of conflict still remained: hunting (the number of deer), enforcement, and the scope of State regulation of ceded lands.


Although the negotiating process has proven successful, there are still issues which will require further negotiations. For example, the Indian tribes are still working to find solutions for the mutual problems created by the Voigt decision. A major concern is the potential for violence and destruction. Sporadically, apparently not coordinated with the state's negotiations, tribal members can be found engaging in activities which are perceived as illegal by the public. The image of the tribes and the Voigt decision is that of an inter-tribal agreement between the DNR and the tribes.

The tribe's rights are protected under the treaty provisions, and the state is required to abide by these provisions. The Indian tribes have been successful in negotiating agreements that benefit them. However, Wisconsin is viewed by some as a model in terms of accommodating the negotiating process. Other states have had less success, and as a result, the image that tribal leaders have of Wisconsin may have changed.
TRIBAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

INLAND FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

The Indian tribes have long been involved in the management of inland fisheries and wildlife resources. This involvement is rooted in the traditional way of life of the tribes, who have always relied on these resources for food and sustenance. The federal government has recognized this and has entered into agreements with Indian tribes to manage these resources.

HUNTING & FISHING RIGHTS

The rights of Indian people to take fish and hunt pursuant to their treaty rights have been upheld by the federal government. The regulation of these resources, however, has been a matter of political controversy. The states, tribes, and federal government have different views on how these resources should be managed.

PRESIDENTIAL POLICY

The principle of self-government is a key part of the American Indian Policy Review Act of 1978. This act sought to recognize the unique legal and political status of Indian tribes and to establish a policy of self-government for Indian tribes without unduly infringing upon federal interests. The act was intended to provide a framework for the resolution of existing disputes and the prevention of future conflicts.

TRIBAL ENFORCEMENT

Tribal courts have been created to enforce tribal laws and regulations. These courts are staffed by tribal members and operate under the authority of the tribal government. The purpose of tribal courts is to provide a forum for the resolution of disputes within the tribe and to ensure the enforcement of tribal laws.

- Nature of the Right
- The rights of Indian people to take fish and hunt pursuant to their treaty rights have been upheld by the federal government. The regulation of these resources, however, has been a matter of political controversy. The states, tribes, and federal government have different views on how these resources should be managed.

HUNTING & FISHING RIGHTS

For tribes, control over hunting and fishing activities is both economically and politically essential. For many Indian tribes, hunting and fishing provide an important source of food and income. In turn, hunting and fishing provide an important source of culture and heritage.

Further reading on the subject can be found in the American Indian Policy Review Act of 1978, which established a policy of self-government for Indian tribes without unduly infringing upon federal interests. The act was intended to provide a framework for the resolution of existing disputes and the prevention of future conflicts.
ABRIGATION: BREAKING AGREEMENTS

ABRIGATION OF INDIAN TREATIES

The treaties that are important to the Indians of today's Native Americans, treaties are vital. First, they represent a legal and binding agreement made between the tribes and the European settlers, and the United States. Often, before a treaty agreement was made, the United States government had to negotiate with the tribal nations. The purpose of the treaties was to ensure the rights and protections of the Indian people. Over the years, many treaties have been broken or abrogated.

Why were Indian treaties given special recognition in the U.S. Constitution?

First of all, treaties are constitutionally required contracts between governments. Under Article II, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the President is required to make treaties. All treaties must be ratified by the U.S. Senate, and all treaties made by the President must be consistent with the Constitution. The Constitution provides that treaties have the force of law in the United States.

Why should Indian treaties be treated as a national concern?

The treaties are an important part of the history of the United States, and they are a symbol of the nation's commitment to the principles of self-government and respect for the Indian people. The treaties also provide a framework for the relationship between the federal government and the tribes. The treaties are a reminder that the United States is a nation of laws and that the government is bound by the law.

Myth vs. Fact

All treaties are the same. All treaties that are broken are a breach of trust. All treaties are broken.

The treaties are different. Some are broken, and some are honored. Some treaties are broken.

The treaties are not all the same. There are differences between the treaties and their interpretation.

The treaties are broken in different ways. Some treaties are broken by the federal government, and some are broken by the tribes.

