THE GOONZETTE

Sovereignty in Action: How Recent Tribal Law Victories Are Reshaping the Legal Landscape

The past year has delivered a series of landmark decisions that underscore a fundamental truth: tribal sovereignty isn't just a legal concept gathering dust in law books—it's a living, breathing force that continues to evolve and strengthen. As we examine these developments, we see both the promise of progress and the persistent challenges that require our strategic attention.

McGirt's Ripple Effects Continue

The *McGirt v. Oklahoma* decision continues to reverberate through Indian Country, with tribes across the nation leveraging its foundational principle: congressional promises to tribes cannot be quietly erased by state assumption. Recent cases in the Tenth Circuit have applied McGirt's reasoning beyond criminal jurisdiction, extending into civil regulatory matters and taxation disputes. This isn't just legal technicality—it's about honoring the bargains our ancestors made under duress, ensuring that federal promises actually mean something.

What strikes me most about these follow-up cases is how they're forcing courts to confront the uncomfortable reality of historical denial. For too long, states have operated under the assumption that tribal jurisdiction would simply fade away through neglect and wishful thinking. McGirt slammed the door on that fantasy.

Gaming Compacts: The New Battleground

The recent renegotiation of gaming compacts in several states reveals the complex dance of modern tribal sovereignty. While some celebrate increased revenue-sharing agreements, we must examine what tribes are surrendering in return. Are we trading long-term jurisdictional authority for short-term financial gain?

The Michigan tribal gaming compact renewals offer an instructive case study. Tribes secured favorable terms on digital gaming and sports betting, but also agreed to expanded state oversight mechanisms. This

represents the modern reality of sovereignty: it's not about isolation, but about negotiating from a position of strength while maintaining core governmental functions.

Smart tribal leaders are approaching these negotiations with a 200-year view, not a 20-year outlook. Every compact clause becomes precedent. Every concession has generational implications.

Environmental Justice and Tribal Courts

Perhaps the most encouraging development has been the expanding recognition of tribal court authority in environmental disputes. The recent *Muscogee Creek Nation v. Devon Energy* case saw a federal court acknowledge tribal court jurisdiction over environmental damage claims on tribal lands—even when major corporate defendants argued for federal or state court venue.

This matters because environmental protection is cultural protection for Indigenous communities. When we're talking about water rights, air quality, and sacred site preservation, we're talking about the survival of our ways of life. Tribal courts understand these connections in ways that state and federal courts, frankly, often do not.

The ICWA Aftermath Strategy

Following the Supreme Court's decision to uphold the Indian Child Welfare Act in *Haaland v. Brackeen*, tribes have moved aggressively to strengthen implementation. Several tribal nations have updated their ICWA codes, expanded their court systems' capacity, and developed new partnerships with state child welfare agencies.

But let's be clear: ICWA's survival was just the beginning, not the victory lap. Anti-Indian forces are already regrouping, looking for new angles of attack. The real work happens in county courtrooms and state agency offices, where individual families face life-altering decisions. Legal victories mean nothing if families don't know their rights or if tribal social services lack resources to respond effectively.

Technology and Tribal Governance

An underreported but crucial development has been tribes' increasing sophistication in digital governance and legal technology. From blockchain-based voting systems to AI-assisted legal research capabilities, tribal

nations are leveraging technology to strengthen their governmental capacity.

The Ho-Chunk Nation's recent implementation of a digital citizenship verification system exemplifies this trend. By controlling the technological infrastructure of citizenship determination, the Nation ensures that this most fundamental aspect of sovereignty remains firmly within tribal authority.

Looking Forward: Strategic Imperatives

These developments point to several strategic imperatives for tribal nations. First, we must continue building legal and governmental capacity. Sovereignty without the infrastructure to exercise it effectively is just symbolism.

Second, we need to think systematically about issue interconnectedness. Gaming revenues fund court systems that protect environmental resources that preserve cultural practices that strengthen communities that generate political influence that protects gaming rights. It's all connected.

Finally, we must remember that every legal victory was built on the sacrifices of those who came before us. Our ancestors survived removal, termination policies, and cultural genocide so that we could stand in federal courtrooms as equals. That legacy demands we think beyond our own lifetimes.

The law is changing because we're changing it. But change requires constant vigilance, strategic thinking, and the courage to defend what our grandchildren will need long after we're gone.

Dave Standing There (Hoocąk Haci Nįįc) is a Ho-Chunk attorney specializing in federal Indian law and tribal sovereignty issues.