The treaties are not all broken. Some treaties are honored.

There are differences between the tribes and the federal government in how they interpret the treaties.

The treaties are not all broken. Some treaties are honored.
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INTRODUCTION TO THE FEDERAL REFORM

The Sioux of Minnesota and Wisconsin, home to the Chippewa and Menominee tribes, respectively, have been fighting for years to maintain their treaty rights. The treaties, made in the 1850s and 1860s, guaranteed the tribes certain rights and privileges, including hunting, fishing, and access to land. However, these rights have been challenged by the U.S. government and by non-Indians, leading to a series of legal battles and political struggles.

DEFINITION OF RACISM

Racism is an ideologically indefensible belief that one race is superior to another. It is often manifested in discriminatory policies and practices that deny equal opportunity to people of color.

WCA RESOLUTION TOABOGRATE

The Wisconsin County Association, after establishing a joint working committee with the tribes, voted at their annual meeting in Green Bay to drop Resolution 79, an anti-Indian resolution.

RETURN TO THE WISCONSIN CHIPPENEAUS

In 1990, it was assumed that some Indian tribes had governed politically and economically more or less according to the terms of the treaty with the United States. However, the tribes were still under the control of the federal government. Consequently, they were unable to exercise their treaty rights.

SAWYER COUNTY REFERENDUM

The referendum asked: "Should legislation be drafted and submitted in the November election for the purpose of limiting the hunting and fishing privileges of the Sawyer County Chippewa tribe?" With all 28 Sawyer County voting districts reporting, 1,586 voted "Yes" and 1,528 voted "No," according to County Clerk Frank Wittwer, who supported the "Yes" side.

INITIATIVE 456: ANTI-INDIAN MOVEMENT NATIONAL IN SCOPE

In response to a recent meeting with C. Montgomery Johnson, the American Indian Movement (AIM) and the Native American Rights Fund (NARF) held a news conference to discuss the proposed referendum in Wisconsin. AIM leaders were concerned that the referendum would limit the hunting and fishing rights of the Sawyer County Chippewa tribe.

STATE SEeks TO LIMIT TREATY HUNTING LAND

The Wisconsin County Association has also expressed concern about the proposed referendum. They believe that the referendum would limit the tribal members' rights to hunt and fish and would also affect the state's economy.

A federal court hearing is scheduled to determine the legality of the initiative. The court is expected to rule on the issue in the coming weeks.

The referendum, if approved, could have significant implications for Native American rights and sovereignty. It is important to note that the referendum is just one of many initiatives being considered in other states, and it is likely that similar measures will be proposed in other parts of the country.
**COOPERATIVE COMMITTEES EMERGE**

**INDIAN - WHAT DOES IT MEAN?**

**JOURNEY COMMITTEE**

An Ad Hoc Journey committee was established by the Ashland County Board of Supervisors, which was proposed in June at the Ashland County Board meeting. The purpose of the committee is to establish, with the Bad River Tribe and the Ashland County Government, a joint cooperative committee that would work toward the future together.

**Bad River - Ashland Co.**

Similar in efforts being made in Lac du Flambeau, two years now and essentially taken. Both community-wide. Commerce member, it was named by the Wisconsin Department of Commerce member, and named by the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians, Inc., formed. Advocating the tribe's tribal council, the Ashland County Government, and the Bad River Tribe. The Ashland County Board passed a resolution in May, which restructured the governance of the tribe and the county. The resolution also called for the establishment of a joint commission to explore avenues of mutual cooperation and communication. It was set to meet with the first organizational meeting set for today.

**Bad River - Ashland Co.**

Similar in efforts being made in Lac du Flambeau, two years now and essentially taken. Both community-wide. Commerce member, it was named by the Wisconsin Department of Commerce member, and named by the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians, Inc., formed. Advocating the tribe's tribal council, the Ashland County Government, and the Bad River Tribe. The Ashland County Board passed a resolution in May, which restructured the governance of the tribe and the county. The resolution also called for the establishment of a joint commission to explore avenues of mutual cooperation and communication. It was set to meet with the first organizational meeting set for today.