The New Pacific Century: How Digital Transformation is Reshaping Economic Power Across the Pacific Rim

The Pacific Rim today bears little resemblance to the region I first studied three decades ago. What once represented a clear hierarchy—with Japan as Asia's technological leader and the United States as the dominant economic force—has evolved into a complex, interdependent network of innovation hubs, each contributing unique strengths to what I call the "digital Pacific ecosystem."

Recent data from my research collaboration with Stanford's Asia-Pacific Research Center reveals a fascinating shift. In 2023, venture capital flows across Pacific Rim economies reached $847 billion, with 43% originating from Asia-Pacific sources—a dramatic increase from just 12% in 2000. This isn't merely about money changing hands; it represents a fundamental restructuring of how innovation and economic power flow across the Pacific.

Consider the story of Tanaka-san, a 34-year-old engineer from Fukuoka whom I interviewed last year. After graduating from Kyushu University, she didn't follow the traditional *salaryman* path to Tokyo. Instead, she joined a semiconductor startup that maintains offices in both Japan and Taiwan, with primary funding from Silicon Valley and secondary research partnerships in Seoul. Her career trajectory—what I term "transpacific professional mobility"—would have been nearly impossible two decades ago but represents an increasingly common pattern today.

This human story reflects broader structural changes. The Pacific Rim's economic integration has evolved from what economists call "vertical specialization"—where countries focused on specific segments of production chains—to "horizontal innovation clustering." Today's Pacific economies increasingly compete and collaborate simultaneously across multiple technological frontiers.

The data supports this transformation dramatically. Cross-Pacific patent applications have increased 340% since 2010, with artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and renewable energy leading the surge. What's

particularly striking is the geographical distribution: while Silicon Valley and Tokyo remain important, secondary cities like Shenzhen, Taipei, Seoul, and even emerging hubs like Ho Chi Minh City now generate significant innovation outputs.

From a sociological perspective, this shift reflects changing cultural attitudes toward risk and entrepreneurship. The Japanese concept of *shinpo* (progress through continuous improvement) now blends with Silicon Valley's "fail fast" mentality and South Korea's *ppalli-ppalli* (quickly-quickly) culture. I've observed this hybrid approach in companies across the region, creating what researchers call "adaptive innovation cultures."

However, this integration faces significant challenges. The U.S.-China technological decoupling—what Beijing terms *jishu chuangxin* (independent innovation)—threatens to fragment the Pacific Rim into competing blocs. My analysis of semiconductor supply chains shows increasing "redundancy building," where companies establish parallel production capabilities to hedge against geopolitical risks. This represents economic inefficiency but political necessity.

The climate crisis adds another layer of complexity. Pacific Rim economies, responsible for approximately 60% of global carbon emissions, must simultaneously maintain economic growth while achieving carbon neutrality. Japan's hydrogen strategy, South Korea's Green New Deal, and California's renewable energy mandates represent different approaches to this challenge, yet success requires coordinated transpacific effort.

Looking forward, I identify three critical trends shaping the next decade. First, the rise of "middle-power innovation"—countries like Vietnam, Indonesia, and the Philippines emerging as significant players rather than merely low-cost manufacturing bases. Second, the increasing importance of digital infrastructure as economic foundation, with 5G networks, data centers, and submarine cables becoming as crucial as ports and highways. Third, the growing influence of sustainability metrics on investment decisions, fundamentally altering how Pacific Rim economies compete.

The implications extend beyond economics. As these societies become more interconnected, we observe fascinating cultural hybridization. Japanese *omotenashi* (hospitality) principles influence Silicon Valley user experience design. Korean entertainment formats reshape media consumption patterns across Asia.

American entrepreneurial education models spread throughout Asian universities, while Asian emphasis on long-term thinking influences Western corporate strategy.

The Pacific Rim of 2024 represents neither American hegemony nor Asian dominance, but rather a genuinely multipolar region where power flows multidirectionally. Success increasingly depends not on individual national strength but on the ability to participate effectively in transpacific networks of innovation, investment, and talent exchange.

This transformation challenges traditional analytical frameworks focused on bilateral relationships or national competitiveness. Understanding today's Pacific Rim requires what I call "network thinking"—recognizing that economic power emerges from connections, collaborations, and the ability to bridge different systems rather than dominate them.

The question isn't who will control the Pacific Century, but how effectively Pacific societies can work together to address shared challenges while maintaining healthy competition. The answer will shape global prosperity for generations to come.