**Bayfield-Redcliff**

Retiring from the recent Lubahn Committee, Madison, Wisconsin, Chairman of Commerce member, says he was reappointed by the Bad River tribe and the Ashland County Board. He was named by the Wisconsin Department of Commerce member, and named by the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians, Inc., formed. Advocating the tribe's tribal council, the Ashland County Government, and the Bad River Tribe. The Ashland County Board passed a resolution in May, which restructured the governance of the tribe and the county. The resolution also called for the establishment of a joint commission to explore avenues of mutual cooperation and communication. It was set to meet with the first organizational meeting set for today.

**Within the Old Indian Cemetery on Madeline Island a cross stands upon a tree - symbols of the mixing of two cultures, European and Indian.**
CEDED TERRITORY UNDER VOIGT DECISION
WISCONSIN ONLY

This map of Wisconsin shows the overall territory of the lands impacted by the Voigt Decision. Shown here are the locations of the six Chippewa Reservations, the approximate southern boundary on the ceded territory, and the Wisconsin DNR listing of public lands currently open to hunting.

For more specific details contact your Tribal Council or District DNR office.

715/682-6619
Great Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Commission
P.O. Box 9 Orofino, WI 54801

DNR NEGOTIATIONS IS IT WORTH THE TRIP?

Negotiations: A Perilous Journey
Commissioner By Matt Thrush, Chairman

For many reasons, my office has been somewhat removed from the negotiations between Wisconsin and the six Chippewa tribes. This has been intentional, frustrating, and as I prepare this article, somewhat exhilarating. In this short article, I will attempt to explain the problems that underlie the negotiations and the role the DNR plays in them.

The negotiations are a complex process of give and take. Each side has its own set of interests and priorities, and these interests often conflict with those of the other side. The negotiations are a game of strategy, where each side tries to get the best deal possible. The DNR is just one of several parties involved in the negotiations, and its role is to represent the interests of the state of Wisconsin.

Some tribal members believe that the DNR doesn't want or need an open water agreement, while others feel that the DNR is trying to get as much as possible out of the tribes. In reality, both sides are trying to get the best deal possible. The DNR is not alone in its efforts, and both sides are working hard to get the best possible outcome.

Negotiations are a complex process, and it is important to understand the role of each party before trying to judge the outcome of the negotiations. The DNR is just one of several parties involved in the negotiations, and its role is to represent the interests of the state of Wisconsin.

LOOKING BACK AT THE NEGOTIATIONS AND TREATY ISSUES

It is best to keep your response in the negotiations in line with several conclusions drawn by Jim Schlender, Chairman of the Voigt Task Force. After over a year of negotiation with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for a series of interim agreements on Chippewa hunting and fishing rights.

Despite criticism and the other factors, the DNR has been roundly criticized. Anti-Indian groups, tribal courts and political, rather than biological, negotiating positions add to the complexity of the negotiations. The DNR has been criticized for its handling of the negotiations, and the state has been roundly criticized. Anti-Indian groups, tribal courts and political, rather than biological, negotiating positions add to the complexity of the negotiations.

Negotiations are a complex process, and it is important to understand the role of each party before trying to judge the outcome of the negotiations. The DNR is just one of several parties involved in the negotiations, and its role is to represent the interests of the state of Wisconsin.

NATIONAL PONDS
PUBLIC LANDS CURRENTLY ACCESSIBLE FOR HUNTING PURPOSES

NEWLANDS NATIONAL FOREST
WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST

DEER RANGE "NO HUNTING" RESPONSIBLE FOR "HUNTING" PURPOSES

SLIP FOREST
RED RIVER

The state has been roundly criticized. Anti-Indian groups, tribal courts and political, rather than biological, negotiating positions add to the complexity of the negotiations. The DNR has been criticized for its handling of the negotiations, and the state has been roundly criticized. Anti-Indian groups, tribal courts and political, rather than biological, negotiating positions add to the complexity of the negotiations.

Negotiations are a complex process, and it is important to understand the role of each party before trying to judge the outcome of the negotiations. The DNR is just one of several parties involved in the negotiations, and its role is to represent the interests of the state of Wisconsin.